

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 28, 1981

The House met at 3 p.m.

The Reverend Richard Englund, Trinity Church, Chambersburg, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O God, we come before You with the song of joy and thanksgiving still ringing in our hearts. We are grateful that this difficult and trying chapter in our national life is now over and that the hostages have been returned from Iran. We ask You to be with them and their families as they begin to pick up the pieces of their lives and put them back together again. May they be aware of Your presence and Your love as they go through these difficult days of getting to know one another again.

We ask for Your special grace upon our Nation and our leaders. Help us so that our anger and disgust at the way they have been treated does not turn into wrath and vindictiveness. You have not taught us to live that way. Guide us into following in the footsteps of Your Son, Jesus Christ, whose forgiveness came to us from the cross and whose love bore all things and endured all things.

We seek Your guidance in particular for all those to whom is committed the Government of this Nation. At this time of great uncertainty give them wisdom and courage, discipline and self-control, so that they may consider all questions calmly in their deliberations, and act wisely and promptly, upholding what is right, abhorring what is wrong, and performing that which is just, so that in all things Your will may be done. In Jesus' name we pray. 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.

## THE REVEREND RICHARD ENGLUND

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this afternoon to welcome the Reverend Richard Englund of the Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church of Chambersburg, Pa., to the House of Representatives.

Reverend Englund was the pastor of my church in Fond du Lac for 5 years. His warmth and his guidance to all the

members of the church is still remembered by all of us. It was in his living room in Fond du Lac that Reverend Englund urged me to give up the practice of law and try my hand at politics. I like to think that is a good example of his wise counsel.

He was educated in Massachusetts where he received his bachelor's and master's degrees in chemical engineering and then decided to set his life on a different road and attended the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago.

Reverend Englund has had churches all over the United States: Colorado, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and now, Pennsylvania; and he has been joined in his work by his wife Greta and three children.

The dedication and love of all the ministers, rabbis, and priests of this country—men like Dick Englund—contribute toward maintaining our country's value system.

Dick Englund represents here today, all those men and women who spend their lives teaching and preaching among us.

Thank you, Reverend Englund.

## SWEARING IN OF MEMBER-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) kindly step into the well of the House and take the oath of office?

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), the majority leader.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make some brief announcements with respect to the schedule.

The first thing is that today there is a special order, in which any Member who desires to do so is invited to participate, in memory of Olin E. Teague, who was buried yesterday.

The second thing I want to tell Members is that we will have a pro forma session tomorrow, another Friday and another Monday. It is not anticipated that legislation would be brought up on the House floor tomorrow, Friday, or Monday.

The next thing is that the President of the United States has requested of

the leadership that we enact very early next week, if possible, a debt ceiling extension at a net figure of \$985 billion. Now, if it is possible for the Congress to complete action upon this request next week, either by Thursday or by Friday if necessary, then it will be possible for the House to take the entire week of Lincoln's birthday as a home district work period.

If it is not possible, for whatever reason, to complete action on that debt ceiling extension requested by President Reagan next week, then we would have to be in session Monday and/or Tuesday of the following week.

## INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. MOTTI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution calling for the Federal Reserve Board to take action to bring down interest rates.

For the past year, the Fed has been literally bludgeoning major sectors of the economy by twice pushing the prime borrowing rate above the unbelievable level of 20 percent. In the name of fighting inflation, the Fed has been causing more while only delaying economic revitalization which in the long run would reduce inflationary pressures.

Mr. Speaker, tight money will not end inflation unless we are brought to an unacceptable economic standstill. We in Congress must also do our part, by cutting taxes and spending, balancing the budget, scrapping needless regulations, and restraining energy prices.

Let us not put the inflation-fighting burden on the family wanting to buy a house or a car, or on the small businessman trying to stay out of the red.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF APPOINTMENT OF STAFF MEMBER JONNA LYNNE CULLEN TO OMB STAFF

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make the following announcement.

There has been a young, able, talented, and beautiful woman who has worked for the Committee on Rules for many years, and her name is Jonna Lynne Cullen. She is leaving the committee and going to the Office of Management and Budget to be the liaison to the House for the newly con-

□ 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.

firmed Director, Mr. Stockman, and the Chair is sure all Members and friends wish her the greatest success and happiness.

#### THE FORGOTTEN HOSTAGE IN IRAN

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

Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the sincere hope that the celebration by this body and this Nation in the past 8 days over the release of the 52 Americans held hostage in Iran will not dim our memory of an American citizen who remains today an uncharged, untried prisoner of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Cynthia Dwyer, a freelance journalist from Amherst, N.Y., near Buffalo, traveled to Iran last April after having published several articles on the Iranian revolution—articles that, ironically, were anything but supportive of the Pahlavi regime. She was in Tehran to continue her journalistic research when, on May 5, she was arrested by revolutionary guards at her hotel, accused of being a spy for the CIA. The accusation, never followed by formal charges, is blatantly false; nevertheless, the shameless and irrational leaders of Iran have used it to indefinitely detain this professional writer, this homemaker, and mother of three young children, this innocent American.

I urge the administration, which has already initiated third-party efforts to secure a definition of Mrs. Dwyer's status and to seek her release, to redouble those efforts immediately in this uncertain stage of American-Iranian relations. And I call on my colleagues and my fellow citizens not to allow Cynthia Brown Dwyer to become a forgotten hostage of Iran. We owe her and her family the freedom so recently won for her 52 countrymen.

□ 1510

#### MR. DONOVAN SHOULD BE CONFIRMED

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged over yesterday's proceedings at the confirmation hearing for Labor Secretary-designate, Raymond J. Donovan. The FBI on the basis of admittedly unsubstantiated allegations from informants—attempted to link Donovan's construction company to questionable or illegal mob activities.

Mr. Donovan was entirely correct in calling these informants slime. I was a police officer for 23 years in New York City and know that informants are un-

reliable—pathological liars and are oftentimes manipulated. The very best one can expect from an informant is a lead or a direction which in and of itself may be meaningless unless pursued for confirmation by supporting credible evidence.

The reliance on informants prompted Mr. Donovan to say—

I'm from a great State, New Jersey. But if you're in the construction business in this country, you're suspect. If you're from New Jersey, you're indictable. And if you're Italian, you're convicted.

What Mr. Donovan is enduring is not unique—but he very graphically makes the point. The Italian-American community has been burdened with this problem for years. Numerous prominent and average Italian Americans have been the victims of character assassination on the strength of informant innuendos that somehow are leaked to the media and which result in extreme political and personal damage.

Any individual or agency which uses informant evidence without corroboration is truly abusing their power. The fact that the FBI has resorted to this tactic is truly unfortunate—it threatens the very integrity of the system of justice in our Nation.

Based on the testimony received, I hope the Senate Labor Committee goes forward with a vote to confirm Mr. Donovan.

#### PRESIDENT ERRS IN REMOVING PRICE CONTROLS ON OIL

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

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has made a serious mistake by removing price controls from oil at this time.

It may be warm and sunny in some parts of this Nation, but in New England, we are in the middle of the coldest winter this century.

We have already run short of coal; we have run short of natural gas; we are running short of heating oil; and we have conserved every possible Btu.

The President's order will not produce any more oil this afternoon, this week, this winter. The only fuel it will provide immediately is fuel for inflation.

The decision to decontrol today will cost the American consumer billions of dollars more than if he had waited until controls expire in 8 months.

Government may profit; the oil companies will profit; and price gougers will make giant profits. Only the American consumer will lose.

#### EL SALVADOR SHOULD HANDLE ITS OWN PROBLEMS

(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, last week, the State Department informed the Congress that the United States will be sending military personnel into El Salvador to assist Salvadoran security forces. These are the same security forces that Ambassador Robert White said were undoubtedly "directly involved" in the December murder of four American Catholic missionaries.

Our military personnel are now involved in the internal problems of El Salvador. In the State Department's own words, they are at risk from the "possibility of an 'isolated' terrorist attack." Terrorist attacks are not isolated incidents in El Salvador—10,000 people have been killed there in acts of political violence during the past year.

It is ludicrous to risk the lives of American military to support a government that our own State Department has implicated in the murders of American civilians.

The problems of El Salvador must be solved by Salvadorans, not by Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge the removal of all U.S. military personnel, and the discontinuation of all economic aid to the Government of El Salvador.

#### MR. DONOVAN SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO ABUSE BASED ON HEARSAY

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to the remarks made by Mr. BIAGGI and I concur with him entirely. Too often, decent Americans, called into public service, have their pasts picked through with finetooth combs, only to be rewarded with a barrage of unsubstantiated allegations. I do not think that men of Mr. Donovan's stature should be subjected to slander and abuse in a public forum on the basis of unreliable and hearsay information.

#### WHO WILL HEAD THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DURING THE NEXT 4 YEARS?

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that the President has not yet disclosed his choice to head the Veterans' Administration for the next 4 years. Many of my colleagues share my concern.

I realize there are many things that must be done in assuming the Presidency and I am sure the administra-



tion is doing the very best it can to put in place those people who will help lead the administration during the next 4 years. I believe the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is one of the most important appointments the President will make and I would have hoped the President would have made his choice before now. Obviously, he must first concentrate on the Cabinet-level positions and one can even understand the high priority being placed on the No. 2 position in the Cabinet.

What concerns me is that many sub-Cabinet positions have already been announced. In fact, the Washington Post this weekend revealed that the President has selected his Director of the Internal Revenue Service and his Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration is the largest independent agency in the executive branch. In fact, it is larger than several departments combined. It operates a budget of more than \$22 billion and its total number of employees exceeds 220,000. I would, therefore, urge the President to move with dispatch to make known to the Congress and to the veterans of our Nation his choice to head this most important agency during his administration. It is in the best interest of all our Nation's veterans that this be done without further delay. In this way our veterans will know the President cares about them and that he intends to place a high priority on benefits and services to be provided to them and their families.

#### H.R. 1008 PROVIDES FLEXIBILITY IN CLEAN WATER ACT

(Mrs. BOUQUARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Speaker, while we all support the goal of abundant pure clean water, hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee on Oversight and Review last year made it clear that the EPA is not implementing the pretreatment provisions of the Clean Water Act in a cost-effective manner. In fact, testimony before this subcommittee indicated that the EPA's attempt to develop national uniform pretreatment standards would add tremendously to the cost borne by industries in waste treatment and not necessarily provide cleaner water.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 1008. Legislation to provide some flexibility in enforcing section 307 of the act by allowing local communities to develop their own pretreatment programs as long as the final discharge from the publicly owned treatment works did not violate the effluent limitation for treatment works. Our chief concern, as well as the chief concern

of the EPA, should be in controlling the amount of toxicity which is ultimately discharged from a treatment works. It should be left to the local authorities to determine just what the most cost-effective means of meeting these requirements will be.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in providing this needed flexibility by cosponsoring H.R. 1008.

#### CONSUMERS LEFT AT MERCY OF OIL COMPANIES AND OPEC

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration is wasting no time showing the American people where it stands on energy issues. The action by President Reagan to immediately decontrol domestic oil leaves consumers entirely at the mercy of the big oil companies and OPEC.

President Reagan is renouncing any responsibility for our Nation's energy policies. In throwing away the Federal Government's energy tools, he is insuring that big oil and OPEC will dictate energy policies and energy prices to the American people.

While I did not agree with the previous policy of gradual decontrol, that policy did provide a buffer for the American consumer and American industry. But in his efforts to get a running start, President Reagan has resorted to running over consumers. His action will bring long-term economic shocks and mean real hardship for the American people.

Letting OPEC and big oil determine our energy costs will only further unleash inflation and make a mockery of our free market system. Energy has been the single most important factor disrupting our economy for the past 8 years. In one hastily reached decision, the Reagan administration is surrendering the sole weapon we possess to limit the full brunt of spiraling energy costs on American consumers. And with one stroke of the President's pen, the essential allocation protections we worked so hard to get are being cast aside.

This decision to immediately decontrol domestic oil will have long-term repercussions, primarily on energy dependent States. Instead of being enhanced, the free market system will be further stifled. Decontrol has the potential to encourage monopoly as oil companies pull out of existing markets in search of more profitable areas closer to their product sources.

In my own State of Minnesota, four oil companies—Texaco, Gulf, DX, and Shell—are already considering moving out. The lifting of allocation requirements will only increase the possibility of such desertions.

The loss of these oil companies could create a real crisis in my State. Forty-four percent of the refined oil consumed in Minnesota is brought in from other States. With the loss of these major oil companies, who would make up their share of the Minnesota market? How much freer would the market be without them?

The problem is compounded by the cutbacks and gradual phase out of Canadian crude oil to Minnesota. At present, 82,000 barrels per day are brought into the State from Canada. Compare this to the 123,000 barrels per day we received just last year. And in a few short years there will not be any Canadian crude at all. There is real concern that Minnesota farmers will face shortages of the fuel needed to plant and harvest their crops. Homeowners whose bills are already soaring will find their utility bills even higher. And consumers who have already reduced gasoline consumption to minimal levels will face higher costs and the prospect of gasoline shortages.

The sad aspect of this situation is that Minnesota is not alone. Other energy dependent States will have to come to grips with the effects of immediate decontrol. We should have had in place, before decontrol occurred, alternative measures to insure that all those who need oil would have access to it at affordable prices.

□ 1520

#### COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP TO HONOR OUR RETURNEES AND SERVICEMEN

(Ms. FIEDLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, since November 1979, our country has been bedecked with a symbol—a symbol that has been seen in every corner of the Nation. That symbol is the yellow ribbon, signifying our Nation's desire for the safe return of our countrymen who were held hostage in Iran.

Yesterday that symbol covered Washington, even to the balcony of the White House. There is a proposal before this House to strike a medal for each of our returned hostages. Today, I propose an additional step—that Congress pass a concurrent resolution calling for the printing of a commemorative postage stamp to honor our returnees and the eight American servicemen who died during the aborted rescue attempt. Perhaps the theme of that stamp could be the yellow ribbon our countrymen have displayed and worn for 14 months.

I believe a commemorative postage stamp, easily within the means of every American, will be a constant reminder to the people of our country of the need to remain strong in the face

of hostile enemies and keep alive the memory of those Americans who suffered so long in Iran and those who gave their lives trying to free them.

#### LET TERRORISTS BE AWARE

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on November 7, 1979, just after the Iranian terrorists attacked our Embassy and kidnapped our fellow Americans, I came before this body charging that it was decision time for our country—time to warn the terrorists of the world that the United States is through backing away and apologizing—time to say and do those things necessary to let the world know that America will never go to its knees again, except in the worship of Almighty God.

President Reagan proclaimed such a decision yesterday when speaking for the American people he said:

Let terrorists be aware that when the rules of international behavior are violated, our policy will be one of swift and effective retribution.

I am proud of our President for saying what has been in the hearts and minds of our countrymen for so long.

The President's announcement will be welcomed by our country's friends and allies, who now realize that the slumbering giant has been aroused and it will be greeted with grudging respect by those who would be our adversaries.

Our President has made a strong statement, one that has been long overdue, but one that will enjoy the strong support of a united America.

#### SUMMIT MEETING TO IMPROVE RELATIONS WITH OUR NORTH AMERICAN NEIGHBORS

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

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, today, I am reintroducing a concurrent resolution calling upon President Reagan to invite President Lopez Portillo of Mexico and Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau of Canada to a summit meeting to discuss improving our relations with our North American neighbors in a variety of areas such as trade, immigration, agriculture, transportation, energy, and others. This resolution is modeled after a similar one I introduced in the last Congress which was cosponsored by over 70 Members and which generated hearings before several foreign affairs subcommittees. As a result of these hearings and in consultation with both private sector and governmental leaders

in all three countries, I have broadened the scope of my original proposal to cover a wide range of issues affecting the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

This North American summit meeting is designed to provide a forum for discussion of key issues that have, in the past, caused strained relations with our border neighbors to the north and south. Potential conflicts should also be studied at such a top-level meeting. It is important to emphasize that the spirit behind this resolution is one of mutual cooperation and benefit to all three nations. This spirit has often been lacking in previous negotiations and, for this reason, it is imperative that President Reagan act expeditiously to improve our relations with Mexico and Canada, as he has promised to do during his Presidential campaign.

As cochairman of the House North American Trade Caucus with Congressman JOHN BREAU, it is our intention to urge greater sensitivity to the issue of North American relationships. The summit meeting will be an important first step and strong signal to our neighbors that we are, in fact, serious about this proposition.

#### PRESIDENT MCKINLEY'S BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, we Americans, in every corner of our great Nation, have just experienced a marvelous week, an historic week, a week which drew us together in love of country and in determination to be resolute in the protection of our greatest blessing—freedom.

I think it is appropriate at this particular moment in our history, when America is reasserting itself as a world leader, to recall an American leader who stood for the values and principles we cherish as a people.

Tomorrow is the birthday of our martyred President William McKinley. It was during his administration that the United States moved onto the world scene as a great power and it was generally recognized that isolation was no longer desirable or even possible.

Our 25th President led our country to accept its international responsibilities and commitments. The history of the world was greatly influenced as a result.

If he had been present here in the Nation's Capital yesterday, I am sure he would have strongly endorsed the words of our 40th President when he warned international terrorists that our patience has a limit.

A religious man, President McKinley found it necessary to lead us in war.

His goal, however, was peace. He said, in one of his speeches:

Let us ever remember that our real eminence lies in victories of peace, not those of war.

William McKinley served the 16th District of Ohio, which I am proud to call my own, for 13 years and, in his last term, was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Before being elected President in 1896, he also served 4 years as Governor of Ohio.

His favorite flower was the red carnation, Ohio's State flower. The carnations you see today in the House dining room honor his memory.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. The American people spoke on November 4 and they said they are tired of runaway government. In order to control the growing bureaucracy there must be some belt tightening. The businesses and workers of the United States are required to balance their budgets, why should they not be able to expect the same from their Government. The actual 1980 budget had a deficit of almost \$74 billion. President Carter's 1981 budget has an estimated deficit of \$78.4 billion. Need we wonder why inflation has been in the double digits for 2 consecutive years, only for the second time since 1917.

The budget is full of fat. Joseph Califano, former Secretary of HEW admitted his agency lost billions of dollars through fraud and waste. As another example, OSHA has had a constant budget increase for 5 years while job-related accidents have skyrocketed. This to me indicates inefficiency in the OSHA program not to mention the cost to businesses and consumers in paperwork.

In the past 4 years the majorities in the House and Senate have not acted on their own to balance the budget, therefore, I feel it is time to listen to the American people.

Former President Carter's 1982 budget shows a deficit of \$27.5 billion, but his estimate includes a 10-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax. The American people have spoken and I for one have heard. The heroes that President Reagan spoke of in his inaugural address do not need more taxes, they do not want more government, they want a government that can live as they do, within their means.



### THE IMPUTED TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1981

(Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from issuing final regulations that would harm family farms and businesses and further depress the housing industry.

This measure, the Imputed Tax Relief Act of 1981, would prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from adopting new regulations that increase the imputed interest rate on a loan between related parties and on transactions involving deferred payment sales of certain property. At a time when high and fluctuating interest rates are hurting economic recovery as much or more than any other factor, the IRS should not be throwing fuel on the fire by raising imputed interest rates.

In August of 1980, the Internal Revenue Service proposed regulations that would increase imputed interest rates by 50 percent on transactions between related parties and on deferred property sales. It is obvious that this increase is inflationary and that it will most affect farm and ranch income.

One of the most important factors affecting the sale of farm and ranch land is not only the price of the land but the terms of the sale as well. The freedom of the seller to offer a property at less than commercial rates gives him and the buyer a critical edge in the market. IRS action to raise the imputed interest rate will seriously erode this critical edge.

The typical farm or ranch operation simply does not generate the income to pay for land, meet equipment and operational costs, and pay higher interest rates. The land contract is one of the common estate-planning tools used by many young farmers and ranchers.

Such special arrangements may allow the young farmer an entry into land ownership that might otherwise not be available. The proposed IRS action, which my bill will prevent, would discriminate against family transactions by requiring higher interest rates on loans for the sale of property to family members. The increased interest rates are contrary to our historic national policies of preserving the family farm and the operation of the independent farmer.

The IRS justifies the increase on the ground that it is necessary to reflect current market rates. I contend that the market rates referred to do not accurately reflect the unique situation in the agriculture economy. Agriculture is Nebraska's leading industry and this multibillion-dollar economy is suffering.

The past year has been a year of lower prices and higher production costs, a year marred by losses due to the grain embargo, and a year of drought and other poor weather conditions. Imposing higher imputed interest rates will only add to the forces working against the economic well-being of American agriculture.

The IRS was wise to heed public protest against these proposed rules by delaying their implementation until July 1, 1981. Congress would be wise to take this opportunity to enact legislation to prohibit on a permanent basis the increase in imputed interest rates sought by the IRS.

### JUMPING TO CONCLUSIONS IN EL SALVADOR

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to all the Members that one of the wisest things we could do is not jump to conclusions on the basis of press reports. There have been press reports of a dramatic nature about developments in El Salvador. The picture is painted as if all the evil lies on one side and somehow the truth only lies with the would-be rebels.

We went through a similar scenario in Nicaragua and the picture now looks very, very different after more facts come in.

I would suggest that the responsible committees of the House and the other body take a good look through proper channels and procedures at the situation in El Salvador and that we in the House personally and collectively not be stamped into any premature judgment.

### REMEMBER THE VIETNAM VETERANS

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of all the celebration yesterday and welcoming home our 52 hostages, I just have one observation I have to make. After participating with the Speaker and the distinguished majority leader in those proceedings at Andrews Air Force Base, we along with many of our colleagues, present and former, attended the funeral of that great patriot and nine-time decorated veteran, a former Member of this House, Olin "Tiger" Teague, at Arlington National Cemetery. The eulogy was a most beautiful one, delivered by Colonel Singleton of the Air Force who was, you may recall, a fighter pilot who was shot down over North Vietnam and held prisoner for more

than 7 years in those hell holes where our prisoners were held at the time.

He is now an Air Force chaplain and, as I said, delivered a most moving and touching eulogy.

□ 1530

I could not help but think as I went home last night, after all that had taken place, that it was just too bad we did not—we did not—give just a fraction of the attention to those returning prisoners from Vietnam as we did for those returning yesterday. In my judgment, we still owe those heroes much more attention than their Government ever gave them.

### SEXUAL ORIENTATION SHOULD NOT BE REGARDED AS LEGITIMATE GROUNDS FOR BIAS

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. WAXMAN and 31 other of our colleagues, I am today introducing legislation that addresses one of the most pervasive forms of discrimination found in our Nation. My bill also reinforces the constitutional guarantee of the right to privacy since this fundamental freedom is undermined whenever an individual's sexual orientation becomes the basis for discrimination.

A person's sexual orientation should not be regarded as legitimate grounds for bias any more than should skin color or religious expression.

Over 20 million homosexual men and women are in every occupation and institution in our Nation. They are doctors, lawyers, professors, carpenters, clerks, secretaries, writers, Government workers, and street-sweepers. They are rich and poor, black and white, city dwellers and rural residents. And like most Americans, they obey the law and work hard.

But unlike other groups, homosexuals do not have legal recourse when they encounter discrimination. A man or woman may meet every possible criterion for housing or employment and yet if he or she is a homosexual an apartment or job can be denied him or her simply on the basis of personal, private sexual orientation.

Last October, hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities on this issue in San Francisco. Almost every witness testified to the need for this legislation. And its enactment would confirm my belief that most Americans oppose this form of bias just as strongly as they reject discrimination directed against racial and religious minorities.

I hope this Congress will recognize that homosexuality is not a sufficient

reason to relegate a person to the status of second-class citizen. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation to amend the Civil Rights Act so that we may eliminate discrimination against homosexuals in housing, employment, education, and public accommodations.

When we address the issue of rights for homosexuals we are, in fact, talking about human rights. Let us make 1981 the year when our Nation no longer sanctions discrimination based on the private sexual orientation of millions of Americans.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R.—

A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of affectional or sexual orientation, and for other purposes

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

#### PUBLIC FACILITIES

Sec. 2. Section 301(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000b(a)) is amended by inserting after "religion," the following: "affectional or sexual orientation,".

#### FEDERALLY ASSISTED OPPORTUNITIES

Sec. 3. Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) is amended by inserting after "color," the following: "affectional or sexual orientation,".

#### EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Sec. 6. (a) Sections 703(a), 703(b), 703(c), 703(d), 703(e), 703(j), 704(b), 706(g), and 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-2, 2000e-3, 2000e-5, 2000e-16) are amended by inserting after "sex," each place it appears the following: "affectional or sexual orientation,".

(b) Section 717(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16) is amended by inserting ", affectional or sexual orientation," after "sex,".

(c)(1) Section 703(h) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e-2) is amended by inserting after "sex," the first place it appears the following: "affectional or sexual orientation,".

(2) Such section 703(h) is further amended by inserting ", affectional or sexual orientation," after "sex" the second place it appears.

#### INTERVENTION AND PROCEDURE

Sec. 7. Section 902 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000h-2) is amended by inserting after "sex" the following: ", affectional or sexual orientation,".

#### HOUSING SALE, RENTAL, FINANCING AND BROKERAGE SERVICES

Sec. 8. (a) Section 804 of the Act entitled "An Act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation and for other purposes," (42 U.S.C. 3604), is amended by inserting after "religion," each place it appears the following: "affectional or sexual orientation,".

(b) Section 805 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3605) is amended by inserting after "religion," the following: "affectional or sexual orientation,".

(c) Section 806 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3606) is amended by inserting after "religion," the following: "affectional or sexual orientation,".

#### PREVENTION OF INTIMIDATION

Sec. 9. Section 901 of the Act entitled "An act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of

violence or intimidation, and for other purposes," (42 U.S.C. 3631) is amended by inserting after "religion," each place it appears the following: "affectional or sexual orientation,".

#### DEFINITION

Sec. 11. As used in the amendments made by this Act, the term "affectional or sexual orientation" means male or female homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality by orientation or practice by and between consenting adults.

#### RULE OF INTERPRETATION

Sec. 12. No amendment made by this Act shall be construed to permit or require—

(1) the determination that discrimination exists to be based on any statistical differences in the incidence of persons of a particular affectional or sexual orientation in the general population as opposed to in the activity wherein such discrimination is alleged; or

(2) the fashioning of any remedy requiring any sort of quota for the activity wherein such discrimination is alleged for persons of any particular affectional or sexual orientation.

#### FRANK R. HOOD, HEAD OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION'S PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAM, HAS RETIRED

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to the fact that after nearly 23 years as head of the Veterans' Administration's public information program, Frank R. Hood, has retired.

Mr. Hood has been acclaimed professionally over the years and is held in esteem by countless persons he has worked with, in VA, in the Congress, in veterans' organizations.

But it is interesting to think what he accomplished during his long tenure for people who do not know him and will never hear of him. As VA's Assistant Administrator for Information Services, he directed a nationwide program to inform veterans and dependents of their rights and opportunities—and he did it for more than a generation.

At the time he was elevated from assistant to top VA publicist, many veterans who served in World War II and the conflict in Korea were still receiving readjustment help from VA. He was there through the buildup in Vietnam, the long war that followed, the development of new benefits and services to help veterans of that war, the end of the Vietnam era, and several years into the post-Vietnam era.

More than a third of those who are veterans today became veterans during Mr. Hood's tenure and heard about—and have been constantly reminded of—their rights and privileges through word put out by his organization. Those who already had service

have continued to receive facts and advice of value to them.

Every newspaper, every radio station, every television station, every news organization in the United States has played a part in the dissemination of this vast amount of information Frank Hood has initiated and supervised. The number of people he has touched is inestimable.

#### A BILL TO LIFT SOME OF THE TAX BURDEN FROM SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we call our Nation the land of opportunity, and rightfully so. Here people have a chance to build for themselves, to keep the fruits of their labors for themselves and their posterity.

How terrible it is then, Mr. Speaker, when we find those people who cannot do this. Rather, too often, the fruits of their labor wind up going to the tax collector.

In his inaugural address, President Reagan spoke about lessening the tax burden. I think we have to do this, particularly in regard to the crushing level of taxation small business bears.

Mr. Speaker, many, many family-owned small businesses and family farms have been sold to pay taxes. This is very unfortunate. It is something that should be stopped. Unless it is, we are going to see family-owned small businesses cease to exist, being bought up by large businesses that tend to greater and greater economic concentration.

Mr. Speaker, small business accounts for the creation of 87 percent of the new jobs in this country. The only way we are going to get true recovery from this recession is by encouraging small business. The way to do this is to keep small business functioning.

Mr. Speaker, I join our colleague, Congressman TAUKE, of Iowa, in sponsoring a bill to lift some of this burden from the back of small business. We propose, in essence, that the estate tax threshold on a family-owned business or farm be raised from the current \$500,000 to \$1 million provided the business or farm is passed along to the members of the immediate family. This increase would be phased in over a 5-year period, and the maximum amount would be indexed for inflation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill for the "New Beginning."



# LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO METE OUT JUSTICE IN CASES WHERE VANDALS AND THIEVES DISHONOR THE SACRED RIGHTS OF OTHERS

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, among the many treasured liberties guaranteed to each American under the Constitution of the United States is the right to freely exercise the religion of one's choice. Our reverence for that right is generally reflected in the profound respect and deference that we accord one another in choosing and honoring our respective religions.

Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing minority among us which does not share that respect. With heightened regularity, newspapers carry stories of vandalism, theft, and arson directed against cemeteries, buildings used for religious purposes, and irreplaceable religious relics. These incidents are not confined to any geographic region, nor are they directed exclusively against any particular religion. Although the brunt of this crime wave has been borne by Jews, attacks have been waged on Christians and Buddhists as well.

Mr. Speaker, a survey released by B'nai B'rith in December of last year highlights this frightening assault on first amendment rights. That survey suggests an increase in episodes directed against Jewish property alone from 1979 to 1980 of as much as 192 percent. Furthermore, many of these incidents involved potentially life-threatening activities, such as arson and firebombings. It has been estimated that losses to religious organizations stemming from this type of destruction may run as high as \$1.5 billion per annum.

Because of the first amendment concerns that permeate this area, the Federal Government must take firm, effective, and swift measures to bring this horrifying trend to an immediate halt. Since existing Federal criminal law provides the Justice Department with inadequate means for prosecuting those who flagrantly and intentionally attempt to interfere with the free exercise of religion, I am today introducing a bill designed to remedy this situation. Specifically, it would add a new section to title 18 of the United States Code which would prohibit anyone from willfully damaging a cemetery, a building used for religious purposes, or any religious article contained therein, or stealing such religious articles, with an intent to interfere with the free exercise of religion by any person or class of persons. Attempts to commit such destruction or theft would also be an offense under this section. Because property damage of this nature can pose a serious

threat to life and limb as well, the penalties are graded based on the type of damage that results. Thus, the penalties provided are: First, in general, \$10,000 and/or 5 years maximum imprisonment; second, \$15,000 and/or 15 years maximum imprisonment where bodily injury results; and third, maximum life imprisonment where death results.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill addresses a clear Federal interest in an effective manner. Vandals and thieves who dishonor the sacred rights of others should be put on immediate notice that the strong arm of the Federal Government will mete out justice in these cases.

## INCREASING NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON WARTIME RELOCATION AND INTERNMENT OF CIVILIANS

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 253) to increase the number of members of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield to explain what this is about?

Mr. MINETA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MINETA. As the gentleman, my distinguished colleague from California, knows, in July 1980 the House passed and the Senate passed the committee bill to establish the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. Since then we are now going to add an additional appointment by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, in addition to the two or three that were authorized originally in the legislation, for the President to appoint two in the House and two in the Senate. So this is to increase it so that each of the branches, the executive, the House, and the Senate, will have three appointments to the Commission.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, so this is just an expansion of that?

Mr. MINETA. If the gentleman will yield further, this is an extension of that and an expansion of that Commission to one additional member each as an appointment from each

body of the Congress. It was passed by the Senate yesterday.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. With no additional cost, or anything?

Mr. MINETA. No additional cost, just the addition of one Commission member.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. MINETA. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wanted to know, can the gentleman give us some idea of the reason for expanding the size of the Commission over and above the original bill?

Mr. MINETA. Would my colleague from California yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. MINETA. I thank the gentleman. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER), in making the appointments to the Commission, in the legislative history of the establishment of the Commission, the President or the Senator from Alaska had gotten a promise that an Aleut would be one of the appointees to the Commission. That commitment was overlooked at the time the commissioners were appointed and, consequently, in order to accommodate the Senator from Alaska, this has been approved by the Senate and is now up for House consideration.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 253

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) subsection (b) of section 3 of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians Act is amended by striking out "seven" and inserting in lieu thereof "nine".*

*(2) Clause (2) of such subsection is amended by striking out "Two" and inserting in lieu thereof "Three".*

*(3) Clause (3) of such subsection is amended by striking out "Two" and inserting in lieu thereof "Three".*

*(b) Subsection (e) of section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out "Four" and inserting in lieu thereof "Five".*

Passed the Senate January 27 (legislative day, January 5), 1981.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**COMMENDING FORMER PRESIDENT CARTER, FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE MUSKIE, FORMER DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE CHRISTOPHER, AND THE ALGERIAN NEGOTIATORS**

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 43) commending former President Jimmy Carter, former Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, former Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher, and the Algerian negotiators for their efforts in securing the safe release of the 52 American hostages from Iran, and President Reagan for designating former President Carter to greet the freed hostages, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

□ 1540

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin this question: Is this not a version of the resolution originally introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI)?

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois and other Members recall, a version of the resolution introduced by our good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI), was to be considered last week. There was some concern about the wording and the inclusion of certain statements and phrases in that resolution. This is a resolution that is perfected, and there is no objection. I am proud to support the resolution that was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI), with certain amendments.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, would it be more accurate to say "with certain language perfections"?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman from Illinois, as always, is accurate and true in his perception.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, can the chairman of the committee tell us, did this resolution go before the gentleman's committee, or was the Foreign Affairs Committee consulted? Because I know that last week the gen-

tleman was not completely sure that enough Members had been consulted.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), under his reservation, yield to me?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs after the perfecting amendments were agreed to or included, and, as is normal when we have a resolution that is timely, to expeditiously consider it, I am asking unanimous consent to discharge the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman.

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY**

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the request before us is to discharge the committee. If that is accepted, then there will subsequently be a motion to adopt the resolution; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at that time I will reserve the right to object so that I might direct some helpful questions to the original sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation at this time.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the resolution that we would have before us will mention in particular the Algerian negotiators, but will not at any point mention the efforts of our friends in Canada and our friends in Switzerland who have also participated in trying to help us during the crisis? Am I correct that only the Algerian negotiators are mentioned and not the Canadians and the Swiss?

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

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman must remember and does recall that we indeed have expression of appreciation as far as the cooperation and the efforts made on the part of the Canadians and the Swiss, and others, in the last Congress.

So, to answer the gentleman, this is specifically commending the President, the Under Secretary of State, President Reagan, and the Algerian negotiators.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, do I un-

derstand from the gentleman that there is no language in here with regard to the Canadian and the Swiss participation in the negotiations? It mentions only the Algerian negotiators?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield, that is true. But we felt it was not necessary because we already have done so.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 43**

Whereas the 52 Americans who were held as captives of the Iranian Government for 444 days were set free on January 20, 1981; and

Whereas during the period of the hostages' captivity the American people kept the plight of the hostages foremost among their concerns; and

Whereas our Nation will always remember the supreme sacrifice made by the eight American servicemen who were killed in the April 1980 effort to rescue the American hostages; and

Whereas the persistent efforts of former President Jimmy Carter throughout the duration of the crisis resulted in all 52 Americans being released alive; and

Whereas the diligence and leadership exhibited by former President Carter, former Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, and former Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher were instrumental in securing the release of the hostages; and

Whereas the Algerian negotiators played a pivotal intermediary role in the final stages of the negotiations which led to the release of our citizens; and

Whereas President Reagan reflected the unity of the American people when he requested former President Carter to officially greet the hostages after their safe arrival in Wiesbaden, Federal Republic of Germany: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives commends former President Jimmy Carter, former Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, and former Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher for their success in securing the release of the American hostages from captivity in Iran, for the diligence and leadership they exhibited in their efforts during the hostage crisis, and for their persistence in these efforts. The House further conveys its deep appreciation to the Algerian negotiators for the role which they played in resolving the crisis.

SEC. 2. The House of Representatives pays special tribute to the eight Americans who lost their lives during the heroic effort to rescue the American hostages.

SEC. 3. The House of Representatives commends President Reagan for his warm gesture in recognition of former President Carter's significant contribution to the successful resolution of the hostage crisis.

SEC. 4. The House of Representatives welcomes the 52 Americans back to freedom and wishes them peace and happiness in the days ahead.



## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution. A similar resolution was passed in the other body unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise in support of the resolution introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) commending our former President, Jimmy Carter and former Deputy Secretary of State, Warren Christopher for their leadership in securing the safe release of the 52 American hostages from Iran, and President Reagan for recognizing those efforts.

The measured and steady actions which former President Carter took throughout this long ordeal played a key role in helping to bring about the happy outcome, and convinces me that history will prove that his patience and statesmanship were the ultimate key to this long trial.

To Mr. Christopher must surely go our lasting gratitude for his diligence and able negotiating ability. Under intense pressure he resolved several complex and difficult issues together with the key assistance of the Algerian Government.

To former Secretary of State Muskie goes our thanks for the continuity he brought to the negotiations when he assumed his Cabinet position last year.

To President Reagan goes our commendation for his crucial support of the negotiations and the unity he brought to that delicate point when the hostages were being freed and the new administration was being installed.

To the Government of Algeria, and especially to its Foreign Minister, Mohammed Benjahia, and Algerian President, Chadli Bendjdid, go our everlasting thanks and appreciation. Under their able leadership, Algerian mediators accomplished a duty dictated to them by the exercise of their international obligations.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we express our deep gratitude to the families of those held in Iran for their patience and courage. Above all, we extend our highest praise and everlasting thanks to those who died in the ill-fated rescue attempt. Their courage will be long remembered.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) had earlier stated that he would seek some answers from the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI). At this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I wish to commend the gentleman for the initiative he has shown, for the fact that he has worked with many other Members in perfecting this language, the fact that he has taken into account in what I consider a very practical fashion the realities of the situation. I especially wish to commend the gentleman for the final language of his resolution that refers to the Algerian negotiators. I know that the gentleman realizes that for too long Algeria was a haven for terrorists. The earlier Algerian Governments, in fact, were quite responsible for international terrorism. So I think it is accurate to note the proper role of the Algerian negotiators rather than to mistakenly embrace everything their Government has done.

Mr. BIAGGI. Yes; we did. We modified the original resolution as a result of the suggestion made by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Then I noticed that the gentleman's language properly notes the efforts of former President Carter, the diplomatic initiative of former Secretary Muskie and former Deputy Secretary Christopher, and notes their persistence in this effort.

I take that to mean that it would only be a skilled diplomat who would be able to understand the true magnitude of the undertaking, and my question is—

Mr. BIAGGI. Before the gentleman poses the question, Mr. Speaker, that is not our construction. In this case, there were, true, some skilled diplomats. Ofttimes there are others who are not truly skilled but have the ability to communicate and have a special feeling for questions and commit themselves to seek some resolution.

Now I will defer to the gentleman for his question.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the modesty of the gentleman from New York, which is very obvious, I was wondering when the gentleman would be able to advise this House of the successes, if any, that he may be able to achieve when he applies his unique diplomatic skills to the problems in Northern Ireland.

Mr. BIAGGI. I think that if the gentleman looks at the record, it was yesterday that we submitted a record of performance of the ad hoc committee, and I am just delighted to have the gentleman from Illinois as a valued member of that ad hoc committee. We appreciate his presence and, hopefully, one day there will be a resolution. In the end, I do not know that it will be the United States that will resolve it. We have always said that it would be the ultimate responsibility of all

parties to the conflict—the same resolution, the same formula that was used in the resolution of the problem in Zimbabwe, Rhodesia.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would hope for a better resolution than that particular example, but I think the gentleman is to be commended for his very special interest in the most difficult of foreign affairs problems. I commend him for his persistence. I hope that some day he would join us as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs where his expertise would be truly implemented.

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his kind remarks.

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

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

Mr. PEYSER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to congratulate the gentleman for the resolution. I certainly support it.

I do want to make reference to the fact that Ambassador Haynes, who was the American Ambassador to Algeria, also played a very important role. I understand the gentleman's resolution, and I simply wanted to make comment of that, because the Ambassador has not appeared too much in the press or the media involvement; but I know of his personal involvement, and it was of great help in the matter.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Members of this House and the Senate greeted the 52 American heroes whose captivity in Iran ended on January 20 after 444 excruciatingly long days. I consider it most appropriate that we commemorate this special occasion by calling up under unanimous consent this resolution welcoming the former hostages and commending those responsible for securing their freedom.

As the author of this resolution, I am proud to note that it is cosponsored by 144 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The resolution is offered in a bipartisan spirit.

It pays an appropriate tribute to our former President Jimmy Carter, former Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, and former Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher for their efforts throughout the crisis, but most especially during the final few critical days which proved to be the turning point. The resolution offers our gratitude to the Algerian negotiators who played such a vitally important role as an intermediary during the last days of the crisis; and salutes President Reagan for his generous gesture of sending former President Carter to meet the freed hostages in West Germany—a gesture which symbolizes the unity of the American people.

My resolution also pays a special tribute to the supreme sacrifice made by the eight American servicemen who were killed in the ill-fated April 1980 rescue mission. I consider it absolutely critical that this Nation never forget what these patriotic Americans did to try and save their fellow citizens from an illegal and immoral captivity. At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert their names:

S. Sgt. Dewey L. Johnson; Sgt. John D. Harvey; T. Sgt. Joel C. Mayo; Capt. Harold L. (Butch) Lewis; Capt. Charles McMillan, Jr.; Cpl. George N. Holmes, Jr.; Capt. Lynn D. McIntosh; and Capt. Richard L. Bakke.

Finally, and in a most appropriate sense, my resolution welcomes the former hostages back to freedom in the United States. It salutes them as the heroes they are and wishes them a life filled with peace and happiness.

Americans in general—and Washingtonians in particular—today are basking in a sense of patriotic euphoria created by the freedom granted to the hostages. We know that nothing happens by itself and my resolution seeks to bestow the proper thanks of this House for those who contributed so much to this cause.

Our Nation owes thanks to other individuals and countries not mentioned specifically in the resolution, but who aided us in this unprecedented crisis. The countries of West Germany, Canada, and all our Western Allies who united against Iran are to be acknowledged and commended for their actions. A special word of praise is reserved for Italy, which was the first nation to call for the release of our hostages and which fought hard on the diplomatic front on our behalf.

This Nation can be proud of the solidarity which we exhibited throughout this ordeal. The fate of the hostages never left our minds and prayers. Our national resolve was never stronger, and most importantly, it has been rewarded.

With this in mind, I now urge immediate support for my resolution, so we can all join in the welcoming committee for the 52 American heroes who have made a lasting impression on our Nation's Capital. At this time, I am privileged and honored to insert the names of the 52 freed Americans:

Thomas L. Ahern Jr., Clair C. Barnes, William E. Belk, Robert O. Blucker, Donald J. Cook, William J. Daugherty, Robert Engelman, William A. Gallegos, Bruce W. German, Duane Gillette, Alan B. Golacinski, John E. Graves, Joseph M. Hall, Kevin J. Hermaning, Donald R. Hohman, Leland J. Holland, Michael H. Howland, Charles Jones, Jr., Malcolm Kalp, Moorhead Kennedy, William F. Keough, Steven W. Kirtley, Kathryn Koob, Frederick Lee Kupke, L. Bruce Laingen, Steven Lauterbach, Gary E. Lee, Paul E. Lewis, John W. Limbert, Jr., James Michael Lopez, John D. McKeel, Jr., Michael J. Metrinko, Jerry J. Miele, Michael E. Moeller, Bert C. Moore, Richard H. Morefield, Paul M. Needham, Robert C. Ode, Gregory A. Persinger, Jerry

Plotkin, Regis Regan, David M. Roeder, Barry Rosen, William B. Royer, Jr., Thomas E. Schaefer, Charles W. Scott, Don A. Sharer, Rodney A. Sickmann, Joseph Subic, Jr., Ann Swift, Victor L. Tomseth, and Phillip R. Ward.

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I join with all other Americans in sharing the joy of seeing our hostages in Iran finally return home after some 15 months in captivity.

That is a great moment for the hostages, their families and all of us who have prayed for their release.

But there is another group of Americans who at this very moment may also be imprisoned in some foreign land. I refer of course to those American servicemen who were captured during the Vietnam war and never heard from again.

Time and time again we hear reports from refugees and other travelers from Southeast Asia that they have indeed seen Americans being held, alive, in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

There are an estimated 2,500 American families who have no confirmation that their men, who have been listed as missing in action, are alive or dead.

Today marks the eighth anniversary of the signing of the Paris peace accords, which officially ended our involvement in the Vietnam war.

But there is no peace for the families of the missing American servicemen and they will never be able to fully accept of the fate of their loved ones until definite knowledge of their status is provided by the Vietnamese Government.

I urge President Reagan and this Congress to pressure the Vietnam political leaders to show a sense of true humanity by releasing this information once and for all.

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my distinguished colleagues in the House, my joy at the release of the 52 American diplomats held hostage by the terrorist government in Iran. I praise former President Carter, Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, and Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher for their long hours of hard work in putting together the compromise that led to the release of the hostages after so many months of frustration. I would also like to praise the Government of Algeria for their unswerving fidelity to the principles of international justice and their courage in sticking to the agreement even though Iran balked in the final hours.

In the past few years, Mr. Speaker, America has often doubted not only its ability to triumph over the evils of communism and anarchy in the world but its need to do so. The return of the hostages should point out to the American people not only the quality of our Nation and fellow citizens but the need to hold ourselves forth as an example to the other nations of the

world. For 14 months, the hostages underwent torture and mistreatment by the Iranians, and at the end of those 14 months they have come back to us whole and eager to set out again into the international community to show the stuff America is made of. For 14 months, the American people prayed and waited patiently for the good people in Iran to gain the strength to overcome the madmen and return the hostages. For 14 months, Americans kept faith with their American brothers and sisters suffering in captivity, and at the end of those 14 months, we were rewarded by victory. Patience and perseverance are two new weapons in America's arsenal to protect peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, because it has been in turmoil for so long, the world has often seemed to me and my constituents in Chicago, to be a harsh desert, which is unfriendly to freedom-loving nations. We have sometimes despaired of finding friends we can count on while we are constantly encountering enemies hostile to America and the American people. It is good to know that there are nations in this world and especially in the Middle East, like Algeria that we can deal with openly and honestly and who will not desert us when the mood strikes them. In these next few years, which will be so important to the future of freedom in the world, it will help greatly to remember Algeria's performance in this episode.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank God for the return of the former hostages, and I welcome them home. God bless them and the Americans they represent.

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I share in the elation which is sweeping the Nation over the return to freedom of the 52 Americans held hostage for more than 14 months in Iran. The prolonged act of terrorism strained the patience of all Americans and tested our belief in peaceful methods of resolving international conflicts. But in the end our commitment to negotiation and nonmilitary means of handling the crisis was not in vain. Our 52 fellow Americans are home safely, and our national commitment to world peace is strengthened.

We should also remember at this time of joy that eight American servicemen died last April in an attempted rescue of the hostages. I lament that they are not able to share in our happiness now, and I express my condolences to their families and loved ones.

To the returned hostages I express my gratitude and admiration for their strength, endurance, courage, and most of all, for their commitment to our Nation. The pressures they endured and the anguish they suffered were great. The difficult ordeal was shared by the families and loved ones of the hostages. We should offer our



assurances of support and assistance to them all.

Former President Carter, too, deserves our commendation. His handling of this dangerous international conflict successfully prevented the outbreak of war, and set a precedent for the use of peaceful means to resolve future international conflicts.

Algerian diplomats who aided negotiations deserve our special thanks. They provided stability to a dangerous, volatile situation, and successfully guided the negotiations to a happy conclusion. Our Nation long will be indebted to the Algerians for the crucial role they played in this difficult task.

● **Mr. GILMAN.** Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 43 commending former President Carter, President Reagan, and others for their efforts in behalf of the release of the 52 American hostages from Iran.

It is appropriate at this time of national celebration resulting from the release of our 52 American citizens that we reflect on all of those individuals who worked so long and hard for their release. In particular, the resolution recalls that throughout the 444 days of their captivity the American people kept the plight of the hostages uppermost in their minds. Furthermore, it reminds us all that eight other brave Americans made the ultimate sacrifice by laying down their lives in an attempt to rescue their countrymen.

Throughout this crisis former President Carter, former Secretary of State Muskie, and former Deputy Secretary of State Christopher demonstrated relentless dedication and leadership in the release effort, and were instrumental in its successful outcome. In addition, President Reagan exhibited true statesmanship through his support of a unified, nonpartisan foreign policy on this issue and showed true graciousness by his warm gesture of sending former President Carter to represent him in Germany.

The valuable assistance provided by other nations cannot be overlooked. Algeria, Canada, Switzerland, and West Germany all played constructive roles in helping resolve the crisis.

As the Representative of our 26th Congressional District of New York, I wish to express the appreciation of our region for the great honor of hosting the hostages first touchdown back in this country at Stewart Airport and at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. For the citizens of the 26th District and for our entire Nation, the hostage experience has drawn our Nation closer together than at any time in the last 30 years.

By recognizing the contributions of former President Carter, President Reagan, and the many others who played such a significant role in securing the release of the hostages, we underscore concern for our fellow man

which has made our Nation such a beacon for freedom throughout the world. Their efforts which brought about the safe return of these Americans gave purpose and meaning to the 444-day Iranian ordeal and to the eight brave servicemen who sacrificed so much.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of House Resolution 43.

● **Mr. DE LUGO.** Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise as a cosponsor in support of House Resolution 43 commending our former President, Jimmy Carter, and former Deputy Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, for their leadership in securing the safe release of the 52 American hostages from Iran, and the Algerian negotiators who played such a pivotal intermediary role in the final stages of the negotiations. Their courageous role in these delicate negotiations on behalf of our hostages is an example to other developing nations that must not be forgotten.

I also wish to pay a special tribute to the eight Americans who lost their lives during the heroic effort to rescue the American hostages and to the black American hostages who had been released at an earlier date and whose suffering must not be forgotten.

It is appropriate that the Congress commemorate this special occasion by passing House Resolution 43 welcoming the former hostages and commending those responsible for securing their freedom.

**The SPEAKER.** The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DESIGNATING MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus and at the direction of that caucus, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 44) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 44

Resolution designating membership on certain standing committees of the House

*Resolved*, That the following named Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioner be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

##### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

E de la Garza, Texas, chairman;  
Thomas S. Foley, Washington;  
Walter B. Jones, North Carolina;  
Ed Jones, Tennessee;  
George E. Brown, Jr., California;  
David R. Bowen, Mississippi;  
Charles Rose, North Carolina;  
Frederick W. Richmond, New York;  
James Weaver, Oregon;  
Tom Harkin, Iowa;

Berkley Bedell, Iowa;  
Glenn English, Oklahoma;  
Floyd J. Fithian, Indiana;  
Leon E. Panetta, California;  
Jerry Huckaby, Louisiana;  
Dan Glickman, Kansas;  
Charles Whitley, North Carolina;  
Tony Coelho, California;  
Thomas A. Daschle, South Dakota;  
Beryl Anthony, Jr., Arkansas;  
Charles W. Stenholm, Texas;  
Harold L. Volkmer, Missouri;  
Charles Hatcher, Georgia; and  
Byron L. Dorgan, North Dakota.

##### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi, chairman;  
Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts;  
William H. Natcher, Kentucky;  
Neal Smith, Iowa;  
Joseph P. Addabbo, New York;  
Clarence D. Long, Maryland;  
Sidney R. Yates, Illinois;  
David R. Obey, Wisconsin;  
Edward R. Roybal, California;  
Louis Stokes, Ohio;  
Tom Bevill, Alabama;  
Bill Chappell, Jr., Florida;  
Bill Alexander, Arkansas;  
John P. Murtha, Pennsylvania;  
Bob Traxler, Michigan;  
Joseph D. Early, Massachusetts;  
Charles Wilson, Texas;  
Lindy Boggs, Louisiana;  
Adam Benjamin, Jr., Indiana;  
Norman D. Dicks, Washington;  
Matthew F. McHugh, New York;  
Bo Ginn, Georgia;  
William Lehman, Florida;  
Jack Hightower, Texas;  
Martin Olav Sabo, Minnesota;  
Julian C. Dixon, California;  
Vic Fazio, California;  
W. G. (Bill) Hefner, North Carolina;  
Les AuCoin, Oregon;  
Daniel K. Akaka, Hawaii;  
Wes Watkins, Oklahoma;  
William H. Gray III, Pennsylvania; and  
Bernard J. Dwyer, New Jersey.

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Melvin Price, Illinois, chairman;  
Charles E. Bennett, Florida;  
Samuel S. Stratton, New York;  
Richard C. White, Texas;  
Bill Nichols, Alabama;  
Jack Brinkley, Georgia;  
Robert H. Mollohan, West Virginia;  
Dan Daniel, Virginia;  
G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Mississippi;  
Les Aspin, Wisconsin;  
Ronald V. Dellums, California;  
Patricia Schroeder, Colorado;  
Abraham Kazen, Jr., Texas;  
Antonio Borja Won Pat, Guam;  
Larry McDonald, Georgia;  
Bob Stump, Arizona;  
Beverly B. Byron, Maryland;  
Nicholas Mavroules, Massachusetts;  
Don Bailey, Pennsylvania;  
Earl Hutto, Florida;  
Ike Skelton, Missouri;  
Marvin Leath, Texas;  
Dave McCurdy, Oklahoma;  
Thomas M. Foglietta, Pennsylvania;  
Roy Dyson, Maryland; and  
Dennis M. Hertel, Michigan.

##### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Fernand J. St Germain, Rhode Island, chairman;  
Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin;  
Henry B. Gonzalez, Texas;  
Joseph G. Minish, New Jersey;

Frank Annunzio, Illinois;  
 Parren J. Mitchell, Maryland;  
 Walter E. Fauntroy, District of Columbia;  
 Stephen L. Neal, North Carolina;  
 Jerry M. Patterson, California;  
 James J. Blanchard, Michigan;  
 Carroll Hubbard, Jr., Kentucky;  
 John J. LaFalce, New York;  
 Gladys Noon Spellman, Maryland;  
 David W. Evans, Indiana;  
 Norman E. D'Amours, New Hampshire;  
 Stanley N. Lundine, New York;  
 Mary Rose Oakar, Ohio;  
 Jim Mattox, Texas;  
 Bruce F. Vento, Minnesota;  
 Doug Barnard, Jr., Georgia;  
 Robert Garcia, New York;  
 Mike Lowry, Washington;  
 Charles E. Schumer, New York;  
 Barney Frank, Massachusetts;  
 William N. Patman, Texas; and  
 William J. Coyne, Pennsylvania.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

James R. Jones, Oklahoma, chairman;  
 Jim Wright, Texas;  
 David R. Obey, Wisconsin;  
 Paul Simon, Illinois;  
 Norman Y. Mineta, California;  
 Jim Mattox, Texas;  
 Stephen J. Solarz, New York;  
 Timothy E. Wirth, Colorado;  
 Leon E. Panetta, California;  
 Richard A. Gephardt, Missouri;  
 Bill Nelson, Florida;  
 Les Aspin, Wisconsin;  
 W. G. (Bill) Hefner, North Carolina;  
 Thomas J. Downey, New York;  
 Adam Benjamin, Jr., Indiana;  
 Brian J. Donnelly, Massachusetts;  
 Beryl Anthony, Jr., Arkansas; and  
 Phil Gramm, Texas.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Ronald V. Dellums, California, chairman;  
 Walter E. Fauntroy, District of Columbia;  
 Romano L. Mazzoli, Kentucky;  
 Fortney H. (Pete) Stark, California;  
 Mickey Leland, Texas;  
 William H. Gray III, Pennsylvania; and  
 Michael D. Barnes, Maryland.

#### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky, chairman;  
 Augustus F. Hawkins, California;  
 William D. Ford, Michigan;  
 Phillip Burton, California;  
 Joseph M. Gaydos, Pennsylvania;  
 William (Bill) Clay, Missouri;  
 Mario Biaggi, New York;  
 Ike Andrews, North Carolina;  
 Paul Simon, Illinois;  
 George Miller, California;  
 Austin J. Murphy, Pennsylvania;  
 Ted Weiss, New York;  
 Baltasar Corrada, Puerto Rico;  
 Dale E. Kildee, Michigan;  
 Peter A. Peyser, New York;  
 Pat Williams, Montana;  
 William R. Ratchford, Connecticut;  
 Ray Kogovsek, Colorado; and  
 Harold Washington, Illinois.

#### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

John D. Dingell, Michigan, chairman;  
 James H. Scheuer, New York;  
 Richard L. Ottinger, New York;  
 Henry A. Waxman, California;  
 Timothy E. Wirth, Colorado;  
 Philip R. Sharp, Indiana;  
 James J. Florio, New Jersey;  
 Anthony Toby Moffett, Connecticut;  
 Jim Santini, Nevada;  
 Edward J. Markey, Massachusetts;  
 Thomas A. Luken, Ohio;  
 Doug Walgren, Pennsylvania;

Albert Gore, Jr., Tennessee;  
 Barbara A. Mikulski, Maryland;  
 Ronald M. Mottl, Ohio;  
 Phil Gramm, Texas;  
 Al Swift, Washington;  
 Mickey Leland, Texas;  
 Richard C. Shelby, Alabama;  
 Cardiss Collins, Illinois;  
 Mike Synar, Oklahoma;  
 W. J. (Billy) Tauzin, Louisiana;  
 Ron Wyden, Oregon; and  
 Ralph M. Hall, Texas.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin, chairman;  
 L. H. Fountain, North Carolina;  
 Dante B. Fascell, Florida;  
 Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York;  
 Lee H. Hamilton, Indiana;  
 Jonathan B. Bingham, New York;  
 Gus Yatron, Pennsylvania;  
 Stephen J. Solarz, New York;  
 Don Bonker, Washington;  
 Gerry E. Studds, Massachusetts;  
 Andy Ireland, Florida;  
 Dan Mica, Florida;  
 Michael D. Barnes, Maryland;  
 Howard Wolpe, Michigan;  
 George W. Crockett, Jr., Michigan;  
 Bob Shamansky, Ohio;  
 Sam Gejdenson, Connecticut;  
 Mervyn M. Dymally, California;  
 Dennis E. Eckart, Ohio; and  
 Tom Lantos, California.

#### COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Jack Brooks, Texas, chairman;  
 L. H. Fountain, North Carolina;  
 Dante B. Fascell, Florida;  
 Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York;  
 Don Fuqua, Florida;  
 John Conyers, Jr., Michigan;  
 Cardiss Collins, Illinois;  
 John L. Burton, California;  
 Glenn English, Oklahoma;  
 Elliott H. Levitas, Georgia;  
 David W. Evans, Indiana;  
 Anthony Toby Moffett, Connecticut;  
 Henry A. Waxman, California;  
 Floyd J. Fithian, Indiana;  
 Ted Weiss, New York;  
 Mike Synar, Oklahoma;  
 Eugene V. Atkinson, Pennsylvania;  
 Stephen L. Neal, North Carolina;  
 Doug Barnard, Jr., Georgia;  
 Peter A. Peyser, New York;  
 Barney Frank, Massachusetts;  
 Harold Washington, Illinois; and  
 Tom Lantos, California.

#### COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Augustus F. Hawkins, California, chairman;  
 Frank Annunzio, Illinois;  
 Joseph M. Gaydos, Pennsylvania;  
 Ed Jones, Tennessee;  
 Robert H. Mollohan, West Virginia;  
 Joseph G. Minish, New Jersey;  
 Charles Rose, North Carolina;  
 John L. Burton, California;  
 William R. Ratchford, Connecticut;  
 Al Swift, Washington; and  
 William J. Coyne, Pennsylvania.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Morris K. Udall, Arizona, chairman;  
 Phillip Burton, California;  
 Robert W. Kastenmeier, Wisconsin;  
 Abraham Kazen, Jr., Texas;  
 Jonathan B. Bingham, New York;  
 John F. Seiberling, Ohio;  
 Antonio Borja Won Pat, Guam;  
 Jim Santini, Nevada;  
 James Weaver, Oregon;  
 George Miller, California;  
 James J. Florio, New Jersey;

Philip R. Sharp, Indiana;  
 Edward J. Markey, Massachusetts;  
 Baltasar Corrada, Puerto Rico;  
 Austin J. Murphy, Pennsylvania;  
 Nick Joe Rahall, II, West Virginia;  
 Bruce F. Vento, Minnesota;  
 Jerry Huckaby, Louisiana;  
 Jerry M. Patterson, California;  
 Ray Kogovsek, Colorado;  
 Pat Williams, Montana;  
 Dale E. Kildee, Michigan;  
 Tony Coelho, California;  
 Beverly B. Byron, Maryland;  
 Ron de Lugo, Virgin Islands; and  
 Sam Gejdenson, Connecticut.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey, chairman;  
 Jack Brooks, Texas;  
 Robert W. Kastenmeier, Wisconsin;  
 Don Edwards, California;  
 John Conyers, Jr., Michigan;  
 John F. Seiberling, Ohio;  
 George E. Danielson, California;  
 Romano L. Mazzoli, Kentucky;  
 William J. Hughes, New Jersey;  
 Sam B. Hall, Jr., Texas;  
 Mike Synar, Oklahoma;  
 Patricia Schroeder, Colorado;  
 Billy Lee Evans, Georgia;  
 Dan Glickman, Kansas;  
 Harold Washington, Illinois; and  
 Barney Frank, Massachusetts.

#### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Walter B. Jones, North Carolina, chairman;  
 Mario Biaggi, New York;  
 Glenn M. Anderson, California;  
 John B. Breaux, Louisiana;  
 Gerry E. Studds, Massachusetts;  
 David R. Bowen, Mississippi;  
 Carroll Hubbard, Jr., Kentucky;  
 Don Bonker, Washington;  
 Norman E. D'Amours, New Hampshire;  
 James L. Oberstar, Minnesota;  
 William J. Hughes, New Jersey;  
 Barbara A. Mikulski, Maryland;  
 Mike Lowry, Washington;  
 Earl Hutto, Florida;  
 Brian J. Donnelly, Massachusetts;  
 W. J. (Billy) Tauzin, Louisiana;  
 Thomas M. Foglietta, Pennsylvania;  
 William N. Patman, Texas;  
 Fofi I. F. Sunia, American Samoa;  
 Dennis M. Hertel, Michigan; and  
 Roy Dyson, Maryland.

#### COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

William D. Ford, Michigan, chairman;  
 Morris K. Udall, Arizona;  
 William (Bill) Clay, Missouri;  
 Patricia Schroeder, Colorado;  
 Gladys Noon Spellman, Maryland;  
 Robert Garcia, New York;  
 Mickey Leland, Texas;  
 Geraldine A. Ferraro, New York;  
 Donald Joseph Albosta, Michigan;  
 Gus Yatron, Pennsylvania;  
 Mary Rose Oakar, Ohio;  
 George E. Danielson, California;  
 Ronald V. Dellums, California;  
 Stephen J. Solarz, New York;  
 Peter A. Peyser, New York; and  
 Ron de Lugo, Virgin Islands.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

James J. Howard, New Jersey, chairman;  
 Glenn M. Anderson, California;  
 Robert A. Roe, New Jersey;  
 John B. Breaux, Louisiana;  
 Norman Y. Mineta, California;  
 Elliott H. Levitas, Georgia;



James L. Oberstar, Minnesota;  
Henry J. Nowak, New York;  
Bob Edgar, Pennsylvania;  
Marilyn Lloyd Bouquard, Tennessee;  
John G. Fary, Illinois;  
Robert A. Young, Missouri;  
Allen E. Ertel, Pennsylvania;  
Billy Lee Evans, Georgia;  
Ronnie G. Flippo, Alabama;  
Nick Joe Rahall II, West Virginia;  
Douglas Applegate, Ohio;  
Geraldine A. Ferraro, New York;  
Eugene V. Atkinson, Pennsylvania;  
Donald Joseph Albosta, Michigan;  
William Hill Boner, Tennessee;  
Ron de Lugo, Virgin Islands;  
Gus Savage, Illinois;  
Fofo I. F. Sunia, American Samoa;  
Buddy Roemer, Louisiana; and  
Brian J. Donnelly, Massachusetts.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Richard Bolling, Missouri, chairman;  
Claude Pepper, Florida;  
Gillis W. Long, Louisiana;  
Joe Moakley, Massachusetts;  
Shirley Chisholm, New York;  
Leo C. Zeferetti, New York;  
Butler Derrick, South Carolina;  
Anthony C. Beilenson, California;  
Martin Frost, Texas;  
David E. Bonior, Michigan; and  
Tony P. Hall, Ohio.

#### COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Don Fuqua, Florida, chairman;  
Robert A. Roe, New Jersey;  
George E. Brown, Jr., California;  
James H. Scheuer, New York;  
Richard L. Ottinger, New York;  
Tom Harkin, Iowa;  
Marilyn Lloyd Bouquard, Tennessee;  
James J. Blanchard, Michigan;  
Doug Walgren, Pennsylvania;  
Ronnie G. Flippo, Alabama;  
Dan Glickman, Kansas;  
Albert Gore, Jr., Tennessee;  
Robert A. Young, Missouri;  
Richard C. White, Texas;  
Harold L. Volkmer, Missouri;  
Howard Wolpe, Michigan;  
Bill Nelson, Florida;  
Stanley N. Lundine, New York;  
Allen E. Ertel, Pennsylvania;  
Bob Shamansky, Ohio;  
Ralph M. Hall, Texas;  
Dave McCurdy, Oklahoma; and  
Mervyn M. Dymally, California.

#### COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Parren J. Mitchell, Maryland, chairman;  
Neal Smith, Iowa;  
Joseph P. Addabbo, New York;  
Henry B. Gonzalez, Texas;  
John J. LaFalce, New York;  
Berkley Bedell, Iowa;  
Frederick W. Richmond, New York;  
Henry J. Nowak, New York;  
Thomas A. Luken, Ohio;  
Andy Ireland, Florida;  
Ike Skelton, Missouri;  
Billy Lee Evans, Georgia;  
Charles W. Stenholm, Texas;  
Romano L. Mazzoli, Kentucky;  
Nicholas Mavroules, Massachusetts;  
George W. Crockett, Jr., Michigan;  
Charles Hatcher, Georgia;  
Ron Wyden, Oregon;  
Dennis E. Eckart, Ohio;  
Byron L. Dorgan, North Dakota;  
Gus Savage, Illinois;  
Buddy Roemer, Louisiana; and  
John G. Fary, Illinois.

#### COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Louis Stokes, Ohio, chairman;

Nick Joe Rahall II, West Virginia;  
Bill Alexander, Arkansas;  
Charles Wilson, Texas;  
Ken Holland, South Carolina; and  
Don Bailey, Pennsylvania.

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Mississippi, chairman;  
Don Edwards, California;  
George E. Danielson, California;  
Jack Brinkley, Georgia;  
Ronald M. Mottl, Ohio;  
Bob Edgar, Pennsylvania;  
Sam B. Hall, Jr., Texas;  
Douglas Applegate, Ohio;  
Marvin Leath, Texas;  
William Hill Boner, Tennessee;  
Richard C. Shelby, Alabama;  
Dan Mica, Florida;  
Thomas A. Daschle, South Dakota;  
Bob Stump, Arizona; and  
Phil Gramm, Texas.

#### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Dan Rostenkowski, Illinois, chairman;  
Sam Gibbons, Florida;  
J. J. Pickle, Texas;  
Charles B. Rangel, New York;  
William R. Cotter, Connecticut;  
Fortney H. (Pete) Stark, California;  
James R. Jones, Oklahoma;  
Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Indiana;  
Harold E. Ford, Tennessee;  
Ken Holland, South Carolina;  
William M. Brodhead, Michigan;  
Ed Jenkins, Georgia;  
Richard A. Gephardt, Missouri;  
Thomas J. Downey, New York;  
Cecil (Cec) Heftel, Hawaii;  
Wyche Fowler, Jr., Georgia;  
Frank J. Guarini, New Jersey;  
James M. Shannon, Massachusetts;  
Marty Russo, Illinois;  
Donald J. Pease, Ohio;  
Kent Hance, Texas; and  
Robert T. Matsui, California.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1550

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution presented at the beginning of each session of the Congress designating members on the standing committees of the House. The committee assignments contained in the resolution have been approved by the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DESIGNATING MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 45), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 45

Resolution designating membership on certain standing committees of the House

*Resolved*, That the following named Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioner be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

#### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

William C. Wampler, Virginia;  
Paul Findley, Illinois;  
James M. Jeffords, Vermont;  
Tom Hagedorn, Minnesota;  
E. Thomas Coleman, Missouri;  
Ron Marlenee, Montana;  
Larry Hopkins, Kentucky;  
William M. Thomas, California;  
George Hansen, Idaho;  
Arlan Stangeland, Minnesota;  
Pat Roberts, Kansas;  
Bill Emerson, Missouri;  
John Napier, South Carolina;  
Joe Skeen, New Mexico;  
Sid Morrison, Washington;  
Clint Roberts, South Dakota;  
Steven Gunderson, Wisconsin;  
Cooper Evans, Iowa; and  
Eugene Chappie, California.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Silvio Conte, Massachusetts;  
Joseph M. McDade, Pennsylvania;  
Jack Edwards, Alabama;  
John T. Myers, Indiana;  
J. Kenneth Robinson, Virginia;  
Clarence E. Miller, Ohio;  
Lawrence Coughlin, Pennsylvania;  
C. W. Bill Young, Florida;  
Jack Kemp, New York;  
Ralph Regula, Ohio;  
Clair W. Burgener, California;  
George M. O'Brien, Illinois;  
Virginia Smith, Nebraska;  
Eldon D. Rudd, Arizona;  
Carl D. Pursell, Michigan;  
Mickey Edwards, Oklahoma;  
Robert L. Livingston, Louisiana;  
S. William Green, New York;  
Tom Loeffler, Texas;  
Jerry Lewis, California;  
Carroll Campbell, Jr., South Carolina; and  
John E. Porter, Illinois.

#### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

William L. Dickinson, Alabama;  
G. William Whitehurst, Virginia;  
Floyd Spence, South Carolina;  
Robin L. Beard, Tennessee;  
Donald J. Mitchell, New York;  
Marjorie S. Holt, Maryland;  
Robert W. Daniel, Jr., Virginia;  
Elwood Hillis, Indiana;  
David F. Emery, Maine;  
Paul S. Trible, Jr., Virginia;  
Robert E. Badham, California;  
Charles F. Dougherty, Pennsylvania;  
James A. Courter, New Jersey;  
Larry J. Hopkins, Kentucky;  
Robert W. Davis, Michigan;  
Kenneth B. Kramer, Colorado;  
Duncan L. Hunter, California;  
James L. Nelligan, Pennsylvania; and  
Thomas F. Hartnett, South Carolina.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

J. William Stanton, Ohio;  
Chalmers P. Wylie, Ohio;  
Stewart B. McKinney, Connecticut;  
George Hansen, Idaho;  
Henry J. Hyde, Illinois;

Jim Leach, Iowa;  
Thomas B. Evans, Jr., Delaware;  
Ronald E. Paul, Texas;  
Ed Bethune, Arkansas;  
Norman D. Shumway, California;  
Jon Hinson, Mississippi;  
Stan Parris, Virginia;  
Ed Weber, Ohio;  
Bill McCollum, Florida;  
Gregory Carman, New York;  
George Wortley, New York;  
Margaret Roukema, New Jersey;  
Bill Lowery, California; and  
James K. Coyne, Pennsylvania.

## COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Delbert L. Latta, Ohio;  
Ralph S. Regula, Ohio;  
E. G. Shuster, Pennsylvania;  
Bill Frenzel, Minnesota;  
Eldon D. Rudd, Arizona;  
Paul S. Trible, Jr., Virginia;  
Ed Bethune, Arkansas;  
Lynn M. Martin, Illinois;  
Albert Lee Smith, Alabama;  
Eugene Johnston, North Carolina; and  
Bobbi Fiedler, California.

## COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Stewart McKinney, Connecticut;  
Stan Parris, Virginia; and  
Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., Virginia.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

John M. Ashbrook, Ohio;  
John N. Erlenborn, Illinois;  
James M. Jeffords, Vermont;  
William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania;  
E. Thomas Coleman, Missouri;  
Kenneth B. Kramer, Colorado;  
Arlen I. Erdahl, Minnesota;  
Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin;  
Millicent Fenwick, New Jersey;  
Marge Roukema, New Jersey;  
Eugene Johnston, North Carolina;  
Larry DeNardis, Connecticut;  
Larry E. Craig, Idaho; and  
Wendell Bailey, Missouri.

## COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

James T. Broyhill, North Carolina;  
Clarence J. Brown, Ohio;  
James M. Collins, Texas;  
Norman F. Lent, New York;  
Edward R. Madigan, Illinois;  
Carlos J. Moorhead, California;  
Matthew J. Rinaldo, New Jersey;  
Marc L. Marks, Pennsylvania;  
Tom Corcoran, Illinois;  
Gary A. Lee, New York;  
William E. Dannemeyer, California;  
Bob Whittaker, Kansas;  
Thomas J. Tauke, Iowa;  
Don Ritter, Pennsylvania;  
Harold Rogers, Kentucky;  
Cleve Benedict, West Virginia;  
Daniel R. Coats, Indiana; and  
Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., Virginia.

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

William S. Broomfield, Michigan;  
Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois;  
Paul Findley, Illinois;  
Larry Winn, Jr., Kansas;  
Benjamin A. Gilman, New York;  
Tennyson Guyer, Ohio;  
Robert J. Lagomarsino, California;  
William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania;  
Joel Pritchard, Washington;  
Millicent Fenwick, New Jersey;  
Robert K. Dornan, California;  
Jim Leach, Iowa;  
Arlen I. Erdahl, Minnesota;  
Toby A. Roth, Wisconsin;  
Olympia Snowe, Maine; and  
John LeBoutillier, New York.

## COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Frank Horton, New York;

John Erlenborn, Illinois;  
Clarence J. Brown, Ohio;  
Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., California;  
Thomas N. Kindness, Ohio;  
Robert S. Walker, Pennsylvania;  
M. Caldwell Butler, Virginia;  
Lyle Williams, Ohio;  
H. Joel Deckard, Indiana;  
William F. Clinger, Jr., Pennsylvania;  
Raymond McGrath, New York;  
Hal Daub, Nebraska;  
John Hiler, Indiana;  
David Dreier, California;  
Wendell Bailey, Missouri;  
Larry DeNardis, Connecticut; and  
Judd Gregg, New Hampshire.

## COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Bill Frenzel, Minnesota;  
William L. Dickinson, Alabama;  
Robert E. Badham, California;  
Newt Gingrich, Georgia;  
William M. Thomas, California;  
Gary A. Lee, New York;  
James K. Coyne, Pennsylvania; and  
Lynn M. Martin, Illinois.

## COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Manuel Lujan, Jr., New Mexico;  
Don H. Clausen, California;  
Don Young, Alaska;  
Robert J. Lagomarsino, California;  
Dan Marriott, Utah;  
Ron Marlenee, Montana;  
Richard B. Cheney, Wyoming;  
Charles Pashayan, Jr., California;  
Douglas K. Bereuter, Nebraska;  
Jon Hinson, Mississippi;  
David O'B. Martin, New York;  
Larry Craig, Idaho;  
William M. Hendon, North Carolina;  
Hank Brown, Colorado;  
David (Mick) Staton, West Virginia;  
Denny Smith, Oregon; and  
James V. Hansen, Utah.

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Robert McClory, Illinois;  
Tom Railsback, Illinois;  
Hamilton Fish, Jr., New York;  
M. Caldwell Butler, Virginia;  
Carlos J. Moorhead, California;  
John M. Ashbrook, Ohio;  
Henry J. Hyde, Illinois;  
Thomas N. Kindness, Ohio;  
Harold S. Sawyer, Michigan;  
Daniel E. Lungren, California;  
F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Wisconsin;  
and  
Bill McCollum, Florida.

## COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Gene Snyder, Kentucky;  
Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., California;  
Edwin B. Forsythe, New Jersey;  
Joel Pritchard, Washington;  
Don Young, Alaska;  
Norman F. Lent, New York;  
David F. Emery, Maine;  
Thomas B. Evans, Jr., Delaware;  
Robert W. Davis, Michigan;  
William Carney, New York;  
Charles F. Dougherty, Pennsylvania;  
Norman D. Shumway, California;  
Jack Fields, Texas;  
Claudine Schneider, Rhode Island; and  
Clay Shaw, Florida.

## COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois;  
Gene Taylor, Missouri;  
Benjamin A. Gilman, New York;  
Tom Corcoran, Illinois;  
James A. Courter, New Jersey;  
Charles Pashayan, Jr., California;  
William E. Dannemeyer, California;

Daniel B. Crane, Illinois;  
Wayne R. Grisham, California; and  
Frank Wolf, Virginia.

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

Don H. Clausen, California;  
Gene Snyder, Kentucky;  
John Paul Hammerschmidt, Arkansas;  
E. G. Shuster, Pennsylvania;  
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., California;  
Tom Hagedorn, Minnesota;  
Arlan Stangeland, Minnesota;  
Newt Gingrich, Georgia;  
William F. Clinger, Jr., Pennsylvania;  
Gerald B. Solomon, New York;  
Harold C. Hollenbeck, New Jersey;  
H. Joel Deckard, Indiana;  
Wayne R. Grisham, California;  
Jim Jeffries, Kansas;  
Jack Fields, Texas;  
Guy Molinari, New York;  
Clay Shaw, Florida;  
Bob McEwen, Ohio; and  
Frank Wolf, Virginia.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

James H. Quillen, Tennessee;  
Delbert L. Latta, Ohio;  
Trent Lott, Mississippi;  
Gene Taylor, Missouri; and  
John J. Rhodes, Arizona.

## COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Larry Winn, Jr., Kansas;  
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., California;  
Hamilton Fish, Jr., New York;  
Manuel Lujan, Jr., New Mexico;  
Harold C. Hollenbeck, New Jersey;  
Robert S. Walker, Pennsylvania;  
Edwin B. Forsythe, New Jersey;  
William Carney, New York;  
Margaret M. Heckler, Massachusetts;  
F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Wisconsin;  
Vin Weber, Minnesota;  
Judd Gregg, New Hampshire;  
Raymond McGrath, New York;  
Joe Skeen, New Mexico;  
Claudine Schneider, Rhode Island;  
Jim Dunn, Michigan; and  
Bill Lowery, California.

## COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Joseph M. McDade, Pennsylvania;  
Silvio Conte, Massachusetts;  
J. William Stanton, Ohio;  
William S. Broomfield, Michigan;  
Dan Marriott, Utah;  
Lyle Williams, Ohio;  
Olympia J. Snowe, Maine;  
Douglas K. Bereuter, Nebraska;  
Daniel B. Crane, Illinois;  
John Hiler, Indiana;  
David (Mick) Staton, West Virginia;  
Vin Weber, Minnesota;  
Hal Daub, Nebraska;  
Chris Smith, New Jersey;  
Ed Weber, Ohio; and  
David Dreier, California.

## COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Floyd Spence, South Carolina;  
Barber Conable, New York;  
John T. Myers, Indiana;  
Edwin B. Forsythe, New Jersey;  
Hank Brown, Colorado;  
James V. Hansen, Utah;

## COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

John Paul Hammerschmidt, Arkansas;  
Margaret M. Heckler, Massachusetts;  
Chalmers P. Wylie, Ohio;  
Elwood Hillis, Indiana;  
Tennyson Guyer, Ohio;  
Harold S. Sawyer, Michigan;  
Gerald B. Solomon, New York;



Jim Jeffries, Kansas;  
 Bob McEwen, Ohio;  
 Jim Dunn, Michigan;  
 Chris Smith, New Jersey;  
 Albert Lee Smith, Alabama; and  
 Denny Smith, Oregon.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Barber B. Conable, Jr., New York;  
 John J. Duncan, Tennessee;  
 Bill Archer, Texas;  
 Guy Vander Jagt, Michigan;  
 Philip M. Crane, Illinois;  
 Bill Frenzel, Minnesota;  
 James G. Martin, North Carolina;  
 L. A. (Skip) Bafalis, Florida;  
 Richard T. Schulze, Pennsylvania;  
 Willis D. Gradison, Jr. (Ohio);  
 John H. Rousselot, California; and  
 W. Henson Moore, Louisiana.

Mr. MICHEL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have already made the point several times that you, sir, have done us an injustice with your tabulation of committee ratios. If you were really trying to be fair, I would suggest that you buy a new calculator. If you were trying to stick it to us, then congratulations on a job well done.

You may be growing weary of our complaints, Mr. Speaker. I guess I am growing weary of making them, but they must be made again and again and again. The public has got to understand the full consequences of your actions.

We are not just talking about one vote on one committee. We are talking about ratios on subcommittees as well, where one vote or two votes can easily decide whether we have tax relief or more tax increases in the next 2 years. We are talking about the debt ceiling, spending limitations or reductions, the issue of productivity and welfare reform, all of which could easily be decided by a heavily weighted vote in one or a number of subcommittees. And, you are not only insisting on the ratio on full committees, but on subcommittees; and in applying that same ratio to conference committees. Each time you do that, the effect is magnified many times over.

The public must know the full ramifications of the issue. The Democratic majority must be reminded of the new realities of this 97th Congress. You are not dealing with just a handful of Republicans over here anymore. We are now 192 strong. We may not have that elusive working majority that everyone is talking about, but I will tell you this: There is no longer a majority's minority over here either.

The ratios you have established clearly do not reflect our numbers as elected on November 4. To add insult to injury, you are not even being square with the public on the actual numbers. While my distinguished colleagues who serve as Delegates and Resident Commissioner in this House may not be able to vote on the floor, they do vote in committee and subcommittee, and their presence on those committees ought to be counted in the ratios you advertise. But, they are not. Tell me, is the ratio for Interior 23 to 17, or is it really 26 to 17? Is the ratio for Armed Services 25 to 19, or is it really 26 to 19?

I said when I was elected leader last December that I was tired of being the minority. Does anyone wonder why? Well, I am tired of being dealt from the bottom of the deck, tired of getting up every morning and coming to work wondering how the mickey is going to be slipped to us today.

You have argued in the past, Mr. Speaker, that it is the prerogative of the majority to organize this House as it sees fit—and I see the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, who likewise shares that feeling. To the victor, I guess, belongs the spoils. I do not question the privileges that go with power, but with privileges go responsibility; and in this country with power goes limitations.

There are limits to which you can play fast and loose with the rights of the minority, and you have exceeded those limits in your handling of the ratios, particularly in regard to our Ways and Means Committee. Your 2 to 1 minus 1 ratio for Ways and Means makes a mockery of representative government. We have 44 percent of the membership of the House on our side, but we only have 34 percent of the seats on the Ways and Means Committee. By what standard is that considered to be fair? By what formula is it representative of the House or the will of the people?

I suspect that some of my colleagues, frankly, would even like to take you to court over this issue of ratios. And why not? It touches the very heart of the principle of representative government. Maybe there is a threshold of injustice where the courts have a legitimate right to step in and protect the rights of the people who elected us.

I suspect I would consider it somewhat of an embarrassment for one independent branch of Government to have to go to another branch in order to resolve its internal disputes. It does not speak well for the manner in which we fulfill our solemn responsibilities. I would prefer to settle this dispute here and now; Republicans and Democrats working together to organize a House of Representatives that reflects and represents the electorate.

That is why we are here on our side going to make one more effort to achieve fairness and equity by the parliamentary device of a motion to commit with instructions. The motion will be made at the appropriate time by the distinguished whip on our side, Mr. LOTT. I would urge as many Members as are persuaded by the legitimate arguments in our favor to support that motion.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. HENSON MOORE.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on November 4 the American electorate gave the American people and us in public service a mandate to lower taxes. If we look at the record, I do not really blame them. The ratio of taxes to the GNP when President Carter took office was 18.5 percent. When he left office 4 years later, it was almost 23 percent of the GNP being taken in Federal taxes. During the Carter years, we saw a \$29 billion increase in new social security taxes; \$13.6 billion increase in windfall profit taxes, which will be paid by the consumers and not by the oil companies; a \$15 billion increase in inflation-induced "bracket creep" taxes which are paid by all of us; \$12 billion in other tax increases. President Reagan ran on tax cut, won decisively on tax cut, and stated it as his highest priority in his inaugural address. The majority of us in this House today also ran on that same platform.

A tax cut is necessary to get the economy rolling again, to put our jobless back to work, to reduce the tax bite on the average American.

This House, by the action it may well take today, will demonstrate that it is clearly out of step with the American people. A liberal minority of this House is controlling the wishes and the future of the majority. That minority does not want to cut taxes. That minority wants to block or cripple those tax cuts by stacking the Ways and Means Committee. This vote you are about to make on the motion to commit is not a procedural vote. It is not a party line vote. It is not an insignificant vote. It could be as important a vote as will be cast in this Congress, as it may well determine the outcome of the tax policy in this Congress, and thus the economic recovery of this country.

I understand my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were instructed this morning in their caucus to vote no on this motion to commit, or they would be ousted by their caucus. That is a serious matter, but I would simply say to them that the public really does not care about what party we are members of. The public has repudiated excessive spending and runaway taxation, and they expect us to do

something about it. They are not concerned about our problems of getting along with our party colleagues.

Stacking the Ways and Means Committee to prevent or to emasculate a tax cut is not what the American people had in mind on November 4. A vote for the motion to commit to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), to add two members to the Ways and Means Committee, will unstack it somewhat. It will be less than the ratio of the membership of Democrats to Republicans in this House, but it will do something to make a tax cut a reality. Therefore, I conclude that a yes vote on that motion to commit is a yes vote for tax reform the people said they wanted on November 4; and likewise, a no vote on this motion to commit is in reality a no vote for a tax cut for the American people.

□ 1600

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the stacking of committees by a relatively thin majority group is not a new phenomenon.

The historical record is replete with examples of congressional and legislative unfairness. Political parties have tried, as the Democrat majority is trying today, to insure by rule a tighter control over the process than the voters wanted to give them.

Therein lies the problem. Political greed, as exemplified by this Speaker's unfair committee ratios, often exceeds the mandate of the people.

The voters, about as many of whom voted for Republicans as Democrats in House elections, did not intend that the Speaker and his liberal majority should take all the marbles in this game. The people, having elected 44 percent Republicans, are laboring under the understandable delusion that Republicans should hold 44 percent of the committee positions.

Our system provides a variety of checks and balances thought by most Americans to be salutary. Denying any group, even Republicans, its rightful voice in the legislative process warps the system by destroying one of the most important checks.

Of course, it is easier to run the House if the voice of the minority group is stifled. To political elitists, the stifling of opposition by committee stacking is always a strong temptation. To this Speaker and to this Democrat majority, that temptation appears to be irresistible.

What makes this power grab extraordinarily offensive is the fact that this Democrat majority has proclaimed itself "the reform Congress." It has loudly and proudly told whom ever would listen that it has rejected the old politics of greed, unfairness,

and secrecy. We have been told again and again that this House now literally drips with purity, ethics, openness, and integrity.

But today the new politics becomes misrepresentation. The new ethics becomes unfairness. This is the new post-Watergate morality. There is nothing new about committee stacking, power grabs, legislative greed, or denying minority rights. In fact, the only stated justification for this exercise in new politics is the claim that someone did something almost as bad 26 years ago.

Fortunately, however, there is a modest counterbalance. Modern communications means that the people will have a little better idea of what is being done to them. Those who vote for disproportionate committee ratios can be assured that they will have an opportunity to explain that vote. They will be called upon to rationalize committee stacking with their recorded words on not only morality, openness, ethics, but also maybe even on tax policy or budget policy.

Those who spoke bravely of ethics, fairness and morality, Mr. Speaker, may want at this time to remember the politician's prayer:

O Lord, make my words both tender and sweet—for soon I may have to eat them.

To the Speaker and his friends, I can only say, "Bon appetit."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished whip on our side, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT).

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Republican leader for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the committee ratios imposed on us by the Democratic majority do not reflect the ratio of Democrats to Republicans in the House. They are patently unfair, especially on the Committee on Ways and Means.

In essence, the committee ratios ignore the will of the American people as expressed in the last election. Maintaining these unfair ratios effectively disenfranchises a major portion of the American electorate and flies in the face of the one-man-one-vote rule.

The committee ratio on the Committee on Ways and Means amounts to a blatant act to block and obstruct the Reagan economic package, which is the issue the American people should naturally be—and they are—very much concerned about.

Therefore, as the minority leader mentioned in his remarks, at the conclusion of this resolution and before the vote on the resolution, I will offer a motion to commit the resolution to a select committee to be appointed by the Speaker and to be composed of nine members, not more than five of whom shall be from the same political party, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert: That the following-named Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioner be and hereby are appointed to the following standing committees.

There is only one change. That change is that on the Committee on Ways and Means we have added two seats on the Republican side to be filled until otherwise so designated by the Republican conference by the distinguished leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), and by myself, the gentleman from Mississippi.

So there is only one change in this motion to commit, and that would be that the select committee report back forthwith and add those two names on the Republican side to the Committee on Ways and Means. It does not deal with the Committee on Rules; it deals only with the Committee on Ways and Means.

I know that there are some Members on this side of the aisle who recognize the basic unfairness of what this committee ratio calls for on Ways and Means. I urge those Members to join us in this motion to commit so that we will have a resolution that provides a fairer ratio, one that reflects the vote of the American people in last year's election, and so that we can get through a fair economic package that is demanded and needed by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, of course those of us who are speaking on the Republican side are either in the leadership or on the Committee on Ways and Means because the limited time available to us forces us to concentrate the feelings of our side of the aisle on the issue of committee stacking.

Nevertheless, I think I speak for all Republicans in saying that we deeply regret the decision which has been made to have an unrepresentative party ratio in the Committee on Ways and Means. In our democracy there is, of course, dialog within the parties, and there is dialog between the parties. It is important that both types of dialog go forward in a constructive way. We can count on the diversity of our two great parties to insure a high level of dialog within our parties. We depend on comity in the relationship between the parties based on respect, and on fairness. We have come to define fairness in traditional ways, because in fact rules are written for each Congress, and it is within the power of those who have the votes to change those rules unless tradition interprets the meaning of the word "fairness."

I have done some investigation of the facts about the Ways and Means



Committee ratio because the allegation has been made that when the Republicans were in control of the Congress, they did to the Democrats what the Democrats are now doing to us.

The percentage of the majority Members in the House for the 97th Congress is 55.8. The percentage of majority members on the Ways and Means Committee is 65.7. The difference is 9.9 points. There has not been so disproportionate a committee ratio over at least the past 20 Congresses or for the past 40 years.

For 16 of the preceding 20 Congresses, the majority-minority ratio on the Ways and Means Committee has been 15 to 10 or 3 to 2. That statistic certainly approaches tradition.

The exceptions are as follows:

The 89th Congress in which the Democrats gained 37 seats. The majority party percentage was then 67.8 in the House, and in the committee the percentage was 68—17 Democrats and 8 Republicans. In the following Congress, when the majority House percentage dropped to 56.9, the committee returned to its 15 to 10 or 3-to-2 format.

The other few Congresses which were exceptions to the by now well-established tradition of the 3-to-2 ratio on the Ways and Means Committee were the 94th, the 95th, and the 96th Congresses, when the majority percentages in the House were, respectively, 66.9, 66.7, and 63.4. The committee majority percentages for those Congresses were, respectively, 67.6, 67.6, and 66.7, each reasonably consistent with the percentage in the House as a whole.

The Democrats have contended that the 23-to-12 committee ratio is consistent with past practice, and that we Republicans adopted a similarly disproportionate ratio when our party held a majority of the seats in the House during the 83d Congress. The Republicans really were continuing a majority-minority ratio which had become virtually traditional by then. The committee ratio was 15 to 10 in each Congress from the 77th through the 88th Congress.

□ 1610

The Republican 83d Congress committee ratio of 15 to 10 or 3 to 2 is far more liberal than the 23-to-12 or 2-to-1 ratio imposed this year. A ratio of 3 to 2 in short would be traditional for either party.

Tradition is something we have to depend on in this House to provide the guidelines that we need if we are to have the constructive party dialog which is so significant in our democracy and so necessary to its continuance.

Mr. Speaker, when we no longer can appeal to the sense of fairness or the sense of tradition, which has protected us in the past, we have to fall back on appealing to the self-interest of the

majority, because quite frankly, the destruction of a tradition of this sort ultimately is a threat for the majority as well as the minority in a society in which the two-party system involves viable choices between the two parties. I am not threatening, but stating an obvious fact when I say there may be a role reversal at any time.

I deeply regret that after this violation of tradition, it will be difficult for the new minority in the future to fall back on the fairness this tradition embodies. The tradition has been realistic in the past, and has helped the process work. It should not be lightly abandoned.

We are most regretful. We urge in the Members' own self-interest, if not in their sense of fairness, that this body vote for the motion to commit.

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

I simply want to commend the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE) for wrapping up the debate on our side with respect to this very critical question that he is going to have to deal with as the one responsible on our side for leading our side on the Committee on Ways and Means.

I have no more requests for time, Mr. Speaker, but before moving the previous question, I would simply advise the membership of the House that the parliamentary situation is such that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), after the previous question has been ordered, will move to commit. That is a nondebateable motion, and there will be a vote immediately following which will give Members an opportunity to express themselves on the substitute which is embodied in the gentleman's motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LOTT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LOTT moves to commit the resolution (H. Res. 45) to a select committee to be appointed by the Speaker and to be composed of nine members not more than five of whom shall be from the same political party, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The following named Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioner be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

#### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

William C. Wampler, Virginia;  
Paul Findley, Illinois;  
James M. Jeffords, Vermont;

Tom Hagedorn, Minnesota;  
E. Thomas Coleman, Missouri;  
Ron Marlenee, Montana;  
Larry Hopkins, Kentucky;  
William M. Thomas, California;  
George Hansen, Idaho;  
Arlan Stangeland, Minnesota;  
Pat Roberts, Kansas;  
Bill Emerson, Missouri;  
John Napier, South Carolina;  
Joe Skeen, New Mexico;  
Sid Morrison, Washington;  
Clint Roberts, South Dakota;  
Steve Gunderson, Wisconsin;  
Cooper Evans, Iowa; and  
Eugene Chapple, California.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Silvio Conte, Massachusetts;  
Joseph M. McDade, Pennsylvania;  
Jack Edwards, Alabama;  
John T. Myers, Indiana;  
J. Kenneth Robinson, Virginia;  
Clarence E. Miller, Ohio;  
Lawrence Coughlin, Pennsylvania;  
C. W. Bill Young, Florida;  
Jack Kemp, New York;  
Ralph S. Regula, Ohio;  
Clair W. Burgener, California;  
George M. O'Brien, Illinois;  
Virginia Smith, Nebraska;  
Eldon D. Rudd, Arizona;  
Carl D. Pursell, Michigan;  
Mickey Edwards, Oklahoma;  
Robert L. Livingston, Louisiana;  
S. William Green, New York;  
Tom Loeffler, Texas;  
Jerry Lewis, California;  
Carroll Campbell, Jr., South Carolina; and  
John E. Porter, Illinois.

#### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

William L. Dickinson, Alabama;  
G. William Whitehurst, Virginia;  
Floyd Spence, South Carolina;  
Robin L. Beard, Tennessee;  
Donald J. Mitchell, New York;  
Marjorie S. Holt, Maryland;  
Robert W. Daniel, Jr., Virginia;  
Elwood Hillis, Indiana;  
David F. Emery, Maine;  
Paul S. Trible, Jr., Virginia;  
Robert E. Badham, California;  
Charles F. Dougherty, Pennsylvania;  
James A. Courter, New Jersey;  
Larry J. Hopkins, Kentucky;  
Robert W. Davis, Michigan;  
Kenneth B. Kramer, Colorado;  
Duncan L. Hunter, California;  
James L. Nelligan, Pennsylvania; and  
Thomas F. Hartnett, South Carolina.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

J. William Stanton, Ohio;  
Chalmers P. Wylie, Ohio;  
Stewart B. McKinney, Connecticut;  
George Hansen, Idaho;  
Henry J. Hyde, Illinois;  
Jim Leach, Iowa;  
Thomas B. Evans, Jr., Delaware;  
Ronald E. Paul, Texas;  
Ed Bethune, Arkansas;  
Norman D. Shumway, California;  
Jon Hinson, Mississippi;  
Stan Parris, Virginia;  
Ed Weber, Ohio;  
Bill McCollum, Florida;  
Gregory Carman, New York;  
George Wortley, New York;  
Marge Roukema, New Jersey;  
Bill Lowery, California; and  
James K. Coyne, Pennsylvania.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Delbert L. Latta, Ohio;

Ralph S. Regula, Ohio;  
E. G. Shuster, Pennsylvania;  
Bill Frenzel, Minnesota;  
Eldon D. Rudd, Arizona;  
Paul S. Trible, Jr., Virginia;  
Ed Bethune, Arkansas;  
Lynn M. Martin, Illinois;  
Albert Lee Smith, Jr., Alabama;  
Eugene Johnston, North Carolina; and  
Bobbi Fiedler, California.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
Stewart McKinney, Connecticut;  
Stan Parris, Virginia; and  
Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., Virginia.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR  
John M. Ashbrook, Ohio;  
John N. Erlenborn, Illinois;  
James M. Jeffords, Vermont;  
William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania;  
E. Thomas Coleman, Missouri;  
Kenneth B. Kramer, Colorado;  
Arlen I. Erdahl, Minnesota;  
Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin;  
Millicent Fenwick, New Jersey;  
Marge Roukema, New Jersey;  
Eugene Johnston, North Carolina;  
Larry DeNardis, Connecticut;  
Larry E. Craig, Idaho; and  
Wendell Bailey, Missouri.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE  
James T. Broyhill, North Carolina;  
Clarence J. Brown, Ohio;  
James M. Collins, Texas;  
Norman F. Lent, New York;  
Edward R. Madigan, Illinois;  
Carlos J. Moorhead, California;  
Matthew J. Rinaldo, New Jersey;  
Marc L. Marks, Pennsylvania;  
Tom Corcoran, Illinois;  
Gary A. Lee, New York;  
William E. Dannemeyer, California;  
Bob Whittaker, Kansas;  
Thomas J. Tauke, Iowa;  
Don Ritter, Pennsylvania;  
Harold Rogers, Kentucky;  
Cleve Benedict, West Virginia;  
Daniel R. Coats, Indiana; and  
Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., Virginia.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
William S. Broomfield, Michigan;  
Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois;  
Paul Findley, Illinois;  
Larry Winn, Jr., Kansas;  
Benjamin A. Gilman, New York;  
Tennyson Guyer, Ohio;  
Robert J. Lagomarsino, California;  
William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania;  
Joel Pritchard, Washington;  
Millicent Fenwick, New Jersey;  
Robert K. Dornan, California;  
Jim Leach, Iowa;  
Arlen I. Erdahl, Minnesota;  
Toby A. Roth, Wisconsin;  
Olympia Snowe, Maine; and  
John LeBoutillier, New York.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
Frank Horton, New York;  
John Erlenborn, Illinois;  
Clarence J. Brown, Ohio;  
Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., California;  
Thomas N. Kindness, Ohio;  
Robert S. Sawyer, Michigan;  
M. Caldwell Butler, Virginia;  
Lyle Williams, Ohio;  
H. Joel Deckard, Indiana;  
William F. Clinger, Jr., Pennsylvania;  
Raymond McGrath, New York;  
Hal Daub, Nebraska;  
John Hiler, Indiana;  
David Dreier, California;  
Wendell Bailey, Missouri;  
Larry DeNardis, Connecticut; and

Judd Gregg, New Hampshire.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION  
Bill Frenzel, Minnesota;  
William L. Dickinson, Alabama;  
Robert E. Badham, California;  
Newt Gingrich, Georgia;  
William M. Thomas, California;  
Gary A. Lee, New York;  
James K. Coyne, Pennsylvania; and  
Lynn M. Martin, Illinois.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS  
Manuel Lujan, Jr., New Mexico;  
Don H. Clausen, California;  
Don Young, Alaska;  
Robert J. Lagomarsino, California;  
Dan Marriott, Utah;  
Ron Marlenee, Montana;  
Richard B. Cheney, Wyoming;  
Charles Pashayan, Jr., California;  
Douglas K. Bereuter, Nebraska;  
Jon Hinson, Mississippi;  
David O'B. Martin, New York;  
Larry E. Craig, Idaho;  
William M. Hendon, North Carolina;  
Hank Brown, Colorado;  
David (Mick) Staton, West Virginia;  
Denny Smith, Oregon; and  
James V. Hansen, Utah.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
Robert McClory, Illinois;  
Tom Railsback, Illinois;  
Hamilton Fish, Jr., New York;  
M. Caldwell Butler, Virginia;  
Carlos J. Moorhead, California;  
John M. Ashbrook, Ohio;  
Henry J. Hyde, Illinois;  
Thomas N. Kindness, Ohio;  
Harold S. Sawyer, Michigan;  
Daniel E. Lungren, California;  
F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Wisconsin;  
and  
Bill McCollum, Florida.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Gene Snyder, Kentucky;  
Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., California;  
Edwin B. Forsythe, New Jersey;  
Joel Pritchard, Washington;  
Don Young, Alaska;  
Norman F. Lent, New York;  
David F. Emery, Maine;  
Thomas B. Evans, Jr., Delaware;  
Robert W. Davis, Michigan;  
William Carney, New York;  
Charles F. Dougherty, Pennsylvania;  
Norman D. Shumway, California;  
Jack Fields, Texas;  
Claudine Schneider, Rhode Island; and  
Clay Shaw, Florida.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE  
Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois;  
Gene Taylor, Missouri;  
Benjamin A. Gilman, New York;  
Tom Corcoran, Illinois;  
James A. Courter, New Jersey;  
Charles Pashayan, Jr., California;  
William E. Dannemeyer, California;  
Daniel B. Crane, Illinois;  
Wayne R. Grisham, California; and  
Frank Wolf, Virginia.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

Don H. Clausen, California;  
Gene Snyder, Kentucky;  
John Paul Hammerschmidt, Arkansas;  
E. G. Shuster, Pennsylvania;  
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., California;  
Tom Hagedorn, Minnesota;  
Arlan Stangeland, Minnesota;  
Newt Gingrich, Georgia;  
William F. Clinger, Jr., Pennsylvania;

Gerald B. Solomon, New York;  
Harold C. Hollenbeck, New Jersey;  
H. Joel Deckard, Indiana;  
Wayne R. Grisham, California;  
Jim Jeffries, Kansas;  
Jack Fields, Texas;  
Guy Molinari, New York;  
Clay Shaw, Florida;  
Bob McEwen, Ohio; and  
Frank Wolf, Virginia.

COMMITTEE ON RULES  
James H. Quillen, Tennessee;  
Delbert L. Latta, Ohio;  
Trent Lott, Mississippi;  
Gene Taylor, Missouri; and  
John J. Rhodes, Arizona.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
Larry Winn, Jr., Kansas;  
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., California;  
Hamilton Fish, Jr., New York;  
Manuel Lujan, Jr., New Mexico;  
Harold C. Hollenbeck, New Jersey;  
Robert S. Walker, Pennsylvania;  
Edwin B. Forsythe, New Jersey;  
William Carney, New York;  
Margaret M. Heckler, Massachusetts;  
F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Wisconsin;  
Vin Weber, Minnesota;  
Judd Gregg, New Hampshire;  
Raymond McGrath, New York;  
Joe Skeen, New Mexico;  
Claudine Schneider, Rhode Island;  
Jim Dunn, Michigan; and  
Bill Lowery, California.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS  
Joseph M. McDade, Pennsylvania;  
Silvio Conte, Massachusetts;  
J. William Stanton, Ohio;  
William S. Broomfield, Michigan;  
Dan Marriott, Utah;  
Lyle Williams, Ohio;  
Olympia J. Snowe, Maine;  
Douglas K. Bereuter, Nebraska;  
Daniel B. Crane, Illinois;  
John Hiler, Indiana;  
David (Mick) Staton, West Virginia;  
Vin Weber, Minnesota;  
Hal Daub, Nebraska;  
Chris Smith, New Jersey;  
Ed Weber, Ohio; and  
David Dreier, California.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Floyd Spence, South Carolina;  
Barber B. Conable, Jr., New York;  
John T. Myers, Indiana;  
Edwin B. Forsythe, New Jersey;  
Hank Brown, Colorado; and  
James V. Hansen, Utah.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS  
John Paul Hammerschmidt, Arkansas;  
Margaret M. Heckler, Massachusetts;  
Chalmers P. Wylie, Ohio;  
Elwood Hillis, Indiana;  
Tennyson Guyer, Ohio;  
Harold S. Sawyer, Michigan;  
Gerald B. H. Solomon, New York;  
Jim Jeffries, Kansas;  
Bob McEwen, Ohio;  
Jim Dunn, Michigan;  
Christopher Smith, New Jersey;  
Albert Lee Smith, Jr., Alabama; and  
Denny Smith, Oregon.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS  
Barber B. Conable, Jr., New York;  
John J. Duncan, Tennessee;  
Bill Archer, Texas;  
Guy Vander Jagt, Michigan;  
Philip M. Crane, Illinois;  
Bill Frenzel, Minnesota;  
James G. Martin, North Carolina;



L. A. (Skip) Bafalis, Florida;  
Richard T. Schulze, Pennsylvania;  
Willis D. Gradison, Jr., Ohio;  
John H. Rousselot, California;  
W. Henson Moore, Louisiana;  
Robert H. Michel, Illinois; and  
Trent Lott, Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to commit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, this vote then would occur on the motion to commit, not on the resolution itself?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the motion to commit.

Mr. LOTT. An "aye" vote on the motion to commit would be a vote for fairness in the committee ratio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not interpret it in that way.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 172, nays 221, not voting 40, as follows:

(Roll No. 7)

#### YEAS—172

Archer	Dickinson	Hillis
Badham	Dorman	Hinson
Bafalis	Dougherty	Hollenbeck
Bailey (MO)	Dreier	Holt
Beard	Duncan	Hopkins
Benedict	Dunn	Horton
Bereuter	Edwards (AL)	Hunter
Bethune	Edwards (OK)	Hyde
Bliley	Emerson	Jeffords
Broomfield	Emery	Jeffries
Brown (CO)	Erdahl	Johnston
Broyhill	Erlenborn	Kemp
Burgener	Evans (DE)	Kindness
Butler	Evans (IA)	Kramer
Campbell	Fenwick	Lagomarsino
Carman	Fiedler	Leach
Carney	Fields	LeBoutillier
Chapple	Findley	Lee
Cheney	Fish	Lent
Clausen	Forsythe	Lewis
Clinger	Frenzel	Livingston
Coats	Gillman	Loeffler
Collins (TX)	Gingrich	Lott
Conable	Goldwater	Lujan
Conte	Goodling	Lungren
Corcoran	Gradison	Madigan
Coughlin	Green	Marks
Courter	Gregg	Marlenee
Coyne, James	Gunderson	Marriott
Craig	Guyer	Martin (NC)
Daniel, R. W.	Hagedorn	Martin (NY)
Dannemeyer	Hammerschmidt	McClory
Daub	Hansen (ID)	McCloskey
Davis	Hansen (UT)	McCollum
Deckard	Hartnett	McEwen
DeNardis	Hendon	McGrath
Derwinski	Hiler	McKinney

Michel	Ritter	Snyder
Miller (OH)	Roberts (KS)	Solomon
Mollinari	Roberts (SD)	Spence
Moore	Robinson	Stangeland
Moorhead	Rogers	Stanton
Morrison	Roukema	Staton
Myers	Rousselot	Tauke
Napier	Rudd	Tribble
Nelligan	Sawyer	Walker
O'Brien	Schneider	Weber (MN)
Parris	Schulze	Weber (OH)
Pashayan	Sensenbrenner	Whitehurst
Paul	Shaw	Whittaker
Petri	Shumway	Winn
Porter	Shuster	Wolf
Pritchard	Skeen	Wortley
Quillen	Smith (AL)	Wyllie
Railsback	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)
Rhodes	Smith (OR)	
Rinaldo	Snowe	

#### NAYS—221

Addabbo	Fountain	Nelson
Akaka	Frank	Nichols
Alexander	Frost	Nowak
Anderson	Fuqua	Oakar
Annunzio	Garcia	Obey
Anthony	Gaydos	Ottinger
Applegate	Gedjenson	Panetta
Aspin	Gephardt	Patman
Atkinson	Gibbons	Patterson
Bailey (PA)	Ginn	Pease
Barnard	Glickman	Pepper
Barnes	Gonzalez	Perkins
Bedell	Gore	Peyser
Beilenson	Gramm	Pickle
Benjamin	Gray	Price
Bennett	Guarini	Rahall
Bevill	Hall (OH)	Ratchford
Blaggi	Hall, Ralph	Reuss
Bingham	Hall, Sam	Richmond
Blanchard	Hamilton	Rodino
Boggs	Hance	Roemer
Boland	Hatcher	Rose
Bolling	Hawkins	Rostenkowski
Bonior	Hefner	Roybal
Bonker	Heftel	Sabo
Bouquard	Hertel	Santini
Bowen	Hightower	Savage
Breaux	Holland	Scheuer
Brinkley	Howard	Schroeder
Brodhead	Hubbard	Schumer
Brooks	Huckaby	Seiberling
Burton, John	Hutto	Shamansky
Byron	Ireland	Shannon
Chappell	Jacobs	Sharp
Clay	Jenkins	Shelby
Coelho	Jones (NC)	Simon
Collins (IL)	Jones (OK)	Skelton
Conyers	Jones (TN)	Smith (IA)
Cotter	Kastenmeier	Solarz
Coyne, William	Kazen	St Germain
Crockett	Kildee	Stark
D'Amours	Kogovsek	Stenholm
Daniel, Dan	LaFalce	Stokes
Danielson	Lantos	Stratton
Daschle	Leath	Studds
Dellums	Lehman	Stump
Derrick	Leland	Swift
Dicks	Levitass	Synar
Dingell	Long (LA)	Tauzin
Dixon	Long (MD)	Traxler
Donnelly	Lowry	Udall
Dorgan	Luken	Vento
Downey	Lundine	Volkmer
Dwyer	Markey	Walgren
Dymally	Matsui	Washington
Dyson	Mattox	Watkins
Early	Mavroules	Waxman
Eckart	Mazzoli	Weaver
Edgar	McCurdy	Weiss
Edwards (CA)	McHugh	White
Ertel	Mica	Whitley
English	Miller (CA)	Whitten
Evans (GA)	Mineta	Williams (MT)
Evans (IN)	Minish	Wilson
Fary	Mitchell (MD)	Wirth
Fascell	Moakley	Wolpe
Fazio	Moffett	Wright
Ferraro	Mollohan	Wyden
Pithian	Montgomery	Yates
Flippo	Mottl	Yatron
Florio	Murphy	Young (MO)
Foglietta	Murtha	Zablocki
Foley	Natcher	Zeferetti
Ford (TN)	Neal	

#### NOT VOTING—40

Albosta	Fowler	Pursell
Andrews	Grisham	Rangel
Ashbrook	Harkin	Roe
AuCoin	Heckler	Rosenthal
Boner	Hughes	Roth
Brown (CA)	Latta	Russo
Brown (OH)	Lederer	Stockman
Burton, Phillip	Lowery	Taylor
Chisholm	Martin (IL)	Thomas
Coleman	McDade	Vander Jagt
Crane, Daniel	McDonald	Wampler
Crane, Philip	Mikulski	Williams (OH)
de la Garza	Mitchell (NY)	
Ford (MI)	Oberstar	

□ 1630

Messrs. NICHOLS, JOHN L. BURTON, GRAY, and SCHEUER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLLINS of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Economic Committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. REUSS of Wisconsin; Mr. BOLLING of Missouri; Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana; Mr. LONG of Louisiana; Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland; Mr. RICHMOND of New York; Mr. BROWN of Ohio; Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts; Mr. ROUSSELOT of California; and Mr. WYLIE of Ohio.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

#### WRONG SIGNALS TO CENTRAL AMERICA

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

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the Sunday Washington Post article by its foreign affairs writer, Chris Dickey and to a resolution approved by the Church Council of Greater Seattle on January 15 on the current situation in El Salvador. The Post states that we have resumed military aid to

El Salvador complete with M16 rifles, grenade launchers, and six U.S. helicopters which are awaiting to be transformed into gunships and troop transports. Along with this aid, the U.S. Government has provided up to 20 advisers.

We have resumed aid without a satisfactory inquiry into the murders of four American churchwomen, including three nuns, or into the murders of two Americans involved in the land reform effort. We have resumed aid without evidence that the Government of El Salvador is able to control its own security forces or find a solution to the violence which is tearing at its country. At least 10,000 of its citizens were killed last year. Today's Washington Post reports 26 more deaths.

El Salvador has had one of the highest proportions of landless laborers and tenant farmers in Latin America. The grievances of the landless have played a crucial role in the political polarization and violence in that country. The Agrarian Reform Law of El Salvador spelled out a three-phase program which would transfer over 1 million acres of land—over one-third of the farmland—to over 200,000 peasant families. The resumption of military aid comes at a critical time for the land reform program. The program is currently being paralyzed by the Government. On April 28, 1980, the Government enacted decree 207 which transferred 500,000 acres to 150,000 families who had worked the land as tenants or sharecroppers. This step has resulted in a record corn crop which is now being harvested with enough excess to export to Nicaragua and Guatemala. However, the Government has not issued additional decrees for formal titling of the new owners nor has it compensated the former owners for the expropriated land, required under 207. These steps are necessary to prevent attempts by former landowners to reverse the land reform process and to prevent the tenants from being driven back toward supporting the opposition forces.

Therefore, the United States should not repeat the mistake that it made in Vietnam; that of blindly providing military support to a repressive government without guarantees of a policy of land reform and an end to human rights violations. Any continuation of assistance must be tied to willingness of the Government of El Salvador to complete the land reform program. Without land reform, El Salvador will degenerate into a brutal civil war torn country that may cost hundreds of thousands of lives. I am deeply concerned and am afraid that the New York Times editorial of January 15 is correct when it states that the United States is sending "the wrong signal at the wrong time and is bound to encourage more killing."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me the time to address this important issue.

#### The material follows:

##### WRONG SIGNALS TO CENTRAL AMERICA

Of the legacies of the Carter Administration, surely the sloppiest is its policy in El Salvador. The decision, in its last days, to resume the shipment of combat weapons to a besieged and divided junta made a hash of whatever political objectives Washington once had there. Now the Reagan Administration has added to the confusion by halting economic aid to Nicaragua because its regime is allegedly aiding the rebel forces in El Salvador.

There is nothing wrong in reexamining old premises. But in the volatile atmosphere of Central America, every tactical lurch in Washington is sure to be gravely read and misread. Until action can be coherently explained, it would be better to do nothing at all.

The American objective in both countries should be obvious: the encouragement of centrist political forces that aspire to social justice and friendly relations with the United States. Nicaragua has had its revolution and is led by an uneasy coalition of authoritarian socialists and private-enterprise democrats. The \$75 million aid program, long delayed and now suspended, was intended to strengthen the groups most favorable to the United States. They are sure to suffer politically if they cannot deliver significant support.

El Salvador is close to civil war. Its junta is led by a Christian Democrat but dominated by the military. The tragic reality now is that neither President Duarte nor the democrats who have jointed the opposition control their respective armies. Therefore Washington, too, may have lost the chance to affect events.

But whatever influence it can still exert has to be directed to the junta's armies, pressing them to pursue policies that will make friends rather than enemies of the country's peasants. Land reform was the chosen instrument, but the old oligarchs were never reconciled to it. If their private armies and allies in the junta continue to make every reformer an enemy, the game will be lost to Marxists.

To make clear its displeasure with the junta's performance, the Carter Administration only a few weeks ago suspended military aid, at least until it was satisfied that Government forces did not conspire in the murder of opposition leaders and American Catholic missionaries. No fair inquiry seems to have been held, yet suddenly the aid was restored. It was the wrong signal at the wrong time and is bound to encourage more killing; last year's death toll was an appalling 10,000 in a country of only 4 million.

If the Reagan Administration wants to write off America's avowed friends in Nicaragua and potential allies in the Salvadoran opposition, that would at least be a policy, no matter how wrong and shortsighted. On reflection, however, it may see the pitfalls of a course that has the effect of stiffening both political extremes at the expense of the center.

Whatever the chances of still finding centrist solutions, the most hard-boiled Reagan realists will want to think long and hard before they make Nicaragua dependent on,

say, Cuba, and pour American weapons into a savage Salvadoran war.

##### RESOLUTION ON EL SALVADOR

Whereas, in El Salvador 90 percent of the people earn less than \$100 a year while 2 percent of the people own 60 percent of the land, and almost 75 percent of Salvadoran children under age 5 suffer from malnutrition; and

Whereas, very basic human rights of the people are not respected by the government and the military; and

Whereas, 10,000 people were killed in 1980, 80 percent killed by military or right wing security forces according to the Legal Aid Office of the Archdiocese of San Salvador. Those killed included 9 priests, Archbishop Romero, 3 Catholic Sisters, and numerous Church lay leaders; and

Whereas, The Church of El Salvador is the voice of those who have no voice, and it through Archbishop Romero last March requested to President Carter, "to guarantee that your government will not intervene directly or indirectly with military, economic, diplomatic, or other pressures to determine the destiny of the Salvadorean people." Therefore

We the Church Council of Greater Seatle:

Denounce the human rights violations in El Salvador.

Call for an end to the persecution of the Salvador Church.

Condemn all U.S. intervention in El Salvador.

Ask for an end to all economic and military aid to El Salvador until a representative government has been established.

Approved January 15, 1981.

##### COMMITTEE STAFF FUNDING

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

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, committee funding resolutions are now being prepared by each committee. Before each committee finishes the process of drafting budgets, let us review the pitfalls to avoid. Attached to this statement are charts showing the breakdown of total expenditures for several committees from the 92d through the 96th Congresses, although we do not yet have the 1980 expenditure figures. They show exactly where the exorbitant growth and unnecessary expense has occurred.

Each of these charts represents costs above the statutory budget which is already provided to the committees. Every standing committee, except Appropriations and Budget, is allowed to hire up to 30 statutory staff members. Each committee is given office space, equipment, telephones, and postage moneys needed for those 30 employees to work. These charts show the expenditures for added temporary, investigative staff. They are not subject to civil service or House rules. They are hired by the chairmen of the committees. They have grown rapidly in size and costs to the point where they are



creating more legislation, regulations, and agencies just to justify their jobs.

The charts make it clear just where the unnecessary waste has occurred. The salaries for the investigative staff alone represent around 90 percent of each committee's expenditures during the last 10 years. Look at the consultant fees which are an additional personnel cost. Examine the travel budgets. Remember, these are for supplemental employees.

Each Member of Congress has up to 18 personal staff in his own office plus the 30 statutory for each committee, which totals 600 already at his disposal. Why are we spending \$86 million on these additional investigative staff?

During the next 3 weeks, we will be closely studying the specific problem areas. Salaries, for example. My own committee, Commerce, tops the list—the \$3 million club. That has grown from half a million dollars just 10 years ago. Remember, this budget is

just for 1 year—not both sessions of Congress. Merchant Marine in 1979 was \$1,262,618 for investigative salaries; in 1971 it was only \$161,303. Subcommittees have added to the problem. Agriculture, which has 10, has seen a tremendous growth in costs, many of which are for subcommittee employees—and many of these subcommittees hardly ever meet. Cotton Subcommittee last year met less than 4 hours.

Let us look at the charts and start thinking where you can cut within your own committee. Let us hold the line here so we do not have to make further reductions within the Subcommittee on Accounts. Remember, our constituents expect us to cut back in spending, because less Government spending means less inflation.

Reducing inflation begins by reducing the size of Government. The more we reduce Government spending—the

more we will reduce America's inflation.

When Congress makes committee staffs larger, the staffers create work to justify their jobs. Committee staffs stay busy creating new agencies, establishing new regulations requiring additional reports, and redefining the rules. The Federal Register has grown from 35,572 pages in 1973 to 87,012 in 1980.

Congress wants to reduce the budget so let us cut Government spending. The place to start cutting effectively is at the cause of the trouble. Let us eliminate these obsessed staffers, who compete to see how many new creative laws and complicated regulations they can introduce every week.

The answer for less Government rests with us in Congress. We need to provide the example. Congress must lead the way. We expect all bureaucracies to cut, and we must be the first to cut staff.

## EXPENDITURES 92d TO 96th CONGRESSES

Item	92d			93d			94th			95th			96th	
	1st session 1971	2d session 1972	Full Congress	1st session 1973	2d session 1974	Full Congress	1st session 1975	2d session 1976	Full Congress	1st session 1977	2d session 1978	Full Congress	1st session 1979	2d session 1980
<b>Committee on Agriculture:</b>														
Investigative salaries			\$155,256	\$104,473	\$140,817		\$150,135	\$123,148		\$348,321	\$354,276		\$572,409	
Majority subcommittee salaries							161,675	234,124		239,508	297,812		303,752	
Hearings and travel			8,154	1,768	2,228		26,529	15,005		35,239	37,039		47,338	
Telephone and telegraph			501	320	696		1,868	1,468		4,565	7,543		9,523	
Supplies/equipment			995	1,456	1,980		21,034	45,522		65,923	73,692		74,972	
Periodicals							2,237	1,514		2,849	3,170		3,494	
Miscellaneous			494	158	184		233	188			104		223	
Special food study								134,942						
Consultants							1,350			*183				
<b>Total</b>			165,400	108,175	145,905		365,061	555,911		696,588	774,236		1,011,711	
<b>Committee on Armed Services:</b>														
Salaries	191,169	157,152		132,954	78,465		106,859	153,066		297,551	380,986		436,349	
Travel	1,917	0		1,289	1,217		119	2,661		3,000	55,199		14,638	
Telephone	639	716		495	1,064		890	1,472		1,374	1,803		2,942	
Office equipment				4,061	106		7,025	6,674		9,545	12,818		17,830	
Stationery	1,741	1,241		192	523		328	646		1,297	797		1,924	
Periodicals/books							2,367	1,478		1,198	1,153		2,216	
Special training										489	3,567		4,311	
Witness fees and travel	781	178		113	2,145		528	3,268		717	1,509		4,247	
Consultant fees and travel	4									1,200	7,000		11,500	
Representation													667	
Miscellaneous	1,638	4,393		1,134	6,616								37	
Reporting service	1,866	26,222		7,056	7,574									
<b>Total</b>	199,755	189,902		147,294	97,710		118,116	169,265		316,371	464,832		496,661	
<b>Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:</b>														
Salaries			1,380,852	823,529	956,599		1,164,311	1,577,155		1,816,534	2,036,745		2,012,732	
Travel			40,690	24,094	31,473		28,571	83,983		46,823	73,283		46,791	
Witnesses			3,938	1,429	3,081		8,638	11,053		8,454	9,052		11,366	
Stationery and supplies			7,427	2,984	6,373		16,579	17,985		18,967	19,045		14,081	
Telephone and telegraph			12,856	5,852	8,100		9,322	26,256		19,676	22,232		20,756	
Publications			16,430	10,273	10,694		18,487	22,830		24,253	23,166		24,325	
Duplicating machines			24,920	12,344	14,909		22,959	41,603		32,741	36,904		36,491	
Miscellaneous			781	1,741	3,282		10,257	43,124		36,845	24,760		24,204	
Reporting services			5,280	21,884	5,364									
Contracts			11,600			\$42,300	50,700	44,450			15,000			
Computer			5,630											
Petty cash			100											
<b>Total</b>			1,510,504	904,130	1,082,165	1,986,295	1,329,824	1,868,439		2,004,293	2,260,187		2,190,746	
<b>Committee on District of Columbia:</b>														
Salaries	103,543	121,675		244,559	280,673		247,573	330,355		229,386	230,818		232,586	
Supplies and publications				1,018	1,176		1,512	3,362		2,395	2,910		5,036	
Equipment services				3,623	1,000		8,558	15,907		10,965	13,420		10,941	
Phone/telegraph				4,900										
Reporter service and witness fees				371				469		85			308	
Travel				1,090	2,775		7,844	16,067		1,893	3,614		2,662	
Conference fees				101										
Contracts				5,000				6,000						
Miscellaneous	263	10,659		100										
<b>Total</b>	103,806	132,334	236,140	252,042	294,245	546,287	265,487	372,160	\$637,647	244,724	250,762	\$495,486	251,531	

## EXPENDITURES 92d TO 96th CONGRESSES—Continued

Item	92d			93d			94th			95th			96th	
	1st session 1971	2d session 1972	Full Congress	1st session 1973	2d session 1974	Full Congress	1st session 1975	2d session 1976	Full Congress	1st session 1977	2d session 1978	Full Congress	1st session 1979	2d session 1980
<b>Committee on Education and Labor:</b>														
Salaries			1,640,305	986,067	1,364,668		1,098,568	1,332,741		1,425,164	1,629,263		1,761,225	
Travel			98,552	36,313	65,474		69,655	87,601		90,126	81,242		87,354	
Communication			20,342	11,294	19,076		13,062	19,575		18,791	15,732		17,285	
Publications			9,342	8,240	9,702		12,369	13,611		16,219	18,361		23,088	
Consultants						1,700	4,000	17,000		24,430	2,666		3,000	
Xerox						134,034	12,644	19,827		20,491	23,568		27,740	
Hearings			29,429	13,971	15,680									
Per diem														
Reporting														
Miscellaneous			20,280				2,757	694		959	429		1,672	
Witness fees			817											
Total			1,819,067	1,069,589	1,496,628	2,566,217	1,213,055	1,491,049		1,596,180	1,771,261		1,921,364	
<b>Committee on Foreign Affairs:</b>														
Salaries	276,507			439,324	526,768		513,837	639,833		975,193	1,294,036		1,402,634	
Travel	2,079			1,574	4,055		3,415	7,537		52,376	101,286		21,256	
Witness expense	10,271			5,144	8,167		7,957	11,831		21,652	15,155		20,590	
Telephone and telegraph	2,724	4,497		2,937	4,195		6,317	9,773		12,235	10,780		13,238	
Periodicals	746	1,627		969	2,081		4,774	6,776		10,077	8,185		10,057	
Miscellaneous expenses	641	416		425	433		49	50		387	559		654	
Printing services						706	162	127		205	84		288	
Duplicating expense		3,476					10,186	16,559		24,865	29,336		39,106	
Consulting fees						19,512	6,554	44,563		3,100	22,006			
Parliamentary exchange							2,343	3,376		7,808			6,331	
Stenography services				21,828	19,714									
Duplicating machines				4,784	6,121									
Professional salaries				276,452	427,000									
Clerical salaries				162,873	189,703									
Reporting service	17,356	13,456												
Total	310,324		737,985	476,985	590,945	1,067,930	555,594	740,425		1,107,898	1,481,427		1,514,153	
<b>Committee on Government Operations:</b>														
Salaries	789,497	772,896		861,070	937,493		971,515	1,198,138		1,345,379	1,535,558		1,669,482	
Travel	9,021	10,958		20,369	9,471		26,771	26,571		30,076	43,733		57,494	
Telephone and telegraph	2,882	3,701		2,300	2,732		6,969	10,748		9,630	11,329		12,974	
Stationery and printed matter	7,827	11,450		10,325	17,387		21,803	42,958		37,182	56,897		56,235	
Witness expense	1,398	569		2,619	1,762		3,385	4,566		4,338	4,408		7,290	
Consultant expense		10,961		32,868	1,000		2,850				810			
Reporting services	21,882	21,982		25,447	22,153									
Computer	3,286	2,144												
Miscellaneous			12			17		393		180	172		546	
Total	835,792	834,673	1,670,466	955,015	991,998	1,947,013	1,033,293	1,283,374		1,426,785	1,652,907		1,804,021	
<b>Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:</b>														
Salaries			365,559	407,668	582,812		437,410	438,360		597,906	758,079		985,879	
Consultant fees										1,900	6,147			
Travel			104,409	69,896	82,206		76,794	59,894		185,552	77,171		84,760	
Telephone and telegraph			3,246	4,770	5,136		7,865	6,978		14,743	13,448		20,205	
Periodicals			1,017	748	2,416		2,402	2,806		3,745	7,114		7,776	
Miscellaneous			6,964	637	2,320		20,032	20,393		30,501	33,766		41,880	
Reporting services			9,098	9,179	8,919									
Equipment rental				5,095	14,000									
Petty cash														
Majority room printing														
Total			490,333	497,993	697,809		544,503	528,431		834,347	895,725		1,140,500	
<b>Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:</b>														
Salaries	572,627	681,273		740,529	782,798		1,364,794	2,055,769		2,578,860	2,993,564		3,137,122	
Travel	38,129	47,811		25,913	38,843		40,397	80,263		103,079	124,131		84,931	
Witness fees				1,024		1,024	5,964	12,028		18,636	21,107		20,292	
Stationery supplies	19,866	14,643		15,987	21,872		958	1,785		3,211	1,183		553	
Telephone/telegraph	3,681	6,681		7,454	10,275		16,981	27,902		38,929	39,310		45,814	
Periodicals				3,925		3,925	8,723	16,323		17,072	19,358		29,456	
Consultants				6,400	29,800						22,204		160	
Reporting services	11,755	11,554		13,483	8,056									
Miscellaneous	61	233		501	6,678		78,285	77,210		187,864	77,465		92,265	
Total	646,119	762,195	1,408,314	810,267	903,271	1,713,538	1,516,102	2,271,280	3,878,382	2,947,651	3,298,322	5,245,973	3,410,593	
<b>Committee on Judiciary:</b>														
Salaries	265,297	339,634		1,025,602	1,321,810		777,529	993,940		1,031,814	1,067,157		1,046,591	
Staff training											816		429	
Travel	21,031	7,549		11,913	36,044		40,273	26,717		36,566	48,869		37,272	
Consultants				4,171	133,963		13,200	29,574		31,802	44,080		24,541	
Witnesses				1,720	5,444		17,938	16,277		6,950	11,718		12,829	
Telephone and telegraph	1,200	2,654		6,724	15,257		10,581	9,164		10,475	9,383		12,575	
Periodicals	877	993		4,793	5,667		5,776	8,762		6,833	8,607		10,416	
Office equipment and leasing				19,719	100,163		26,015	43,569		49,943	48,902		52,745	
Mimeographing				128	3,034		602	370		409	365		272	
Office supplies and miscellaneous						24,456		43		267	851		265	
Purchase of transcripts						5,790								
Computer Reporting service	6,202	7,579		8,174	27,412		314							
GAO reimbursement				24,592	27,049		15,024	2,815						
Miscellaneous	5,330	12,494												
Total	299,993	370,903		1,114,147	1,714,502	2,828,649	895,043	1,128,416		1,174,338	1,240,748		1,197,935	
<b>Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:</b>														
Salaries	161,303	221,084		181,052	205,281		170,478	188,210		578,472	948,655		1,262,618	
Contract payments										13,373	113,980		70,412	
Travel	15,993	9,086		10,532	25,642		21,798	24,652		74,381	97,916		67,843	
Duplication	2,888	5,099		3,677	8,889		6,467	6,741		19,726	33,502		27,822	
Periodicals	1,066	555		672	901		1,911	2,521		5,233	6,085		6,575	
Telephone	3,443	3,887		659	1,208		1,572	3,816		2,579	5,071		5,929	
Equipment rental										5,065	23,689		20,131	
Miscellaneous	622	333		81	87					1,869	4,238		5,861	



## EXPENDITURES 92d TO 96th CONGRESSES—Continued

Item	92d			93d			94th			95th			96th	
	1st session 1971	2d session 1972	Full Congress	1st session 1973	2d session 1974	Full Congress	1st session 1975	2d session 1976	Full Congress	1st session 1977	2d session 1978	Full Congress	1st session 1979	2d session 1980
Reporting services.....	9,052	6,040		6,413	3,764									
Total.....	194,367	246,084		203,086	245,692		202,226	225,940		700,698	1,233,136		1,467,191	
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:														
Salaries.....	386,830	421,116		411,015	442,949		374,879	377,262		504,688	593,183		644,704	
Travel.....	19,611	26,167		18,424	21,049		31,563	47,856		40,100	45,898		51,939	
Equipment.....				4,551	5,855		6,596	10,178		14,850	17,123		16,654	
Telephone and telegraph.....			9,690	2,865	4,078		4,619	5,903		7,732	8,444		9,206	
Periodicals.....			876	770	1,726		1,983	2,173		3,454	3,165		609	
Miscellaneous.....			8,106	292	808		868	2,089		4,605	2,589		1,213	
Witness fees and expenses.....							475	1,009			100		100	
Consultants.....			41,896	44,465	79,290		25,300	21,099		67,258				
Reporting services.....			7,105	4,455	6,277									
Contracts.....														
Stationery.....			466											
Supplies.....														
HIS.....														
Total.....	418,401	503,462	921,863	486,846	562,023	1,048,869	446,283	467,569	913,852	642,688	670,402	1,313,090	728,424	
Committee on Public Works and Transportation:														
Salaries.....	616,014	796,673		934,295	1,121,761		1,184,182	1,413,960		1,523,155	1,465,615		1,459,887	
Travel.....	42,989	77,384		57,013	119,646		107,981	185,732		114,618	117,862		103,039	
Telephone and telegraph.....	3,324	5,343		3,207	12,742		12,176	10,180		11,104	12,767		13,349	
Publications.....	970	1,133		2,017	3,571		4,605	5,977		4,404	4,982		4,837	
Electrical equipment.....	6,074	7,206		11,423	16,492		19,699	19,866		20,788	27,396		25,570	
Witnesses.....	929	567		1,217	2,362		509	798		4,755	3,904		187	
Miscellaneous.....	1,807	260				153	259	153		149	305		1,392	
Special training.....										300			4,800	
Stationery and supplies.....	2,378	4,858		1,701	1,192		1,007	1,485		11				
Photo-visual equipment and services.....						13,563	600	489		128				
Consultants.....	24,690	44,010		46,900	65,650			2,000						
Hearing/reporting service.....	6,044	5,796		2,285	9,683									
Panelists.....						11,500								
Total.....	705,219	943,230	1,648,449	1,060,058	1,378,316	2,438,374	1,331,018	1,640,640	2,971,658	1,679,412	1,632,831	3,312,243	1,613,061	
Committee on Rules:														
Office machine rental.....			924			3,860		6,923		7,536	12,310		24,962	
Telephone and telegraph.....						432		1,118		1,126	1,308		2,823	
Subscriptions.....			144			375		706		812	1,129		5,415	
Miscellaneous.....						127	14	146		91	1,038		629	
Travel.....										598			4,713	
Salaries.....													269,811	
Equipment rental.....							3,756							
Telephone.....			178			736	657							
Witness fees and travel.....													9,000	
Contracts.....													3,042	
Witness.....													1,227	
Books.....													357	
Printing.....			378										212	
Office supplies.....													35	
Education.....														
Stenograph.....			120 (c)											
Total.....			1,744 (c)			5,530	4,427	8,893		9,565	16,383		322,226	
Committee on Science and Technology:														
Salaries.....			\$579,462	\$284,688	\$320,661		\$306,795	\$464,912		\$887,144	\$1,077,101		\$1,318,171	
Travel.....			59,575	23,978	48,196		41,840	66,954		110,998	89,051		89,004	
Witnesses.....			4,297	4,146	6,663		17,087	29,562		34,019	38,478		44,747	
Duplicating equipment.....											39,241		34,830	
Periodicals.....								2,708		5,936	5,960		6,279	
Telephone and telegraph.....			2,688	1,743	4,411		7,548	6,240		9,785	8,602		9,885	
Supplies and stationery.....										3,902	7,889		14,858	
Miscellaneous.....			563	341	879		1,783	2,073		4,672	2,344		2,032	
Consultants fees.....				150	900		6,000	27,250		42,174	18,775			
Consultants travel.....							3,704	7,737		15,867	1,794			
Special training.....										2,620				
Duplicating.....			9,936	5,904	11,826		18,279	19,508		24,523				
Reporting services.....			15,469	8,037	7,241									
Total.....			671,990	328,987	400,777	\$729,764	403,036	626,944		1,141,640	1,289,235		1,519,806	
Committee on Small Business:														
Salaries.....			840,805	433,043	385,933		291,581	361,319		451,595	598,567		622,681	
Travel.....			18,494	8,726	7,311		11,399	14,672		20,177	21,016		35,999	
Witness fees.....				526	235			1,596		2,902	2,803		3,584	
Stationery supplies.....			2,033	707	1,243		968	1,570		1,410	1,662		2,883	
Telephone and telegraph.....			5,210	2,359	3,184		3,000	3,597		5,735	9,944		17,705	
Publications and periodicals.....			1,419	698	781		645	340		1,906	1,631		4,651	
Duplicating services.....			711	89	285		20	170		183	387		11,897	
Miscellaneous.....			7,644	410	1,137		23,747	2,671		6,221	10,777		873	
Consultant fees.....						12,000							15,000	
Equipment lease.....						1,153							9,829	
Outside computer charges.....													4,500	
HIS charges.....													5,200	
Reporting.....			10,307	10,473	10,192									
Total.....			886,533			880,485	331,360	385,935		490,129	646,787		734,802	
Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:														
Salaries.....										54,791	189,874		241,136	
Consultants.....			7,400			6,389	10,793	163,113		123,299	135,348		8,365	
Stationery, supplies and equipment.....			626			1,107	1,028	3,288		7,566	14,535		1,389	
Telephone and telegraph.....			171			266	424	1,656		4,954	11,954		1,027	
Publications.....			592			747	1,144	622		1,293	989		4,097	
Members and staff travel.....			629			417	223	2,169		25,720	37,902		23,588	
Travel.....										12,139	9,642		2,788	
Miscellaneous.....			48			8		17,018		19,544	15,929		8,820	
Total.....			9,466			8,934	13,612	187,866		249,306	439,761		267,622	

## EXPENDITURES 92d to 96th CONGRESSES—Continued

Item	92d			93d			94th			95th			96th	
	1st session 1971	2d session 1972	Full Congress	1st session 1973	2d session 1974	Full Congress	1st session 1975	2d session 1976	Full Congress	1st session 1977	2d session 1978	Full Congress	1st session 1979	2d session 1980
Committee on Veterans' Affairs:														
Salaries	\$78,382	\$75,678		85,595	83,281		81,564	106,530		164,794	211,303		204,998	
Travel	20,453	21,365		12,909	9,715		27,315	27,797		25,544	33,742		29,093	
Witness			167			156					499			
Stationery and Supplies	1,934	5,914		1,851	3,594		4,226	10,259		16,972	22,162			
Telephone and telegraph	302	572		336	663		347	260		275	124		2,093	
Periodicals and publications	318	560		237	195		805	673		670	597			
Consultant fees	7,200	9,400		6,775	8,738						4,819		4,070	
Equipment lease														
Equipment and supplies													24,450	
Publications													1,106	
Miscellaneous							1,900			2,653				
Reporting service			338			259	2,336			470				
HIS contract fees							5,975							
Total	109,095	113,488	222,583	107,962	106,342	214,304	120,232	149,755	\$269,987	211,378	273,246		265,810	
Committee on Ways and Means:														
Consultant fees			1,100			7,000		3,000		10,580	1,275		5,750	
Duplicating Services			10,027	3,634	6,207		11,977	19,825		24,454	24,575		30,909	
Equipment						1,215	718	21,064		14,661	18,926		17,471	
Miscellaneous			17	21	32		573	51		551	1,424		88	
Periodicals			1,719	996	1,364		2,867	5,232		9,570	8,285		11,316	
Tax services			8,253	3,065	6,480		14,172	11,489		16,484	14,136		17,137	
Technical publications			2,888	1,852	1,373		1,557	2,012		9,419	3,302		2,060	
Telephone and telegraph			1,706	1,117	1,348		4,892	14,641		13,507	13,134		18,307	
Travel			613	6,694	342		33,273	53,673		69,640	85,618		51,150	
Witnesses										5,478	6,095			
Salaries			20,400	45,411	106,207		617,154	1,008,099		1,375,601	1,592,056		1,708,718	
Representation allowance													145	
Total			46,723	69,790	124,568		687,183	1,139,086		1,549,945	1,768,826		1,863,051	

\*Includes minority subcommittee.

\*Includes miscellaneous.

\*56 temporary.

\*Machine utilization.

\*Publishing.

\*Includes duplicating expenses. ●

□ 1640

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

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to my colleague that the Agriculture Committee has reduced from 10 to 8 subcommittees, in an effort to comply with Democratic Caucus rules, which is trying to bring down the number of subcommittees. I just wanted to set the record straight. My colleague said that we had 10, and we do have 8 subcommittees.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. There were 10 the last time. And I want to commend the gentleman. I hope the gentleman can get it down to six. The figure we are shooting for now is six. Does the gentleman anticipate that we might be able to get to six in Agriculture?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I cannot speak for the committee. I am just saying that, as a matter of policy, we have reduced from 10 to 8 subcommittees.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. That is a step in the right direction.

I might just say this, since the gentleman mentioned subcommittees, that no committee is as bloated as the committee on which I serve, which is the Committee on Energy and Commerce. This committee has a staff of over \$3 million. Three million dollars. We not only have a staff, but we have high priced executives. I was interested to see that on the investigative staff, we have eight of them who make

over \$50,000, which puts you in the ranks of a top executive. We have everything on that Commerce Committee, but we have done it in six subcommittees. So it is not the number of subcommittees. You can end up just putting staff, staff, staff on any of them that you have. The thing that we want to do is to reduce staff.

Mr. BOWEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. COLLINS, will be pleased to know that the Agriculture Committee is reducing the total number of subcommittees from 10 to 8 and that the Subcommittee on Cotton, Rice, and Sugar, which I should chair.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure, however, that the gentleman from Texas must have received some erroneous information about the time the Cotton Subcommittee spent in session last year.

During 1980 we spent more than 30 hours in session, including markup, hearings in Washington, and field hearings in three different locations across the Cotton Belt of our Nation.

Although we were very busy on that subcommittee, I, too, regard the consolidation as a progressive and economical step forward.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE OLIN E. TEAGUE

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, Olin E. Teague was buried yesterday at Ar-

lington National Cemetery. It is right that this should be his resting place, for that is where heroes lie. And "Tiger" Teague was a hero. His footprints are everywhere in the history of the past half century.

Tiger Teague was, in the best sense of that word, a man's man. He was an American's American, guileless, unaffected, and unashamed in his patriotism. It would please him, I think, to be described as a Texas Aggie's Texas Aggie.

Olin Teague's name is synonymous with courage. His blood watered the battlefields of Europe, and he left a part of himself there in World War II. He was a battlefield commander who fought his way through the thick of combat. Tiger Teague was awarded three Silver Stars, three Bronze Stars, and three Purple Hearts.

Patched back together after numerous operations, Olin Teague walked for the rest of his life on one leg which was several inches shorter than the other. He wore a heavily built up shoe. Finally, some 3 years ago, his damaged foot developed gangrene and had to be amputated. Nor was this the only physical impediment which Tiger Teague bore uncomplainingly. He was afflicted during the latter years of his life with a diabetic condition and other internal maladies.

But what a man he was. And what a competitor. During my early years in Congress, Tiger was the scourge of the paddleball court. Unable to compete with swiftness of foot, he would place himself in the center of the court and



dominate it. Barrel chest and torso and muscular arms, he was an intimidating presence. So competitive was he that others kept their distance lest their insteps fall under the crunch of that heavily built up shoe.

Tiger once told me that he had "lost 250 pounds this year." When I scoffed in jocular incredulity, he assured me it was literally true. "I've lost 25 pounds 10 times," he said. Plagued by overweight, Tiger Teague would goad someone into a friendly wager as to which of the two could lose the most in the succeeding 2 weeks. If the wager were for no more than a quarter, Tiger Teague would starve himself rather than lose the competition. That is the kind of man he was.

But he was also another kind of man as well. He had a gentle side. Never was this more evident than in his tender concern for the families of those who were prisoners of war or missing in action in the Vietnam hostilities. With aggrieved young wives and mothers and little children, Olin Teague was the heart of sympathy and the soul of patience.

The law books of our Nation bear his handiwork. Olin Teague had much to do with veterans legislation, with our space program, and with our first legislative attempts to launch a synthetic fuels program for America.

Returning from World War II as a decorated hero, Tiger perhaps predictably was assigned to the Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which he became chairman 8 years later. The GI bill of rights, the educational benefits that were provided for the veterans of Korea and Vietnam, and other productive ways in which the Nation expressed its gratitude to those who gave of their wholeness in defense of the things we hold dear, were influenced strongly by Olin E. Teague. But he was never what one could call a professional veteran. He could say "no" and often did whenever he thought the demands of any veterans' organization were excessive.

Upon the inception of the Space Committee, Tiger Teague was assigned to it. He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight and helped to launch and monitor the programs which put American footprints on the Moon. During his last few years in Congress, he was chairman of the full Committee on Science and Technology.

One of Olin Teague's greatest disappointments was his failure—barely, by a margin of only one vote—to muster the support necessary to launch a meaningful synthetic fuels program for our country. If Tiger Teague had had his way, we would have been 5 years further down the road toward energy sufficiency than we are. The ambitious program which Congress finally launched last year is in no small

measure due to the earlier vision of Olin E. Teague.

We who knew and loved him will miss him. His family—Freddie, Jack, Jim, and Jill—have a rich and towering legacy. Olin Teague loved his country and his country owes much to him.

□ 1650

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding to join with him and the delegation from Texas—and indeed all of the Members of the House—in remembering our great former colleague, Olin Teague, and expressing our sympathy at his passing.

The gentleman from Texas has, I think, set forth the record of Olin Teague as a man and as a Member of the Congress as well as it can be done, and I do not intend to repeat any of his accomplishments, although I certainly could because I have had the honor of not only being a colleague of "Tiger" Teague, but also a close personal friend. As a matter of fact, Tiger lived out in that part of Montgomery County, Md., near the part in which Betty and I reside, and we often rode together from that part of Maryland to the Capitol.

We have very similar philosophies on almost everything. The defense of the country was uppermost in the mind of Tiger Teague, and second only to that was his love and respect and admiration and concern for the American veteran. I think that every veteran in this country owes Tiger Teague a debt of gratitude that could never, never, never be repaid. In fact, he would not want it repaid because his reward for all he did was the fact that, I think, most people understand that the American veteran has been treated as well as any veteran ever has in any war, any country, at any time. Much of this has been due to the concern and hard work of our good friend, Tiger.

His wonderful wife, Freddie, their children, are dear friends of Mrs. Rhodes and me. We extend to them our heartfelt sympathy; to the people of Texas who loved him; in fact, to the people all over the country who love him and who will feel poorer because of the fact that the good Lord has seen fit to remove Tiger from our midst.

We wish them, or course, the best of everything, and God rest the soul of a noble, noble gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the

dean of the Texas delegation (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my distinguished friend, I want to thank him for calling this special order in recognition of the passing away of our beloved friend, "Tiger" Teague. I want to say that previously, on January 27, I made a statement about him, and a good many other Members did, in inviting the Members and announcing the detail of the funeral which you and the Speaker and many other Members attended.

I want to say that I do not know anybody who was more fun or who did a better job than Tiger Teague. I want to thank the gentleman very much for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished leader for the opportunity to join in this special order. I certainly listened with great attention to the experiences of my colleagues who shared friendship with Congressman Teague long before I came on the scene, but yesterday at the Fort Myer services I think one of the most impressive things I have ever seen, witnessed, or even read about was the testimony rendered in very simple language by an officer in the U.S. Air Force and a chaplain, who had been a prisoner of war of the Vietnamese Communists for 7 years, and who explained to us how it was that he was identified with Congressman Teague and with the memories he was evoking.

It was the most impressive testimony I have ever heard about a man's true dimensions and stature of greatness, of a great human being with a great heart and great capacity for feeling for his fellow Americans as that which was explained to us by this chaplain yesterday.

My own experience has been that when I first came up in 1961, in the middle of the 87th Congress, I met Chairman Teague for the first time under very auspicious circumstances in which he literally cussed me in the well of the House because I came up consecrated and dedicated and pledged to the task of supporting what turned out to be Congressman Denton of Indiana in his effort to obtain pensions for World War I veterans. When I had been in the State senate I had memorialized Congress through resolutions about the need for World War I veterans' pensions. I still am, for that matter. I did not know that that was a big hot issue up here in which the administration and the chairman of the committee were stoutly resisting that

particular version of Congressman Denton's bill, which he later said would cost \$11 billion.

They had a petition registered with the Clerk, a discharge petition, so I went over and signed that petition, and as much as I might have experienced 5 years in the State Senate—we did not have the equivalent—I discovered that my name was 1 short of the necessary 218. At that point, I heard this muffled voice in very expressive, concise, cogent Texas language—familiar now—express his sentiments.

I did not know him. I had not met Tiger Teague, but I soon found out. So, that started our friendship. Of course, the rest is history because Congressman Denton did get the sufficient number, and the President himself had to intervene and did some arm twisting, and about nine Members came in thereafter and removed their names from the discharge petition.

I want to tell you that in the course of the years, though, who was to say that later on it was Tiger who singlehandedly saved the veterans hospital for the San Antonio area years later when, singlehandedly, he saved that veterans hospital. In fact, it is named the Audie Murphy Hospital because, and only because, of Tiger Teague.

Also, I got to know so much more about this man who, to me, epitomizes what I call the old stock American, which I feel and have said repeatedly back home and everywhere that we owe everything to those that I identify or visualize as what I call the old stock Americans; the ones who made it possible for us who came on the scene later to inherit these wonderful opportunities, the privilege of being in the freest, the most democratic nation in the world, where the likes of myself could not be here as a Congressman anywhere else except in this country.

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, I identify with these sturdy yeoman Americans who have managed to sustain this great edifice, and I identify Tiger as that particular symbol of this old-stock American. This is what I look upon him as; this is what I recall. I join my colleagues in extolling his virtues and praying for and desiring for his widow, Mrs. Freddie Teague, the comfort and the surcease from sorrow that the Lord himself must give.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for this opportunity.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), for those words, and I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) for getting this special order and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something that you all know, and that is

that the appreciation of Tiger Teague has for many, many years reached far beyond the district he served and far beyond the State of the district in which he served to the whole United States.

I had heard of Tiger Teague for many years before I came to Congress. He was the undisputed leader of the whole United States during those crucial years following World War II when 11 million veterans depended upon people like Tiger Teague to make their point and do what was right. He was a man who really had the guts to do what was right and not to overreach but to be sure to get what he wanted.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else that some people do not appreciate probably because this was not well publicized. Tiger Teague was very, very active in revising the rules of the House and the rules of the Democratic Caucus. He was one of the members of that committee, and that is where I really came to appreciate him greatly. He was just an artist at compromise. Whenever he thought that, even though it was not 100 percent to his liking, it was fair and it was right and it was a good bargain, he was willing to make the compromise and stand up for it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join those who just paid tribute to this man and emphasize the noble character of Tiger Teague and the great contribution he has made to this country.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for taking this occasion to recognize our great friend, "Tiger" Teague.

As we attended the funeral services yesterday and as the chaplain kept referring to Olin E. Teague, I remembered that that is one of the few times I ever heard him spoken of as Olin E. Teague. He was the tiger and I tell you, he was a tiger all the way. He was a leader from your side of the aisle.

I know that at one time he was the chairman for the Democrats, but I want to say as a Republican and a Member from Texas who knew him, that there never was a finer man who ever served in the U.S. Congress than Tiger Teague. He had so many things going for him. We always think of him as the voice of the veterans, just as I heard my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), say that he was chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Later, of course, he served as chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, and there again he was interested in what we could do in outer space. He was always for defense.

But as I remember Tiger, I recall that he was a man who won three

Silver Stars. That means that three times he was where the action was. I was also interested to know that Tiger also won three Purple Hearts, which meant that he was where it was the roughest and the toughest. And whenever it was rough and tough, you could always count on Tiger. In fact, as we would see him, I noted that he would tend to limp a little bit, and we know that he still carried that shrapnel with him when he was serving here in Congress.

There is something else about Tiger, and that is that whenever you saw him and he would slap you on the back and knock you four laps forward, you knew that that was his way of being a friend. He had more actual bounce than any man I have ever seen.

And there is one other thing I remember about Tiger. He was a loyal friend and dedicated to his university and his friends at home. He had a feeling for people who love their friends, who love their hometown, and who love their university and their institutions, and if there was ever anyone who loved Texas A. & M. and who was a better Aggie, I do not know who it could be. He had a great interest in Texas A. & M., and the spirit of Aggie-land was in his heart all his life.

We have many fine people who serve in Congress, and there is no man here who was more honest or who was more fair and square, but above all, he was dedicated to his country.

We have lost Tiger, Mr. Speaker, but those of us in Texas will always remember him as one of the greatest men who ever served in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I believe I knew the Honorable Olin "Tiger" Teague about as long as anyone else in this House, at least since the end of World War II. Tiger Teague was an honest-to-goodness authentic World War II hero, and he was a real-life hero and unquestioned leader for his Sixth Congressional District for over 32 years. Few men served longer. None served with more dedication or integrity.

Many people associated Tiger Teague solely with the veterans of this country. It is true he was probably the most distinguished chairman the Veterans' Affairs Committee ever had. Tiger served longer as chairman for veterans and passed more legislation, because he was known as Mr. Veteran, and rightly so. I think the previous chairmen and the present chairman of the committee would agree that Tiger was the essence of veteran leadership. He looked like, he acted like, and performed like the true American fighting man. He was a great patriot.



But this recognition of Tiger's dedication on veterans matters sometimes belies the fact that he had many other outstanding qualities. For some 8 years, Tiger Teague served as chairman of the House Science and Aeronautics Committee. Along with former Chairman GEORGE MILLER, Tiger led the committee toward a major role in putting man on the Moon. He was the planner, coordinator, and power that kept the space program on schedule—the Saturn rocket, the launch pad, and the thrust all rolled into one. I used to think he could generate enough steam to send his own rocket to the Moon. Tiger took this responsibility not because of unusual technical or scientific knowledge, but he had the knack for working out knotty problems, making the tough decisions and getting people to stick with them.

Our space program just would not have accomplished what it has without Tiger Teague's unwavering command and coordination. I speak with authority about Tiger's role because I had the privilege of serving on the science panel for 4 years. I personally know the influence the chairman exercised when we reached a point where the membership was split into too many factions. The membership would turn to Tiger for a solution. He would look at them with his beady eyes and bellow in a strong voice:

I am not going to bring a bill to the floor until you work out your differences. There will be no legislation on the space program until you quit squabbling. The Congress and the whole country will wait on you.

With such an ultimatum, the Members knew they had better get off dead center and act. They knew the space program should not be held back just because of partisanship or personality clashes.

Tiger wielded a strong and quick gavel. He could make it sound like an M-1 rifle, and he could move about the committee like a Sherman tank. When the going got tough, nobody fooled with him or his legislation.

Our next rocket or satellite launching after the Shuttle *Columbia*, should be called the Tiger or the Tiger Teague. I shall make such a recommendation to NASA, and other officials.

Tiger also served as chairman of the Democratic Caucus for 2 hectic years. He settled problems with kindness yet firmness. Again, we saw the winning combination of toughness yet warmth—a pattern unique under the trademark of Tiger Teague.

Throughout this land, there are tens of thousands of Texas Aggies proud of Texas A. & M. University. In their hearts, they claim Tiger Teague as the original Aggie. Nobody gave more of his mind, body, or soul than Tiger. That institution can never fully repay Tiger or his family for the way he

helped A. & M. gain national recognition.

As a graduate of the University of Texas, I found myself competing against Tiger for grants or projects, just as the two football teams produce a lively competition on the field. Often, I came up on the short end. Tiger was not against UT. He just was for A. & M. first and foremost—and then maybe for UT and the other universities. Teague never forgot A. & M. The school befriended him as a young man, gave him a good education, and he went forward in life endowed by the spirit of that great school.

For 32 years, Tiger Teague served this body with honor and distinction. Beside his legacy, he left a wonderful family. His wife, Freddie, and their three attractive and capable children are all respected and loved.

Mr. Speaker, somewhere in the heavens a new star is shining. It will not be a bashful star. It will take on an extra luster because of Tiger Teague's ascendancy. Tiger Teague was one of the bright, shining lights of this body. His leadership, illuminating our hearts and our minds, will be long remembered.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to express my thanks to the distinguished majority leader for taking this time so that I might tell the family of Tiger Teague of the affection which I feel for him at this moment.

Yesterday I attended the funeral services for my friend, Olin E. "Tiger" Teague, and, as expected, there was a huge outpouring of friends who paid their last respects. It was indeed a moving and lasting experience.

As many others, I feel a deep sense of personal loss, but I would just like at this moment to presume to mention just one personal experience which endeared him to me and let me know early why Olin E. Teague was affectionately referred to by his friends as "Tiger."

□ 1710

During one of my earlier campaigns, my opponent was mistaken about a position I had taken on a veterans' bill, and it made the newspapers back home.

I saw "Tiger" Teague on the elevator and showed him the newspaper article. Tiger was chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee at the time, and he boomed out, "That is not right. Come with me, Chalmers."

So as we were going through the outer office of his office there in the Rayburn Building, he said, "Margaret, come in here." Margaret came in, and he dictated a letter to the editor correcting a mistake right on the spot.

He said, "Is there anything else I can do?"

I said, "Well, Mr. Chairman, it also made TV. I guess there is not much we can do about that."

He said, "The heck there is not. Have you got the TV station number?"

I gave him the television station number, and he called the manager and gave him the same account and corrected the mistake.

That is the kind of a friend Tiger Teague was. We had worked together on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I had supported him on some earlier legislation; and he did that for me.

Mr. Speaker, no one could ever begin to list all of Olin "Tiger" Teague's accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I witnessed his unswerving dedication to veterans. He felt an abiding responsibility to them and their survivors. This began, I am sure, while he was an infantry battalion commander during World War II. His personal courage became legendary among his men. He was wounded in action a number of times and became one of the most decorated of the war's combat veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I can say the entire structure of benefits for veterans, their dependents and survivors was cast by his hand. It was he to whom veterans and their organizations turned year after year to obtain increased benefits for GI bill education, housing, insurance, pension, compensation, and medical care. He was particularly interested in medical research insisting year after year during his chairmanship of the Veterans' Affairs Committee that VA physicians and nurses be provided a pay scale comparable to those in the private sector. "Health care second to none," was his goal for VA medical facilities and he focused his immense talents on the development and enactment of legislation required to bring it about.

I am very proud that the 96th Congress, renamed the Veterans' Administration hospital in Temple, Tex., the "Olin E. Teague Memorial Hospital" in time for this grand warrior to participate in the ceremony. He was a patient at that same hospital for 2 years recovering from wounds following World War II when it was known as the McCloskey Army Hospital.

Of all the many honors and decorations bestowed on him by our own and foreign governments, this simple act of commemoration seemed to mean the most to him.

Olin E. Teague was a titan among us, Mr. Speaker. He has left us with a permanent heritage of achievements but many of us have lost a dear friend.

I would just like to say that my wife, Marjorie, and I wish to extend our

sympathies to his wonderful wife, Freddie, and to his beautiful family.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentlemen from Texas.

Mr. HIGHTOWER. Mr. Speaker, occasionally when we want to compliment someone, we say that "When they made him, they threw the mold away." I think that we could honestly say that about "Tiger" Teague. There never was a man like Tiger Teague. I doubt if there will ever be another man like him. He was unique. He was distinctive. He was special in every fine and good way.

In an age of antiheroes, he was a genuine hero.

As has already been pointed out by several speakers, he was one of the most decorated soldiers of World War II, but he was a hero in real life. He is one that we could know and identify with, and he continued to be a hero as he came to the Congress to represent that district in Texas. He had tremendous legislative impact, and it was the impact of his personality.

We have often seen where people, because of their distinctiveness and the force of their personality, can achieve things that men of lesser spirits might aspire to do but would be unsuccessful.

That was the great strength of Tiger Teague and the reasons for his success.

Yesterday afternoon, as he was being interred at Arlington National Cemetery, we were experiencing what has been called in the press a celebration of freedom, as the hostages returned and were being received in the White House Rose Garden.

I think there is a significance about the timing of the going home of Tiger Teague; Tiger Teague, a free man, who had always been a free man, now relieved of his pain and discomfort, now he belongs to the ages, going home to Arlington, to his final rest, as the Nation celebrated the arrival home of the 52.

Tiger Teague was a very special Texan, as has already been pointed out. But he was a Texan, the epitome of the kind of Texans that all men of that State admire and would like to say that is typical Texas, a Texas Aggie, a true Texan. He never let anyone forget it. You always knew who he was and where he stood and that he could be counted on.

We have already missed him on the floor of this House after his retirement last year, but we will continue to miss his friendship; but we cannot fail to thank God for the privilege of having known the very unique and distinctive man, a very special man that was Olin "Tiger" Teague.

Thank you.

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LEATH).

Mr. LEATH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and memory of Olin E. "Tiger" Teague.

All his life Tiger Teague looked to the future with an unshakeable belief in his fellow human beings. It was not because he was naive that this great Texan looked to the future with so much optimism, nor because he was blind to the failings of others. Rather, Tiger Teague believed in mankind because he saw how far we have come—and the potential we have to go further still. This faith in people made him a natural leader who was both revered and respected by his colleagues and the literally thousands of people who knew and loved him.

Tiger was a man of boundless energy. He was a fighter. He fought for veterans and he was their hero. He fought for the dreams of those who believed in the unlimited capacity of America to conquer outer space. He fought for education for the young and decent health care for the aged. He gave of himself because he deeply believed in his country and the people.

Horace Greeley, the famed journalist, wrote:

Fame is a vapor, prosperity an accident, riches take wing, those who cheer today will curse tomorrow; the only thing that endures is character.

Mr. Speaker, Tiger Teague had character in abundance. Those who knew him drew on his character and were strengthened by it. This House is the better because of Tiger Teague. We are grateful that he touched our lives.

Mr. Speaker, among Tiger Teague's many accomplishments in life was his ability to lead and instill confidence in those around him. Part of this success came from straightforward action and unswerving dedication to principle. However, an even greater part of his life's work was achieved through his ability to make friends and to keep friends close to him. Tiger Teague had many friends. The loyalty he showed them came back to him and his family over the years many times over. It will continue even though he is gone.

Mr. Speaker, one of Tiger's friends, one of his many friends, was our former colleague from Texas and chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Ray Roberts. Until his retirement at the end of the 96th Congress, Ray had served 18 years on the Veterans' Committee and 6 years as chairman. He shared with Tiger Teague a deep concern for the veterans of this country as his colleague, and an abiding love of Texas and America as his long time friend.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to place in the RECORD Ray Roberts' remarks in tribute to his friend, Tiger Teague.

The death of Tiger Teague leaves a void in the country that can never be filled. Along with Sam Rayburn, Tiger exemplified the

best qualities of American citizenship. Words like duty, honor, country were not just words to Tiger Teague. He lived them every day of his life.

From humble beginnings, he used his great talents for the public good. He spoke as a common man for the common man; as a citizen for the citizens of this country. In war and in peace he was a star performer. His rock-ribbed integrity combined with his consistent faith in America's potential made him among the most influential and effective members of the House of Representatives.

As my friend of more than 35 years, I can never adequately express my gratitude for his many kindnesses to me, for his counsel, his wisdom and his example. My work on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee was one of the joys of my life, but I never forgot that it was Tiger Teague who gave the leadership and the creativity that established our veterans' programs.

We are all better for having known Tiger Teague. He leaves us a legacy of honor, a legacy of hope, and an inspiration that if we work and have faith in ourselves America's best years are before us.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HANCE).

Mr. HANCE. Mr. Speaker, "Tiger" Teague was indeed a great Congressman. We can talk about what he did for the veterans. He did do an outstanding job. We can talk about being the father of the Science and Technology Committee, and that is certainly true.

I had a unique opportunity to know him in a different light. His daughter Jill was a friend of mine while we were students at the University of Texas. It was quite evident from the type of person she was, and is, that she had outstanding parents.

Yesterday at the funeral, if you noticed, Jill's 11-year-old son wept when he was reading and throughout the funeral. He loved and worshipped his grandfather, and the feeling was mutual.

You could get Tiger talking about that youngster, and he would spend some time talking with you about him. But I think Tiger Teague—one thing I would like to add—not only was he a great Congressman, a great American, and a great Aggie, but he was a great family man. He loved his family and worshipped them, and the feeling was mutual.

I am glad I had an opportunity to know him and call him my friend.

Mr. WRIGHT. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman in the well for giving me the honor to join my colleagues in tribute to Olin Teague.

President Kennedy, one of the Nation's heroes, said on one occasion that war does not strike and fall with equal severity upon all who participate. Some escape unscratched from its battles. Others give much of themselves. Some sacrifice their lives.



Olin Teague was one of those men who gave much of himself physically in the service of his country in World War II.

□ 1720

I think it was some six or seven different wounds that he received in combat. He received many decorations and honors. I can imagine what kind of an intrepid leader "Tiger" Teague was on the field of battle, how he must have been revered and followed with fidelity by the men whom he so bravely led.

Our distinguished majority leader has already reviewed much of the illustrious legislative record of Tiger Teague. It is known to all of us who are here and remember it with vivid admiration.

I like to think of Tiger Teague for what he was himself, the kind of man that he was—a man of indomitable will, a man of unparalleled courage, a man of fidelity to his country, a man who loved the things that were of the spirit, a man who was a family man, a friendly man, a man who cherished the friendship of his colleagues on this floor and in many parts of our country and the world.

For some reason or another, he always called me CLAUDE PEPPER. He never did say CLAUDE or PEPPER. He always said CLAUDE PEPPER and I felt a profound admiration and a great affection for him.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the patriotism, the courage, and the character of Tiger Teague was such that he adds even luster to that heroic company among which he sleeps in honored glory in our National Cemetery at Arlington.

May God give America many more intrepid men like Tiger Teague.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there is little that could be said that would honor "Tiger" more than the words that have already been spoken. I know I would just like as a personal note to say that I think I probably had more affection for Tiger Teague than any other Member of this body, excluding the majority leader, of course; but the thing about Tiger that stuck with me more than anything else is the 38 years that he handled great pain every hour of every day. I used to think about Tiger, that I never saw him without pain and I never saw him without a smile. I think that is what he left us with.

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

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on this sad occa-

sion to pay tribute to the memory of Olin E. "Tiger" Teague.

Tiger Teague was a Member of this body for 32 years where he served his district, the State of Texas, and the veteran with great distinction and dedication. It was in 1946, while a patient in a U.S. Army hospital in Texas, that he was first elected to Congress. Tiger was a bona fide war hero. He was the Member of Congress with the highest number of decorations and awards for valor and heroism which included several Silver Stars for gallantry in action against the enemy, Bronze Stars for valor and Purple Hearts for wounds received in combat against the enemy. He was commander of foot soldiers on the battlefields of Europe during World War II.

Tiger Teague had been in an Army hospital for 2 years for disabilities which resulted in his being awarded his third Purple Heart. Ironically, it was this third combat-incurred wound which ultimately caused him to retire from the Congress in 1978.

I mention this disability for the purpose of emphasizing that Tiger Teague always identified with combat and disabled veterans all of his years in Congress. Undoubtedly, the 2 years he spent in an Army hospital helped him to gain an insight into the desires, concerns, and needs of veterans that was to help him to earn the title of "Mr. Veteran" on Capitol Hill for over a quarter of a century.

Tiger Teague authorized more bills for veterans' rights, benefits, and assistance than any Member in the history of Congress.

A few highlights are legislation which established the Department of Medicine and Surgery—a 172-hospital system and other facilities which is one of our veterans' greatest health assets; the Korean and Vietnam conflict GI bills, which have not only helped millions of veterans to go to college, but have helped the general welfare by training hundreds of thousands of physicians, dentists, engineers, technicians, teachers, and others who have made this Nation the leader of the free world. The War Orphans' Education Assistance Act for the survivors of those who made the supreme sacrifice in defense of the Nation, and a loan guarantee program, which has helped millions of veterans to purchase a home, and is vital to the housing and mortgage banking industry.

Mr. Speaker, Tiger Teague was a leader. He was a statesman. His interests and concerns went far beyond veterans. He was for a strong national defense. He was for a strong fiscal policy. He abhorred waste and inefficiency. He was opposed to a bloated bureaucracy. He loved America.

While he kept his intense interest in the welfare of veterans to the day he died, he was also deeply involved in

the space age. Soon after America was taken by surprise when Russia launched its first sputnik in 1957, Congress established the Science and Technology Committee. Tiger Teague was elected a member of this new committee. Later he was to become its chairman. Under his leadership, the United States not only surpassed the Russians, but was successful in landing a man on the Moon. Just this year we electrified the world with our incredible Voyager journeys which have advanced the science of astronomy beyond our wildest dreams of only a few years ago.

Tiger Teague was also honored by his colleagues when he was elected to chair the Democratic Caucus during the 92d and 93d Congresses.

He was a man of great personal ability who was admired by veterans everywhere. He loved this country and all it stands for. He loved the Congress. Our Nation has lost a great man who labored hard and long for the causes to which he was devoted.

I join with all Members to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Teague and their children.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CHAPPELL).

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of joining my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, Tiger Teague.

I suppose once in an eon of time there moves across the stage of life the kind of man such as Tiger Teague, a man who was determined to be right and who had always the energy to see it through. He was the kind of a man that believed in doing the right and making certain that others around him had an opportunity to do the same.

When I first came to the House, Tiger was one of the first Members that I had the opportunity to know. He always was willing to help, always interested in the problems which I had and always good guidance and counsel.

I am pleased that we have taken this time today to honor a man such as Tiger Teague.

I just wish somehow that the communications of our country were such that into the hearts of every American there could be poured the kind of information that we have before us today on this wonderful man. Somehow I wish there was a way to inspire the hearts of other Americans, as we have been inspired by the life of Tiger Teague. He was a great soldier, a great statesman, a great American. We shall all miss him. We shall miss his life. We shall miss his personality, but we shall remember forever that wonderful spirit that has contributed so much to our great and wonderful country and we will always remember Tiger Teague.

● **Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.** Mr. Speaker, we who are Members of this body have been honored to serve with individuals of strength and courage. Some have been known for the distinction of their intellect, others for the broad range of their interests; still other Members of the House were renowned for their character and integrity.

To me, there was one Member who combined all these noble qualities and that was Tiger Teague. The passing of Olin E. Teague in the early morning hours of January 23 was a personal loss to me. He was chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee when I was first elected to Congress in 1966. After being assigned to the committee he gave me one of those big bear hugs of his and announced that I was his Congressman.

He had once been a resident of the small town of Mena in my district—some of his people still lived there—and he said with a smile, he was honored that I was here to represent him. Our friendship began on that note, and it flourished over the years.

Tiger left the Veterans' Affairs Committee to serve as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Technology, or as it was then known, the Committee on Science and Astronautics. The future of America's space program was in some doubt when Tiger took the gavel. During the early days of the Apollo program, there had been numerous failures—all well publicized—and the early enthusiasm of the Nation was waning. But Tiger Teague believed in the program and accepted it as his responsibility to make Congress see its importance to the Nation's future. Had he not put his great prestige and powers of persuasion to work when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, billions of dollars in appropriations would have been shunted away from this vital program and our national defense would be in deadly peril.

But Tiger never let his attention drift far away from veterans and their families. Although chairman of the Science Committee, he retained the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He had developed the GI bill for veterans of the Korean war. In the 82d Congress he investigated abuses that had crept into the administration of the World War II GI bill. Thus, he was better qualified than any other individual in this body to write a GI bill for Vietnam veterans. The high quality of that legislation can be seen in the fact that it provided a free college education to 7.8 million Vietnam-era veterans.

Consider, Mr. Speaker, the enormous impact this great man had on the lives of veterans. Behind his lead-

ership, the House approved extensive compensation programs for them, their dependents and survivors. He was the congressional overseer for the construction of most of the VA's network of 172 hospitals and 222 outpatient clinics. I have heard it said by VA officials that the Tiger might not have actually set the bolts that went into building that great health system, but he saw to it money was available to buy the bolts and he knew where every one was.

As he was a veterans' veteran, so he had been a soldier's soldier during World War II. He commanded an infantry battalion and was in combat for 6 months before severe wounds drove him to a bed at the McCloskey Army Hospital. It was a proud moment for Tiger when the 96th Congress redesignated that same hospital the "Olin E. Teague Memorial Hospital."

Tiger Teague represented the Sixth District of Texas while he sat with us in this Chamber but to many of us he also represented the best qualities in the American character. He was strong and unrelenting in the pursuit of his goals, yet he was compassionate and kind in their formulation.

He was the most decorated combat veteran to sit in Congress—that is true—but history will write of him as one of its most distinguished ornaments as well.

● **Mr. DE LA GARZA.** Mr. Speaker, last week we lost a great Texan, and a great American, Olin E. "Tiger" Teague. Tiger Teague led a long and distinguished career in the service to his country, a highly distinguished combat veteran of World War II, and as a Member of Congress from 1946 to 1973. In Congress, Tiger Teague distinguished himself for his service to his constituents in the Sixth District of Texas and for his work on behalf of all veterans of our country's Armed Forces.

As a member of the Veterans' Committee, and as chairman from 1963 to 1973, Tiger Teague oversaw and was responsible for many of the veterans benefits which we take for granted today, the GI bill of rights which provided an education to untold numbers of veterans, the War Orphans Act, which provided college educations for the children of those who died in service to their country, and for a medical system to take care of their health needs. I know of no other country which provides as much for its veterans, and we owe much of it to this one man.

As much as he was concerned by the needs of our veterans, Tiger Teague also had other interests. In 1973, he took over the chairmanship of the Science and Astronautics Committee, a strong believer in our Nation's space program. While many scoffed at the idea of spending money to send people into space, thanks to the foresight of

men like Tiger Teague, all of us now benefit in an untold number of ways from the by products of the research conducted for space exploration.

It was a great privilege to have known and been able to work with Tiger Teague, a great soldier and a great statesman. Our society is richer and our country stronger thanks to Olin Teague's great dedication to public service.

● **Mr. MCCLORY.** Mr. Speaker, the passing of our former colleague, Congressman Olin "Tiger" Teague marks the close of a long, productive and yet a hard and courageous life. Tiger Teague's leadership in veterans affairs and in behalf of programs related to the whole areas of science and technology establishes an enduring record which few in this body can match.

Mr. Speaker, my close relationship with Congressman Teague in connection with the interests of our veterans demonstrated to me his thorough knowledge of the veterans' rights and interests and enabled me to render maximum service in behalf of the many veterans who are served by the North Chicago Veterans' Administration facility in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, likewise on the subject of science and technology, and more particularly, in my constant sponsorship of an orderly and essentially volunteer conversion to the metric system of weights and measures, Congressman Teague was most cooperative.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my wife, Doris, had a close relationship with Mrs. Teague and we have expressed between ourselves our profound respect for Congressman Teague and Mrs. Teague and their family. We take this occasion to pay tribute to Tiger Teague's useful and distinguished life and to extend to his widow, Freddie, and other members of the family our deep sympathy.

● **Mr. EDWARDS** of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues and Americans everywhere in expressing sorrow at the loss of our former colleague and friend, Tiger Teague.

When I think about the old-fashioned marks of character—like honor, duty, integrity—I want to add—"you know, like Tiger Teague."

When I think of the plain marks of good behavior—like courtesy, fairness, gentleman—I want to add—"you know, like Tiger Teague."

When I think of the distinguishing marks of one devoted to public service—like courage, vision, caring—I want to add—"you know, like Tiger Teague."

Tiger Teague was not afraid to be in the minority, nor did he allow the shifting winds of day to day politics to cloud his perception of what was right. I shall remember him as a man of con-



science, a man who loved his country, and a man who cared about people.

Tiger Teague made this House a better place in which to work. Our country is richer for his life. We will miss him. ●

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has lost a true American with the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Olin E. "Tiger" Teague, and America's veterans have lost a stalwart champion as well.

When I arrived in the House of Representatives, I chose to become a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, chaired for 18 years by Mr. Teague. During my service on the committee, I found him at all times to be helpful, friendly, and understanding. Even though he retired at the end of the 95th Congress, his influence will long be felt by all of America's veterans, the committee, and the Veterans' Administration.

His personal achievements are numerous, his legislative achievements are legion, but perhaps both are best summarized in the citation he received accompanying the Veterans' Administration's Exceptional Service Award. The citation stated in part:

No person in the history of America has had such a salutary effect on the lives of veterans and their families.

No member of Congress has ever exerted as much leadership or has been so successful in producing fair, enlightened and helpful legislation for America's veterans.

Mrs. Hillis and I extend our deepest sympathy to his devoted wife Freddie, his three children James, John, and Jill, and his grandchildren. Though death has removed Tiger from our midst, his spirit and his influence will abide with us for many years. Indeed, his life leaves us with an example and an inspiration for higher and nobler deeds. ●

● Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, for 28 years it was my privilege to serve in this House alongside Olin E. Teague. I do not use the word privilege loosely here, for the opportunity to be associated for so many years with an authentic American hero cannot be described by any other term.

Listen to this recitation of the decorations placed upon him for his service to his country during World War II:

Silver Star with two clusters. Bronze Star with two clusters. Purple Heart with two clusters. Combat Infantryman's Badge. Army Commendation Ribbon. Two high French decorations. And a Presidential Unit Citation.

Many times wounded in action, this gallant soldier spent 2 years in Army hospitals before he was deemed fit for release in 1946. And his long service as a Member of this House was punctuated many times by his having to return to a hospital for treatment of illnesses directly stemming from his war service.

But "Tiger" Teague was not a man to complain. He was neither a man to

boast. He regarded himself simply as an American who was called to defend the things his country stood for, and it never entered his mind that there was any other course.

Duty, honor, country. These were three essential elements of his character. Not only did he accept them, he took pride in them, and he lived by them.

His fellow American veterans may never know of all of his work in their behalf during his years as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Chairman of that group for 18 years, he presided over many, many pieces of legislation for the benefit of those who, in the words of Lincoln, "have borne the battle."

And Tiger Teague's fellow Americans who have gloried in our accomplishments in space exploration also owe him a tremendous debt of gratitude. When last year our Voyager II sent home those splendid photographs of the planet Saturn, and even today plows on through space for an even more distant appointment, they should remember the work of Tiger Teague as chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Tiger Teague was an honest, hard-working, useful Member of the House for more than three decades. And those of us who were honored by his friendship will never forget his example.

It was a great loss to the Congress when he retired a little over 2 years ago. And it is a sad loss to his friends that he has now been claimed by death that he fought so long and evaded so skillfully.

The name of Olin Teague is written in the stars. ●

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House will go to Arlington National Cemetery this afternoon to pay our last respects to an old friend, Olin "Tiger" Teague. When Tiger Teague died last Friday morning, America lost one of its great heroes—a man who fought on the battlefields of Europe during World War II and who came home to become an outstanding lawmaker for 32 years. Although he gave a great deal to his country, he asked for very little in return—simply the opportunity to serve his fellow Americans.

Tiger Teague was the most decorated soldier to serve in Congress, having been awarded the Silver Star with two clusters, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart with two clusters, Combat Infantryman's Badge, Army Commendation Ribbon, and the Croix de Guerre with Palm. He landed with the Allied forces at Normandy Beach on June 6, 1944, and the wounds he suffered in battle plagued him for the rest of his life. Tiger Teague understood the tremendous sacrifices made by the men and women of America's Armed Forces, and as chairman of the House

Veterans' Affairs Committee he was responsible for building a system that has helped America's veterans overcome the hardships of war when they return home.

This great legislator also will be long remembered as the father of America's space program. As the chairman of the House Committee on Science and Technology, Tiger Teague helped launch many of the programs which brought our Nation to a position of world leadership in space exploration.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the many Members of this House who knew Tiger have their own memories of this great public servant. I am no exception. My first few months in Congress were spent as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, where I met Tiger Teague and became his friend. I soon moved on to become a member of the House Judiciary Committee, but our friendship endured. I always admired Tiger Teague because of the decency he showed to his fellow man, his courage to stand up for what he believed, and his selfless dedication to our country. This spirited Texan also was a tough competitor, who refused to quit. Whether he was trying to defeat me in a game of paddle ball, or was fighting a more difficult and serious battle against diabetes and the effects of his war wounds, Tiger Teague's courage and dignity were exemplary.

I will miss my friend very much, and I offer my deepest sympathies to his wife Freddie, his sons, John and James, and his daughter, Jill Ruth. ●

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the late Olin E. Teague.

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

There was no objection.

#### FORCED SCHOOL BUSING

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

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a problem we are having in my district of Charleston, S.C. The U.S. Department of Justice has filed suit against the Charleston County Consolidated School District to implement forced school busing.

I am opposed to this action. The people of South Carolina know that forced school busing has hindered quality education for our children. Since forced busing was imposed on public schools, scholastic aptitude test

(SAT) scores of graduating high school seniors have declined 82 points from 1964 to 1978.

In 1979, 25 percent of all high school students dropped out before they graduated; the dropout ratio in 1968 was 20 percent.

The Federal Government has ignored the initial Supreme Court decision regarding forced school busing. The 1954 Brown decision entitled every child to be educated in the school nearest their home. In this case, a little black girl in Wichita, Kans., wanted to go to her neighborhood school which was seven blocks from her home. Because of her race, she was forced to go on a bus 27 blocks to another school. The Court said that every child in America is entitled to and must go to their neighborhood school. The Court also said that no child shall be assigned to a school because of race.

We now have a complete reversal of this original decision. Children are being forced to leave their neighborhood schools and are being assigned to schools based on race and are allocated by racial quotas.

Public opinion polls show that 85 percent of the American people are opposed to court-ordered school busing. Even Dr. James Coleman, known as the father of busing has stated that—

School desegregation in the form of mandatory busing for racial balance has been destructive to its own goals.

One of the primary purposes of busing is to desegregate minority-dominated public schools. A comparison of 1968 and 1977 figures on minority enrollment show that with court-ordered busing, students are increasingly attending segregated schools. The following table shows the increase in the percentage of minority students in public schools enrollment in cities that practice forced school busing:

	1968	1977
Atlanta .....	61.8	88.8
Boston .....	31.5	56.1
Chicago .....	62.3	75.3
Cleveland .....	57.5	61.5
Dallas .....	38.8	61.9
Detroit .....	60.7	81.4
Houston .....	46.7	66.0
Los Angeles .....	46.3	63.5
Memphis .....	53.7	70.6
New Orleans .....	68.7	83.5
St. Louis .....	63.5	72.2
San Antonio .....	73.1	85.2
San Francisco .....	58.8	72.4
Washington, D.C. ....	94.4	96.5

Forced school busing deprives children of participating in extracurricular school activities. They must get up early to catch a bus to ride clear across town to school. This greatly affects their academic performance as they are tired before they even get to school. Then these children must get on a bus immediately after school which prevents them from becoming involved in any other school programs.

Parent participation is vitally important in a child's education. Parents who are eager to become involved in the PTA are often unable to drive miles away from home to attend school meetings.

Busing is not only ineffective in terms of segregation, it is also very costly. At a time when we must closely scrutinize our energy consumption, busing is a wasteful measure. In 1977, the Federal Highway Administration estimated that 401 million gallons of gas, averaging 26,200 barrels of oil per day were used for court-ordered busing of schoolchildren.

It is time for Congress to end this unnecessary and wasteful practice. Children need and should have the right to go to their neighborhood schools.

□ 1730

### TAKE AWAY THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to eliminate the so-called marriage tax which penalizes the over 19 million married working couples in the United States today.

There is no justice in a marriage tax. The Congress, in 1969, set up the present unfair system when attempting to create a tax break for single wage earners. Unfortunately, for over 12 years the Congress has ignored the side effect of this action which causes millions to pay more when married than if they remained single. Under current law, when two incomes are joined together the husband and wife are lifted into a higher tax bracket.

Under my bill married couples would be allowed the choice of filing either a joint return or separate returns. With tax time coming, I am sure more people will become aware of this unjust tax penalty. Repeatedly, I have heard from my constituents during town hall meetings and mobile office visits of the unfairness of tax on marriage and the sabotage which the Federal Government has committed against the traditional family unit.

Fifty-seven percent of today's families have both the husband and wife working. In many situations two incomes in a family are an economic necessity and no longer a luxury.

One of the major initiatives of the new administration will be a revised tax program to help get our economy healthy again. I hope that we take this opportunity to eliminate the marriage tax.●

### AGRICULTURE: A TIME TO CHOOSE

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

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, two important studies relating to the future of American agriculture were concluded in January 1981. I urge all of my colleagues to closely review the study findings as we consider the 1981 farm bill, soil and water conservation laws, and other related legislative options for strengthening our food and fiber industry.

I refer to the final report of the national agricultural lands study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Council on Environmental Quality, as well as USDA's summary report on the structure of agriculture, entitled "A Time To Choose."

In announcing the structure study, Bob Bergland had some comments that, for me, blend the concerns about agricultural land with all of the other factors that make up the business of farming and ranching. He said:

There have been a number of fundamental changes in the environment in which farmers produce our food, feed, and fiber.

One of these basic changes is that agriculture is no longer—if it ever was—an isolated part of the economy whose problems could be addressed separately without consideration of the influences of other forces on farming and the effects of the farm economy on the rest of society. The connections among the various parts of the U.S. economy and the various parts of the world have become so much broader and so much more direct that it no longer makes sense to think about our agriculture that way.

The final goal, Mr. Bergland said, is "consistency between agricultural policy and other national policies." I agree.

It is this need for a broader look at agricultural issues that leads me to augment my role in addressing the concerns of America's dairy farmers by accepting the role of ranking minority member on the House Agriculture Committee's Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development Subcommittee. The subcommittee will constitute an important forum for legislation seeking to improve future opportunities for all farmers and ranchers while assuring reasonable food costs for consumers and limiting the need for future Federal expenditures.

I know that many of my colleagues understand the need for a broader perspective on agricultural issues. Some of you last winter expressed the advisability of delaying consideration of a farmland preservation bill until we had more information on impacts and options. Now that the two studies I mentioned are available, I believe it is time to carefully review the results and recommendations and act accordingly.



### The NALS report concluded:

Continuing nonagricultural demands upon the agricultural land base (have) become a matter for national concern \* \* \*. The cumulative loss of cropland, in conjunction with other stresses on the U.S. agricultural system such as the growing demand for exports and rising energy costs, could seriously increase the economic and environmental costs of producing food and fiber in the United States during the next 20 years.

### The NALS report went on to say:

The conversion of highly productive land will continue unless there is a major shift of development onto rural land that is less productive for agriculture.

NALS identified about 90 Federal programs that contribute to the conversion of agricultural lands to other purposes. Some of these programs have major impacts.

On the other hand, NALS found that considerable grassroots interest in the protection of good agricultural land exists in widely different communities around the country. State and local governments have tried a remarkable number of different approaches to agricultural land protection. No one approach by itself seems entirely adequate, but the interest and the efforts are encouraging.

I agree with NALS that we need to further encourage and assist these local initiatives. It also is imperative that the Federal Government get its own house in order so that the unnecessary shift of good productive land out of agriculture can be avoided.

The programs that can help, and the programs that are part of the problem, are located in many departments—not just Agriculture. The issues are complex and go far beyond considerations of land supply.

As the structure of agriculture study put it:

We found that even the programs that were designed to protect the farm sector accelerated and continue to reinforce trends that push families out of farming, keep new farmers out, and concentrate control of the resources that produce our food into the hands of fewer persons.

I believe that you and I have the responsibility to see that these trends are reversed. We must see that all sectors of American society are fair to each other and the need for expensive Federal programs to repair land use and production mistakes is kept to the absolute minimum.

I hope that you will join me in using the structure study and the agricultural lands study findings to the fullest advantage in designing workable approaches in related legislation during the 97th Congress.●

PATRICK J. CULLERTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to Hon. Patrick J. Cullerton, the late Chicago alderman and "assistant mayor" who gave outstanding service to the people of Chicago for half a century.

P. J. Cullerton's death on January 26 is a tremendous loss to the people of the northwest side of Chicago in the 11th Congressional District I am honored to represent, for he had dedicated his entire life to effective government of and for the people.

Parky, as he was affectionately called by his friends and constituents, was a quiet man who carefully listened to the people he represented in the city council from his 38th ward, and he was overwhelmingly reelected time and time again because he made sure that Chicago's government was effective in meeting their wants and needs. He prided himself on getting the proposals he initiated passed by the city council, and he will be sorely missed by many thousands of people, but especially by me because he was my friend for over 40 years, and during that time I greatly benefited from his advice and counsel.

Alderman Cullerton, after training and working for a time as an electrical engineer, began his political career with an appointment by Mayor Anton J. Cermak as signal engineer for the Chicago Police Department. Subsequently, he became a member of the board of local improvements, and was elected alderman of the 38th ward in 1933 and remained in that position until 1958. During his years of service in the city council, he chaired the council's finance committee, a position many referred to as assistant mayor, and he also was the chairman of the council's emergency committee, assigned to root out fraud and abuse in Chicago government operations.

In 1958, P. J. Cullerton was appointed Cook County Assessor and was reelected repeatedly, retiring from the post in 1974. To his great satisfaction, he was elected the president of the Irish Fellowship Club of Chicago in 1959.

At the time of his death, Parky Cullerton was celebrating his 50th year in Chicago politics, and was still actively serving as the 38th ward's Democratic committeeman. His passing is a great loss to his thousands of friends, and he will be remembered as one of the great leaders of Chicago.

My wife, Angeline, joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Patrick J. Cullerton's daughter, Helen Liddy, and her family.●

### LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE POWERPLANT AND INDUSTRIAL FUEL USE ACT TO ALLOW LOCAL DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES TO CONTINUE NATURAL GAS SERVICE TO RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS FOR OUTDOOR LIGHTING FIXTURES FOR WHICH NATURAL GAS WAS PROVIDED ON THE DATE OF ENACTMENT

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

● Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. CORCORAN and I are introducing legislation to amend section 402 of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act in order to permit the owners of residential outdoor gaslights to retain service to the lights.

This bill is identical to the legislation which was cosponsored by 134 Members during the 96th Congress and passed the House by unanimous consent on December 13, 1980. It amends section 402 by removing the requirement that existing residential gaslights be extinguished by January 1, 1982.

Section 402 was included in the Fuel Use Act at a time of apparent shortage of natural gas. That situation has now changed, and I believe that Congress must act now to recognize that change and remove this costly prohibition. As the law now stands, 2 to 4 million owners of residential gaslights are confronted with a choice between doing without necessary outdoor illumination and paying \$200 to \$300 each for conversion of their lights. Most gaslight owners installed these lights for safety and security reasons, and they should not be forced to make this choice.

Whether or not they personally own gaslights, taxpayers are paying for this prohibition. They have paid for development and promulgation of regulations by the Federal Government, and they will pay for the States, and in some case the municipalities, to enforce the regulations and respond to the thousands of requests for exemptions. At best, a saving of one-fifth of 1 percent of natural gas usage will be realized through enforcement of section 402. As a Department of Energy witness stated at hearings before the Energy and Power Subcommittee, the gaslight provision "promises slight energy savings at potentially enormous bureaucratic and litigative costs."

This legislation will continue to encourage natural gas conservation through a provision which requires gas distribution companies to periodically inform customers of the costs of burning outdoor gaslights. The provision replaces the elaborate enforce-

ment apparatus required by the Fuel Use Act with information which will allow the consumer to make an informed decision, rather than forcing him to choose between safety and compliance with the law.

I believe that the available data, combined with good judgment, clearly argue in favor of amending section 402. I urge my colleagues to join us in pressing for rapid passage of this legislation early in the 97th Congress. ●

#### GAO AUDIT OF LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTS

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

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, during the 96th Congress, there were numerous allegations about misconduct or abuse of funds by our colleagues in Congress. These charges, substantiated or not, have cast a shadow over the credibility of Congress in general. One very direct way I know of restoring public confidence in the honesty and integrity of elected officials is to let the Sun shine on official office accounts as provided for in legislation that I plan to reintroduce.

The Legislative Accounts Audit and Control Act, which I will introduce, requires an annual audit by the General Accounting Office of House Members' and committees' accounts. At the present time, every appropriation made by the Congress for any function of the Federal Government is subject to an annual audit by the GAO, except for the Congress of the United States. Our predecessors in the Congress established the GAO and required annual audits to insure that taxpayers' dollars were being properly spent.

In my view, the congressional exemption should never have been granted in the first place. While we cannot speak for the other body, we in the House have an obligation to the taxpayer to let him know how we expend public funds to run our individual offices and our committees. Certainly, it is not too much to ask that those who set policy and appropriate funds for other governmental functions be subject to scrutiny on how they will spend over \$1.3 billion in tax dollars in 1981 to carry out the legislative function.

Therefore, my bill would require the GAO to perform an audit of any expenditures or financial transactions of each Member, officer, or standing committee of the House of Representatives involving disbursements from the contingent fund of the House during calendar years 1977, 1978, 1979, and 1980, such audit to be completed within 9 months. Beyond that, my bill would require, beginning with calendar year 1979 and each calendar year thereafter, an annual GAO

audit to be completed no later than 3 months following the close of the calendar year. Upon completion of any audit, the Comptroller General would transmit a report to the Speaker of the House with respect to the results of such audit and any such report would be available to the public for inspection and copies furnished upon request for a reasonable charge.

More than ever, Government, and certainly Congress, is being held up to public scrutiny. We resolved in the 95th Congress to open up our personal finances to public view. I can think of no reason for not letting the taxpayers see how their public moneys are being used. ●

#### STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY NATIONAL GUARD/RESERVE BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BEDELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, despite their essential role in meeting combat readiness goals, our National Guard and Reserve units continue to suffer from inadequate funding.

This problem is critical because of the reliance that our active Armed Forces place on the Reserve units. In the Army alone, Reserves provide 90 percent of combat reinforcements, 65 percent of deploying units, 60 percent of support forces, and 53 percent of combat troops. Moreover, our defense strategists rely in their war plans on sending into battle all 8 of the National Guard's combat divisions, along with 20 of the Guard's infantry brigades. In the event of a Soviet invasion of Western Europe, the Army National Guard is expected on the front lines within 30 days, with its total 351,000 troop level in battle within 90 days. The Air National Guard, with 94,000 members and 1,500 planes, would have a similar mission.

Nevertheless, only \$1.6 billion, or little more than 5 percent of the total defense budget goes to maintaining the National Guard and Reserve. As a result, our Reserve units suffer from chronic shortages of manpower and modern equipment.

The crucial problem undermining the Reserve contribution to readiness is a consistent inability to meet maximum authorized manpower levels. After 1973, when elimination of the draft erased the key incentive to Reserve enlistment, recruitment declined rapidly. At the same time, however, the All-Volunteer Force was founded on a "total force concept," which declared an integration of the Active and Reserve components into one unified fighting force.

Now, despite modest gains since 1979, manpower strength remains critically low. Specifically, the total

Reserve force lags at only 85 percent of its authorized level. Of the six major components, Army National Guard, Army Reserve, Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve, Navy Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve, only the Air National Guard is at full strength. On the other hand, the Army National Guard, with 3,368 units scattered in 2,600 cities, is nearly 68,000 short, while the smaller Army Reserve is over 73,500 short. The Army Reserve, in effect, is at 72 percent strength; the Army National Guard at 82 percent strength.

Fortunately, the Army has taken several steps in recent years to attract more Reserve volunteers. Reserve-recruiting chores are now being handled by regular Army recruiters, who can offer the option of either Active or Reserve service. Cash bonuses are being given to volunteers for joining and reenlisting in high priority Reserve units slated for early deployment. Most recently, the Pentagon began offering a \$600 bonus to veterans who reenlist for 3 years after finishing their regular military service obligations.

Nonetheless, I believe it is time that we, as Members of Congress, face up to the problems that remain. Studies have shown that those who join the Guard or Reserves do so because of additional income, social ties, variety from civilian life, opportunities to learn new skills, promotion possibilities, and retirement benefits. In addition, at meetings in my district with National Guard and Reserve representatives, a number of changes and proposals were discussed that would help correct the very real problems regarding manpower strength. Of particular importance were proposals to provide retention incentives and to spur recruiting.

As a result, I am today introducing a package of three bills aimed at improving the Reserve component strength levels. First is a bill to reduce from 60 to 55 the age at which a member of the Armed Forces may retire for nonregular service, providing means by which there is no additional cost to the Government. I believe that this will help provide these individuals and their families with a quality of life commensurate with the sacrifices we demand of them.

The second bill provides a refundable tax credit to employers for supplementary payments to employees who participate in Armed Forces training missions. This will help insure that Guard and Reserve members are not financially penalized for attendance at summer camp. This proposed change should unquestionably improve recruiting and retention. There are more than 100,000 Federal employees out of an 817,000 total Guard and Reserve force. Many of these employees are



willing to serve because of the fully paid leave policy that the Federal Government provides for participation in military training.

The third bill would amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase by \$500 the eligibility of Guard and Reserve members for basic educational opportunity grants. Current law provides for forgiveness of some portion of a student loan for persons service on active duty in combat. The House of Representatives recently changed the Higher Education Act to forgive a portion of student loan for active or reserve enlisted service. This bill would provide an additional educational assistance recruiting incentive.

Mr. Speaker, any realistic solution to the problems of the currently structured All-Volunteer Force must alleviate the manpower shortage. The bills that I am introducing today are an important step in the right direction of insuring that our National Guard and Reserve components have the manpower to meet our national defense goals. They are also an important step in doing our utmost to make the All-Volunteer Force concept succeed. We must continue to evaluate our military personnel policies and search for solutions that will provide the programs needed to halt manpower losses and to overcome existing shortfalls. I urge my colleagues in the House to join with me in seeing that the personnel needs of our military are met. The choice confronting us is simple: either we provide the resources necessary to recruit and retain skilled people or we settle for a military less ready and ill-prepared to respond to our future security and defense needs. ●

#### VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1981

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

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which proposes to establish a veterans' education and training assistance program for certain individuals serving in the Armed Forces.

Since the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Assistance Act of 1944—the World War II GI bill—all who have served satisfactorily in the Armed Forces since the beginning of World War II have been provided entitlement to educational assistance following their discharge or release from active duty.

By way of background, the Congress has authorized three separate GI bills. The World War II GI bill terminated on July 25, 1956. The Korean GI bill terminated on January 31, 1965. The Vietnam GI bill, which includes all who served between January 31, 1955, and December 31, 1976, is scheduled to

terminate on December 31, 1989. For those who have served after December 31, 1976, the Congress established the veterans' educational assistance program (VEAP), a voluntary contributory assistance program. The VEAP program is a 5-year pilot program under which there will be no enrollments after December 31, 1981, unless the President recommends that the program continue.

I have heard a number of statements attributed to President Reagan which indicated that he was in favor of reinstating the GI bill for persons serving in the Armed Forces. In that regard, I do know that the President told delegates to the American Legion convention held in Boston, Mass., on August 20, 1980:

We must provide the resources to attract and retain superior people in each of the services. We should take steps immediately to restore the GI bill, one of the most effective, equitable and socially important programs ever devised. In short, our country must provide these persons and their families with a quality of life that is equivalent to the sacrifices they make on our behalf.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we would expect that budget amendments to be submitted by President Reagan will have a provision for the restoration of the GI bill for active duty personnel in the Armed Forces, and that a recommendation for a veterans' educational assistance program will be a part of President Reagan's legislative program for fiscal year 1982.

Mr. Speaker, none of the three GI bills were identical. In fact the provisions of each of the GI bill programs and the VEAP program are distinct, having been developed at a different time and period in our history to reflect the needs and philosophy of the period in which the programs were approved.

The bill I am introducing today responds to the concerns expressed by many Members of Congress and the military services about the effectiveness of our Armed Forces and the capability of the military to attract and retain the quality of personnel it needs.

The All-Volunteer Force is confronted with major recruitment and retention problems which will be aggravated by the continuing decrease in the recruitment age population. For example, the Army was unable to fulfill its authorized strength in fiscal year 1979, failing to meet its goal by over 27,000, and difficulties in this regard continue.

Much publicity has been given to the failure of the Navy to carry out its mission because of acute personnel shortages. Members will recall that the Congress considered adding additional funds to reactivate an aircraft carrier and a battleship. The Navy, however, vetoed the idea due to a shortage of qualified personnel to man these vessels.

The Air Force also lacks personnel with critical skills. We are told there is a shortage of pilots in both the Navy and the Air Force, and it is estimated there will be an increase in the shortage of pilots, as well as navigators, during the next fiscal year.

So long as we have an All-Volunteer Force, we must continue to improve both the compensation and other benefits for persons serving in the military. As the Members know, I am strongly in favor of reinstituting compulsory military service. Since that is not the case, I believe that educational benefits for those serving in the military can play a vital role in attracting and retaining qualified military personnel, especially in areas where there are critical shortages.

The purposes of my bill are: First, to provide an education and training program to assist in the readjustment of veterans upon their discharge or separation from the Armed Forces; second, to enhance the recruitment of quality personnel for the Armed Forces; third, to encourage reenlistments for active duty service in the Armed Forces; and, fourth, to facilitate the retention of key personnel in critical positions.

To carry out these purposes, the proposed bill would authorize preservice educational assistance to certain individuals who agree to fulfill a tour of military service; provide a basic educational entitlement to certain individuals who serve an initial period of service; provide additional supplemental assistance for those who reenlist for an additional period of service; provide authority for individuals in critical positions to transfer their educational benefits to dependents, and extend the authorization to repay student loans as provided for in Public Law 96-342 for 2 additional years.

Military officers have openly discussed the problems the services are experiencing in meeting recruitment and retention goals not only for active duty personnel, but also for the Selected Reserve and National Guard. The proposed bill, therefore, addresses itself to some degree with the problems of both the Regular and Reserve Forces so far as recruitment and retention are concerned. In addition, the proposed bill authorizes the Secretary of Defense to increase benefits in a number of instances as deemed necessary or appropriate for recruitment or retention of persons in critical specialties in both the Regular and Reserve Forces.

Mr. Speaker, under the proposed bill, the basic educational assistance would be \$250 per month for 1 month of active duty service for high school graduates or those with a general equivalency diploma or entering active service on or after October 1, 1981. Eligibility for 36 months requires completion of 3 years continuous active duty

or 2 years continuous active duty plus 4 years Selected Reserve or National Guard service. In addition to the basic rate, a person would be entitled to an additional \$300 a month upon completion of 6 years of continuous active duty plus 8 years in the Selected Reserve or National Guard service.

A preservice educational program in the proposed bill authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement with an individual to permit such individual to complete or continue an education program prior to fulfilling his or her military obligation. Upon completion of the preservice educational program, the individual would be required to pay back 1 month of active duty service for 1 month of educational benefits, or 3 months of Selected Reserve or National Guard service for 1 month of educational benefits.

To enhance retention of persons in positions with critical specialties, the proposed bill would authorize the Secretary of Defense to allow the veteran to transfer his or her entitlement to educational benefits to a spouse or child for any person who has served on active duty for no less than 8 years and no more than 12 years. The spouse or child could attend school following the transfer of the entitlement so long as the person continues to serve on active duty or, in the case of a person who retires after serving a period of 20 years or longer, following the veteran's discharge or release from active duty.

The Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1981 authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide a 1-year pilot test program for payment of Higher Education Act student loans by the Secretary of Defense. For the Reserve components, an outstanding Federal student loan of up to \$500 and for enlisted members of the Armed Forces serving in certain military specialties up to \$1,500 may be paid by the Secretary of Defense for each satisfactorily completed year of service. Under the proposed bill, this program would be extended 2 years, for a total of 3 years.

Last, the existing VEAP program for persons who have entered the Armed Forces after December 31, 1976, would no longer be available for those entering service after September 30, 1981. However, those currently participating in the VEAP program would be permitted to continue to contribute to the program.

There seems to be a general consensus that an education and training program for veterans serving in the Armed Forces, similar to previous education and training programs, is needed. These include representatives of the major veterans organizations, associations of retired military personnel, and representatives of the active duty military. There is some difference of opinion, however, on how this

program should be funded. Some suggest the entire cost should be paid for by the Department of Defense. Others suggest the entire cost should be the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration.

The cost of my bill would be borne by both the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense. Since the program would be administered in its entirety by the Veterans' Administration, the administrative cost for the program would continue with the Veterans' Administration. This cost would not increase since the superstructure is already in place. The cost of the basic educational assistance payment of \$250 a month, to all entering service with high school or general equivalency diplomas after the effective date of my bill will also be borne by the Veterans' Administration.

All other benefits to be provided by my bill, which includes the supplemental educational assistance, transfer of entitlement, preservice educational assistance program, and other provisions relating to the recruitment and retention of persons in critical positions, will be borne by the Department of Defense.

Under my proposal, no personnel will be eligible for educational benefits until after completion of at least 2 years of military service. Therefore, no funds will be required to implement this bill for fiscal years 1982 and 1983. It is expected that there will be a modest cost for the program in fiscal year 1984, with the maximum cost not occurring until the early 1990's.

Presently, for the academic year 1980-81, there will be some \$10 billion not including veterans educational benefits in student aid available directly or indirectly for students. These education aid programs provide three different types of assistance; grants, loans and workstudy.

It is time we adjusted our educational priorities. It is my intention to bring to the attention of the Budget Committee that the highest priority of educational assistance should be veterans' educational programs, with the balance going to those who do not choose to serve in the Armed Forces. In other words, there does not have to be an increase in Federal outlays for educational assistance if my bill is enacted.

The proposed bill will be referred to our Subcommittee on Education, Training, and Employment. I would anticipate hearings on this, and similar proposals, in the near future, and would urge my colleagues in joining with me in cosponsoring this legislation. ●

## AMENDING THE POWERPLANT AND INDUSTRIAL FUEL USE ACT OF 1978

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

Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join Mr. YOUNG of Missouri in introducing a bill which would amend section 402 of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act in connection with allowing the owners of residential outdoor gaslights to retain service to those lights. The Fuel Use Act prohibits such use of natural gas as of January 1, 1982, and our legislation would remove that prohibition.

As one of the 134 cosponsors of similar legislation during the 96th Congress (H.R. 4576), I was pleased that the House of Representatives passed that legislation without dissent on December 13 of last year. House passage followed by 1 day a hearing on H.R. 4576 by the Energy and Power Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I was a member. Mr. YOUNG of Missouri and I urge congressional support for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues, the text of the bill we are introducing today follows:

H.R. 1464

A bill to amend the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 to permit local distribution companies to continue natural gas service to residential customers for outdoor lighting fixtures for which natural gas was provided on the date of enactment of such Act, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 402(b)(1) of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-620) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(other than any outdoor lighting fixture which was installed before the date of the enactment of this Act for use in connection with a residence and for which natural gas was being provided on such date of enactment)" after "use in outdoor lighting", and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking out the dash and all that follows through "residence," and inserting in lieu thereof "any municipal outdoor lighting fixture".

SEC. 2. Section 402 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f)(1) For the purpose of discouraging the use of natural gas for outdoor lighting, each local distribution company which is subject to subsection (a) or (b) shall, in accordance with rules promulgated by the Secretary—

"(A) establish a reasonable and simple method, as determined by each such company, by which the company shall periodically inform its customers about the amount of natural gas consumed by outdoor lighting and the annual cost of such gas for such lighting; and



"(B) report to the Secretary the method established under subparagraph (A).

A company may establish a method which provides for reporting such information on the basis of estimates where actual information is not readily available.

"(2) The Secretary shall propose the rules referred to in paragraph (1) as promptly as possible after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and such rules shall take effect not later than the ninetieth day after they are proposed. In promulgating such rules, the Secretary shall, to the greatest extent feasible, consult with the appropriate regulatory authority of the States and the local distribution companies who will be subject to the rules."

#### RULE TO BE REQUESTED ON LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 10 minutes. ● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, the House Committee on Ways and Means will hold hearings on the Reagan administration's recent recommendation to increase the public debt limitation. Since the Congress will only have a brief amount of time available to consider this matter, it will be my intention to consider the legislation in executive session on the afternoon of the hearing. At that time, it is likely that the committee will recommend that a rule be requested which is other than one allowing any germane amendments.

As a result, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic Caucus, I take this occasion to advise my colleagues that when this bill is reported from the committee, it is likely that the committee will seek a modified rule.

It is my intention that when the committee completes its work on this legislation, the report will be filed at the earliest opportunity, and we will request to be heard before the Committee on Rules as expeditiously as possible.

A copy of the press release announcing the hearing follows:

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ANNOUNCES PUBLIC HEARING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1981, ON THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

The Honorable Dan Rostenkowski (D. Ill.), Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, today announced that the Committee on Ways and Means will conduct a morning public hearing on Tuesday, February 3, 1981, beginning at 10:00 a.m., in Room 1100, Longworth House Office Building, the Main Committee Hearing Room, on the Administration's recent request for an increase in the public debt ceiling. It is expected the Committee will then immediately follow the public hearing by a markup session that afternoon.

The present debt limitation under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, consists of a permanent ceiling of \$400 billion, and a temporary additional limitation, effective through September 30, 1981, of

\$535.1 billion, resulting in a combined permanent and temporary limitation of \$935.1 billion. The current level of Federal debt subject to the ceiling is approximately \$931.8 billion (as of January 26, 1981). The Reagan Administration has requested, in a letter to the Chairman from the Secretary of the Treasury dated January 28, 1981, that the amount of the temporary combined limitation be increased to \$985 billion.

The Administration witnesses will be officials from the Department of the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget, to be followed by testimony from the general public requesting to be heard.

The cutoff date for requests to be heard is no later than noon, Monday, February 2, 1981. Requests to be heard should be made by telephone to John J. Salmon, Chief Counsel, Committee on Ways and Means, Room 1102 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, (202) 225-3625. Notification to those scheduled to appear will be made by telephone as soon as possible after the filing deadline.

Persons scheduled to appear must submit 100 copies of their prepared statement to the Committee office, Room 1102 Longworth House Office Building, on the day before the hearing. An additional supply may be furnished for distribution to the press and public. For those who wish to file a written statement for the record of the hearing, five copies would be required for this purpose and will be accepted until noon on Tuesday, February 3. ●

#### MARVIN L. STONE RECEIVES AWARD IN PHILADELPHIA

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

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1981, at the Chapel of the Four Chaplains in Philadelphia, a special vesper service was held honoring one of America's most distinguished journalists, Marvin L. Stone, editor in chief of the weekly news magazine, U.S. News & World Report.

Dr. Walter H. White, senior chaplain in the chapel since its inception, presented to Mr. Stone the chapel's highest award, the Bronze Medallion for Distinguished Service.

Sponsoring Mr. Stone were Lucien Katzenberg, a trustee of the chapel and a leading businessman who has devoted much time to advancing the work of the chapel, Mr. John L. Koenig, an energy public affairs consultant who, as a chapel trustee, has been instrumental in bringing to the chapel some of America's outstanding leaders, and Dr. Karl Bennet Justus, executive director emeritus of the Military Chaplains Association, who since retirement from that organization has served as a consultant to the chapel.

The approach of the 38th anniversary of the February 3, 1943, sinking of the troopship *Dorchester* is a fresh reminder that the most dramatic, unforgettable example of brotherhood unfolded on the storm-tossed deck of that torpedoed ship when Chaplains George L. Fox, John P. Washington,

Alexander D. Goode, and Clark V. Poling gave their lifejackets to frightened young soldiers. Then, in a picture that cannot fade from memory, those brave clergymen, two Protestants, a Catholic priest, and a Jewish rabbi, locked arms, joined in prayer and went down with the vessel. As long as time shall last, this dramatic event will be the greatest example of true brotherhood, for truly, "this was their finest hour" as they laid down their lives for their friends.

In accepting the Legion of Honor Bronze Medallion, Mr. Stone's response was characterized by a keen editorial insight into the times in which we live. In part, he said:

The Four Chaplains that we honor sacrificed their lives during World War II, almost forty years ago, while on a mission many of us embarked on—to preserve against sinister forces a way of life in this nation, indeed, to preserve it throughout this world. One might pause a moment and ask what these four men would think of this world today—for it has become a far different world in the past four decades. And what would have been their counsel to us?

Perhaps they would agree that seldom in the course of human events has the spirit of brotherhood been more sorely tried than it is now. We live not only in a divided world but in a divided nation.

Abroad we have not just the Communist East against the non-Communist West. We have, in the Middle East, not only Moslem against Jew, but Moslem against Moslem and Moslem against Christian. In Ulster it is Catholic against Protestant; in South Africa black against white. . . .

The problems we face today are of a nature that tend to divide our people rather than unite them. . . . All across this country, special interest groups are growing, not only in numbers but in influence. Each group is out to get special advantage for itself. These are wedges that are splintering our society. In this push and pull of competing special interests, the really important interest—that of the nation as a whole—is all too often ignored. What kind of brotherhood is this? Is it going to take another World War to revive the kind of dedication and selflessness that motivated those four chaplains to give up their own life jackets and go down with the sinking *Dorchester* in World War II?

I believe that the counsel of the Four Chaplains would not be far from what I am about to say in conclusion:

Certainly we have the intelligence to understand that we are going through one more profound social revolution in this country. The challenge is to preserve the best of the past and embrace the good in the new. But it will take wise leadership to define and inspire a common purpose, and desire by the rest of us to pursue it. We have lost our innocence in the years since World War II. We have been through a lot, and will be forced to endure a lot more—but adversity may bring us back together where affluence could not. . . .

We all have a strong obligation to think about these things if we are to survive and grow as a healthy nation. We should have no illusions about the difficulty of making a comeback in the 1980s. But it can happen, if we want badly enough to make it happen. ●

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. HARTNETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAWYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JEFFORDS, for 5 minutes, today.

At the request of Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. CORCORAN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG OF MISSOURI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEVITAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEDELL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ), for 10 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. PETRI.

Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. LeBOUTILLIER.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mr. SHUMWAY in two instances.

Mr. GILMAN in three instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. CONABLE in three instances.

Mr. HOPKINS.

Mr. PAUL.

Mr. FRENZEL in five instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in two instances.

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

Mr. BRODHEAD in two instances.

Mr. WEISS in five instances.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. BELENSON.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. DORGAN of NORTH DAKOTA.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in two instances.

Mr. GAYDOS.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. PEYSER.

Mr. NOWAK in three instances.

Mr. HEFNER.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. ROSE.

Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. SIMON in two instances.

Mr. FARY.

Mr. LUNDINE.

Mr. SHELBY.

Mr. DASCHLE in three instances.

Mr. PEASE.

Mr. BAFALIS.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. ATKINSON in two instances.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in two instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. BERUTER.

Mr. BOWEN, to revise and extend his remarks, immediately following Mr. COLLINS of Texas on his special order.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 29, 1981, at 2 p.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

410. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installation, Logistics and Financial Management), transmitting notice of the proposed conversion to contractor performance of the motor vehicle maintenance activity at Fort Shafter, Hawaii, pursuant to section 502(b) of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

411. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Research, Development and Logistics), transmitting notice of the proposed conversion to contractor performance of the family housing maintenance function at Grissom Air Force Base, Ind., pursuant to section 502(b) of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

412. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Research, Development and Logistics), transmitting notice of the proposed conversion to contractor performance of the family housing maintenance function at Dyess Air Force Base, Tex., pursuant to section 502(b) of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

413. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting proposed final regulations to implement amendments to title I of the act of September 30, 1950, applying to local educational agencies claiming entitlements based on the number of children residing on

Indian lands, pursuant to section 431(d)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

414. A letter from the Acting Director, ACTION Agency, transmitting final regulations implementing restrictions on certain volunteer activity related to the use of appropriated funds in connection with electoral and lobbying activities, pursuant to section 420(d) of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1972, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

415. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Legislative Affairs, transmitting project performance audit reports prepared by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, special studies prepared by the External Review and Evaluation Office of the Inter-American Development Bank, and project performance audit reports or project completion reports prepared by the Asian Development Bank, pursuant to section 301(e)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

416. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Board for International Broadcasting, transmitting the seventh annual report of the Board, together with its review and evaluation of the operation and mission of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, covering fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 4(a)(8) of Public Law 93-129, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

417. A letter from the General Counsel, Council on Wage and Price Stability, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the Council's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

418. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting a report on the Commission's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

419. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of reports issued or released by the General Accounting Office during December 1980, pursuant to section 234 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Government Operations.

420. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting notice of the designation of a marine sanctuary in certain waters around the Point Reyes-Farallon Islands area off the coast of California, pursuant to section 302(h) of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended (94 Stat. 1058); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

421. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting notice of the designation of a marine sanctuary in certain waters in the lower Florida Keys, pursuant to section 302(h) of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended (94 Stat. 1058); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

422. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting notice of the designation of a marine sanctuary in certain



waters around Gray's Reef off the coast of Georgia, pursuant to section 302(h) of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended (94 Stat. 1058); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

423. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a Corps of Engineers report on the Hydroelectric Power Study, Raystown Lake, Pa., in partial response to a resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted April 11, 1974; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 1353. A bill making additional appropriations to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for the National Institutes of Health to carry out research with respect to lupus erythematosus; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 1354. A bill to amend section 301(3) of title 38, United States Code, so as to include lupus erythematosus among the chronic diseases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 1355. A bill to provide for continuing appropriations for salaries of officials and employees of the United States and former officials and employees of the United States when funds are not available for such salaries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1356. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the medicare program for certain services performed by chiropractors; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ATKINSON (for himself, and Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1357. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from requiring motor vehicle inspection and maintenance before January 1, 1986, and to provide for the separate testing of new motor vehicles to insure that such vehicles comply with emission standards before the time of their sale by the manufacturer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1358. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from requiring motor vehicle inspection and maintenance until such time as each new motor vehicle is required to be separately tested for compliance with emission standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEDELL:

H.R. 1359. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce from 60 to 55 the age at which a member of the Armed Forces may retire for nonregular service and to provide that the retired pay of such a member retiring before the age of 60 shall be reduced in a manner determined by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1360. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the eligibility of members of the military Reserves and of the National Guard for basic educational opportunity grants by \$500; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1361. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a refundable tax credit to an employer who pays compensation to an employee for a period during which the employee is participating in Armed Forces training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEDELL (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. SNOWE, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. ATKINSON, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARNES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STARK, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 1362. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide special loan guarantees to small business concerns for the acquisition of motor fuel service stations, to require the divestment of such stations from operation by certain producers and refiners of motor fuels, to control sales by producers and refiners of motor fuels, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Small Business and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H.R. 1363. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt incremental tertiary oil from the crude oil windfall profit tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself, Mr. BRODHEAD, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 1364. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to adjust provisions governing private foundations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORRADA:

H.R. 1365. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the dollar limitations and Federal medical assistance percentages applicable to the medicare programs of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1366. A bill to provide that certain judicial pleadings and proceedings in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may be conducted in the Spanish language, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1367. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a service pension for veterans of World War I who have annual incomes of less than \$10,000 and for certain surviving spouses and dependent children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1368. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that Federal assistance to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam under the aid to families with dependent children, child welfare, and social services programs shall be furnished on the same basis (under the same formula and without specific dollar ceilings) as in the case of other States, and to amend section 228 of such act to extend to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam the program of special benefits at age 72 for certain uninsured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 1369. A bill to create a Federal Disaster Insurance Corporation to insure the people of the United States against losses due to major natural disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1370. A bill to provide that no relocation payments made under the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act shall be paid to persons who are unlawfully present in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DANIELSON (for himself and Mr. KINDNESS):

H.R. 1371. A bill to amend section 12 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON (for himself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 1372. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code to penalize the use of a cutting or stabbing weapon in the commission of a felony, and to increase the penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of a felony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, and Mr. BERUTER):

H.R. 1373. A bill to terminate the grain embargo imposed upon the shipment of U.S. grain to the Soviet Union in January 1980; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

H.R. 1374. A bill to provide that Federal rights-of-way may be issued for coal pipelines utilizing groundwater only where affected States have approved such utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

H.R. 1375. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the deduction, by certain financial institutions, of interest paid on deposits of public funds where those deposits are secured by tax-exempt obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 1376. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain damage to, and theft of property used for religious purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 1377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage small business capital formation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1378. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the definition of specially defined energy property for purposes of the investment tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to employee stock ownership plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make permanent the provisions relating to the funding of employee stock ownership plans through the investment tax credit, to provide a credit against tax for contributions to an employee stock ownership plan based upon wages as an alternative to that based on investment in equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1381. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that no gain or loss will be recognized in the case of transfers of a principal residence in divorce

or legal separation proceedings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit heads of households to use the standard deduction used by married persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the amount of the charitable deduction allowable for expenses incurred in the operation of a motor vehicle will be determined in the same manner Government employees determine reimbursement for use of their vehicles on Government business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1384. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the tax-exempt status of the interest of certain life insurance accounts to flow through to policyholders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1385. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to make it clear that any State may impose work requirements as a condition of eligibility for aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1386. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax gain from the sale of an individual's principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make certain changes in the tax treatment of private foundation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1388. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a maximum individual income tax rate of 50 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to group-term life insurance purchased for employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1390. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the valuation of bank holding company assets for the purpose of determining the amount certain private foundations are required to distribute; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1392. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act for the purpose of authorizing the President to enter into agreements establishing reciprocal arrangements between the medicare program and similar programs of any foreign country; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 1393. A bill to amend titles 14 and 38, United States Code, to provide veterans' benefits to temporary members of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself and Mr. HUTTO):

H.R. 1394. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration outpatient clinic at an appropriate location in northwest Florida; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H.R. 1395. A bill to provide that an advisory referendum be conducted as part of each

general election to give voters an opportunity to express their views on certain issues of national importance; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Rules.

By Mr. GRADISON:

H.R. 1396. A bill to provide that the retroactive change in method of accounting for life insurance companies which is permitted by Revenue Procedure 78-6 may be made for certain closed taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 1397. A bill to encourage savings and capital formation by offering a bonus payment to modest-income people who purchase certain savings certificates or make certain investments; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 1398. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that any Federal employee who, at the time of retirement, does not elect a reduced annuity in order to provide a survivor annuity to a spouse or other person may make such an election within 1 year after retiring; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEVITAS:

H.R. 1399. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to carry out audits of expenditures and financial transactions of Members, officers, and standing committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. WHITE, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. AU COIN, and Mr. HARTNETT):

H.R. 1400. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish new educational assistance programs for veterans and for members of the Armed Forces; jointly to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services.

By Mr. LOWRY of Washington:

H.R. 1401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow each individual to exclude \$1,000 of interest on savings, and to deny the deduction for interest paid or incurred with respect to credit extended through the use of credit cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 1402. A bill to authorize equalization of the retired pay of certain members and former members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1403. A bill to provide that members of all commissions, councils, and similar bodies in the executive branch of the Government appointed from private life shall serve without any remuneration for their services other than travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1404. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for each barrel of oil or bitumen produced from the several rock types variously known as "tar sand", "bitumen rocks", "oil impregnated rocks", "oil sand and rock asphalt", from which oil is not recoverable in its natural state by oil well production methods including currently used enhanced oil recovery techniques; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUJAN (for himself, and Mr. GUARINI):

H.R. 1405. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 with respect to benefits payable to certain individuals who on December 31, 1974, had at least 10 years of railroad service and also were fully in-

sured under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 1406. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to modify certain provisions relating to restricted data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1407. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to limit certain aspects of its coverage for other than racial groups; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNEY:

H.R. 1408. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to reduce from 30 to 7 legislative days the period for congressional review of acts of the Council of the District of Columbia which do not involve a Federal interest, to allow such acts to take effect during a congressional recess or adjournment, to repeal the authority of the Council of the District of Columbia to enact temporary emergency legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARRIOTT:

H.R. 1409. A bill to amend section 21 of the act of February 25, 1920, commonly known as the Mineral Leasing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the deduction of certain expenses in connection with the business use of homes and the rental of residences to family members; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 1411. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the exchange of information concerning defaulting student borrowers with credit bureau organizations to promote responsible repayment of Federal student loans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1412. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to enter into a cooperative arrangement with the State of New Jersey respecting radium pollution in that State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1413. A bill entitled: "The Handgun Crime Control Act of 1981"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1414. A bill to grant immigrant visas to certain nationals of Italy who were victims of earthquakes which occurred on or about November 23, 1980, in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1415. A bill relating to tax treatment of qualified dividend reinvestment plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1416. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1417. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief to residential users of refined petroleum products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1418. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the personal exemptions from \$1,000 to \$1,200; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income \$500 of interest on savings in the case of an individual taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



H.R. 1420. A bill to increase alternatives to institutionalization for senior citizens; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

H.R. 1421. A bill to establish an Energy Company of America, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, Science and Technology, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.R. 1422. A bill to allow certain interest costs to be reimbursable under the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 in the case of grants to victims of the Johnstown flood; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. NOWAK:

H.R. 1423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to \$15 million the exemption for certain small issues from treatment as industrial development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 1424. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that in the labeling and advertising of drugs sold by prescription the "established name" of such drug must appear each time their proprietary name is used, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1425. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act and to otherwise require the labels on foods and food products to disclose all of their ingredients and any changes in their ingredients, their nutritional content, accurate weight data, storage information, their manufacturers, packers, and distributors, and their unit prices and to provide for uniform product grading and prohibit misleading brand names; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1426. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the highway use tax in the case of certain trucks and other vehicles which are used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their place of production to market or mill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1427. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt farmers from the highway use tax on heavy trucks used for farm purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1428. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for inclusion of the services of licensed registered nurses under medicare and medicaid; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 1429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the requirement that States reduce the amount of unemployment compensation payable for any week by the amount of certain retirement benefits, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEASE:

H.R. 1430. A bill to expedite the decision-making process with respect to the siting of new coal-fired powerplants and to provide, where possible, that such plants be located in the general area where the energy is to be distributed; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1431. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to encourage owners of coal-fired powerplants to utilize new technologies for pollution control and to establish an emissions

charges and rebate plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 1432. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to reduce from six to three the maximum age of a child on account of whom a mother or other caretaker relative receiving aid to families with dependent children may claim an exemption from registration under the WIN program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 1433. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enlarge the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1434. A bill for the relief of the State Community College of East St. Louis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1435. A bill to permit credit for civil service retirement purposes and in computing length of service for purposes of determining leave, health insurance, severance pay, tenure, and status in the case of certain individuals who performed National Guard technician service before January 1, 1969; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 1436. A bill to amend the Public Health Act to provide that enrollment increases made by schools of medicine to receive assistance from the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered in determining if the schools have met the first-year enrollment requirements for capitation grant assistance under title VII of such act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.R. 1437. A bill to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1438. A bill to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations requiring that the locomotive and rear car of all passenger, freight, and commuter trains have bulletproof glass and equipment capable of providing controlled temperatures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1439. A bill to require the Federal Bureau of Investigation to classify the offense of arson as a part I offense for purposes of the uniform crime reporting program and the uniform crime reports for the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1440. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for certain activities relating to the taking of children by parents from legal custodians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1441. A bill to repeal the provisions of law allowing automatic cost-of-living adjustments in the salaries of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1442. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow certain married individuals who file separate returns to be taxed as unmarried individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to claim a credit for amounts paid as tuition to provide education for himself, for his spouse, or for his dependents, and to provide that such credit is refundable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAWYER (for himself and Mr. LUNGREN):

H.R. 1444. A bill to amend section 924(c) (relating to mandatory penalties for certain

felonies committed with firearms) of title 18 of the United States Code to change the sentencing structure for offenses under such section, to eliminate parole for such offenses, and to make specific the exclusion of certain felonies from the groups of felonies to which such section applies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.R. 1445. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for dividends paid by domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELBY:

H.R. 1446. A bill to change the name of the China Bluff Access Area being constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers as part of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway near Warsaw in Sumter County, Ala., to the "S. W. Taylor Memorial Park"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SKELTON:

H.R. 1447. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to establish a revolving fund to finance short-term export credit sales of agricultural commodities produced in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 1448. A bill to prohibit proposed regulatory increases in imputed interest rates for tax purposes on loans between related parties and on deferred in the case of certain sales of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 1449. A bill to stabilize prices, rents, wages, salaries, profits, dividends, interest rates, and other economic transfers; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1450. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to establish an Economic Stabilization Board, to stabilize prices, wages, rents, and interest rates at levels prevailing on the date of enactment of these amendments and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1451. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, to provide free radio and television time to candidates for election to Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1452. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of motor vehicles, and of parts of motor vehicles, that are products of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 1453. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the unified credit against estate and gift taxes so that estates under \$500,000 will not be subject to estate tax, to allow unlimited marital deduction and to increase the gift exclusion from \$3,000 to \$6,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISS (for himself, Mr.

WAXMAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GREEN, Mr. YATES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MOFFETT, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. GRAY, Mr. FRANK, Mr.

BARNES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. BEILSONSON):

H.R. 1454. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of affectional or sexual orientation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 1455. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to increase the number of years with respect to which emergency loans may be made to eligible borrowers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1456. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the exclusion for dividends and interest and to make such exclusion permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 1457. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the provision of medical and dental care to surviving spouses of members and certain former members of the uniformed services who are not remarried; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage greater individual savings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1459. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for State and local public utility taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1460. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the use of methanol as an alternative fuel for motor vehicles by allowing the rapid amortization of facilities producing methanol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 1461. A bill to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to provide that such act shall not apply to persons engaged in the processing or disposal of waste materials recovered from certain dredging operations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1462. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to eliminate the reduction of railroad retirement annuities by amounts payable as social security benefits in cases of certain persons; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1463. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, relating to qualifications for appointment and retention in the civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. CORCORAN):

H.R. 1464. A bill to amend the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 to permit local distribution companies to continue natural gas service to residential customers for outdoor lighting fixtures for which natural gas was provided on the date of enactment of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ZEFERETTI (for himself, Mr. LUNDINE, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 1465. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require the Congressional Budget Office, for every significant bill or resolution reported in the House or the Senate, to prepare and submit an estimate of the cost which would be incurred by State and local governments in carrying out or complying with such bill or resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1466. A bill for the relief of the Herbert J. Thomas Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution designating the month of February 1981 as "National PTA Membership Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the period from October 4, 1981, through October 10, 1981, as "National Schoolbus Safety Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARTNETT:

H.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which requires (except during fiscal years during which the United States is at war) that the total amount of money expended by the United States during any fiscal year not exceed the total amount of revenue of the United States received during that fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARRIOTT:

H.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning on November 22, 1981, as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April each year as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.J. Res. 145. Joint resolution to authorize "National Shut-in Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that except in time of war or economic emergency declared by the Congress, expenditures of the Government may not exceed the revenues of the Government during any fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give citizens of the United States the right to enact and repeal laws by voting on legislation in a national election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the 29th day in May of each year as "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides that the total expenditures of the United States shall not exceed the total amount of revenue (except in time of war or during a period of suspension) and providing that the debt of the United States shall not exceed that amount existing upon ratification of this amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Iowa:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution commending the Americans held hostage by

the Iranian Government and the personnel who took part in the attempt to rescue them; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. FIEDLER:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution to urge the U.S. Postal Service to issue a commemorative postage stamp to honor the 66 Americans who were taken hostage in Iran, the 6 Americans who escaped capture by the Iranians with the assistance of the Canadian Government, and the 8 American servicemen who died during the aborted attempt to rescue the American hostages; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOTTLE:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System should reverse its policy of manipulating the discount rate to cause increased interest rates which result in higher unemployment and economic dislocations; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. STANGELAND:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the leaders of the United States, Mexico, and Canada should participate in a North American summit meeting for purposes of establishing a common economic bond of mutual cooperation and coordination in dealing with issues involving our three countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the foreign policy of the United States should reflect a national strategy of peace through strength; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. DYSON, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DWYER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. WINN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. NEAL, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MATTOX, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. BEILSONSON, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BONKER, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GINN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, Mr. VENTO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. PRICE, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. FISH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr.



MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. RITTER, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. ERTEL, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. BARNES, Mr. SHAMANSKY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. ROE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. PEASE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GORE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H. Res. 43. Resolution commending former President Jimmy Carter, former Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, former Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher, and the Algerian negotiators for their efforts in securing the safe release of the 52 American hostages from Iran, and President Reagan for designating former President Carter to greet the freed hostages; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

H. Res. 46. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should not allow any spare parts or other military equipment to be shipped from the United States to Iran and, to the extent consistent with the agreements relating to the release of the American hostages in Iran, should prohibit any new trade between the United States and Iran, including all imports of oil from Iran; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. Res. 47. Resolution establishing a commission to recommend an appropriate memorial to former U.S. Representative Allard K. Lowenstein; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDONALD:

H. Res. 48. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish the Committee on Internal Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Son I Adrianzen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Edward Carbellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Madeleine Mesnager; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 1470. A bill for the relief of Pius Joseph Lund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 1471. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Gamble and Ursula Gamble; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

H.R. 1472. A bill for the relief of Camille Joseph Paul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Vincent Man-Suentsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Dana Bradford Barretto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Christina A. Macon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1476. A bill for relief of Phyllis Steiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Sarah O. Loot, doctor of medicine, Jesse L. Loot, doctor of medicine, and Brian O. Loot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1478. A bill for the relief of Pablo Del Rosario Esguerra, doctor of medicine, Theresa Esguerra, and Micheline C. Esguerra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Catalina Ensico Fimbres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.R. 1480. A bill for the relief of Omar Marachi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1481. A bill for the relief of George Herbert Weston and Mabel Gregson Weston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELBY:

H.R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Christina Boltz Sidders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Horst Franz Janzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Elena Kosztelnik Cazimir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Marius Radu Stefan Cazimir; 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. 2: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MOTT, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAGGREN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WINN, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 316: Mr. HANSEN of IDAHO, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. COELHO, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. JONES of

Oklahoma, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. ROE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BENEDICT, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. BAILEY of Missouri.

H.R. 318: Mr. FROST, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BEARD, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. ATKINSON, and Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 390: Mr. YATRON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FISH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. NELLIGAN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 654: Mr. MOTT, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. WINN, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1003: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, Mr. FISH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. NOWAK, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. LOEFFLER, and Mr. LeBOUTILLIER.

H.R. 1019: Mr. FORD of Michigan and Mr. COURTER.

H.R. 1064: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. HINSON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. KOGOVSEK, and Mr. PRICE.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, Mr. RUDD, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. SMITH of Alabama, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. LUKE, and Mr. ASHBROOK.

H.J. Res. 125: Mr. BENEDICT and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LEE, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STANGELAND, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. HORTON, Mr. ATKINSON, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. BONKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GINN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. MICA, Mr. WINN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. EARLY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. DE LUCA.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## ALAMEDA TAKES CARE OF ITS OWN

## HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my fellow colleagues, a project in my district of which I am very proud. This program, Meals on Wheels, has just celebrated its seventh birthday.

The program is entirely voluntary and aimed at providing the elderly people of Alameda County, Calif., with low-cost meals in their homes. These meals are delivered daily to their homes in Alameda by many cheerful, caring volunteers.

Alameda Meals on Wheels began rolling October 1, 1980, when the first meals, costing 65 cents each and prepared by the Alameda Unified School District Food Department, were picked up by volunteers and delivered to 10 clients, 5 days a week. Rev. H. W. Vincent, former pastor of the Santa Clara Methodist Church, provided \$2,000 of the first seed money from their insurance and maintenance costs. The congregation merged with the Twin Towers United Methodist Church, which continues its support. Civic and social organizations, fraternal groups, doctors, and nurses, Alameda Council of Churches, Commission on Aging, and the general public join in supporting the program.

The program has helped many elderly people stay in their homes and has enabled many handicapped persons to return home, reducing their hospital convalescence.

I am proud to report that Meals on Wheels received a total of \$19,931.80 in voluntary contributions from the people of Alameda in 1980. This symbolizes to me the concern and respect that everyone in Alameda has for those less fortunate. I am proud to be among those honoring this organization, and I salute the over 500 volunteers who have been a part of this wonderful program.●

## THE MAGNIFICENT OPPORTUNITY

## HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, every 4 years a breath of fresh air

blows across the United States. We feel a new hope that an institution in our lives which we traditionally distrust—our Government—has become capable, for a brief moment at least, of living up to our collective hopes. Whether we be Republicans or Democrats, the election of a new President prompts us to hope that he can succeed, that he can bring the Nation together, and that he can lead us toward solutions to the problems of our time.

For only the President is elected by all of the American people. Whatever philosophy of government he may have, that philosophy has been approved by the American people through an electoral process deeply rooted in our history.

Nevertheless, the period of cooperation between a new President and Congress is brief. The honeymoon between two branches of government constitutionally designed to check and balance rather than cooperate with one another may last only a few months.

In the case of our 38th President, Gerald Ford, the honeymoon period ended in less than 1 month, when Ford pardoned his predecessor, Richard Nixon. Wise as that decision may appear to have been in retrospect, it cost Ford the cooperation of the Congress, and without the mandate of a popular vote behind him, the Nation was deprived of the chance for significant legislative change during the 2½ years of the Ford administration.

The shock of President Kennedy's assassination, coupled with Lyndon Johnson's landslide victory 1 year later, gave President Johnson the opportunity to push through the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 1965, as well as his war on poverty program.

A comparable turning point had occurred three decades earlier when the Great Depression led to a sweeping mandate for change in the 1932 election. President Franklin Roosevelt, confident in his intentions and supported by a strong public vote, was able to change the whole concept of the role of government in American society.

The despair of 1932 and the despair of 1980 were not unlike. I agree with new OMB Director Dave Stockman that the Nation is in a period of economic crisis; we must decide whether a representative democracy can cut spending from a budget where payments for welfare, unemployment compensation, food stamps and health care for the elderly now consume nearly 50 percent of our total expenditures.

Unless our elected representatives can cut those benefits and reduce the inflation caused by deficit spending, our form of government may very well not survive. The crisis is that grave.

When President Reagan took the oath of office last week as our 40th President, he commenced a brief period where he will enjoy the same magnificent opportunity for sweeping change that Franklin Roosevelt was given in 1932 and Lyndon Johnson in 1964.

In many ways, the mandate of 1980 is even clearer than that of 1932 and 1964. To many of us it means:

First, cut Government spending and balance the budget;

Second, cut the size, cost, and complexity of Government itself;

Third, create an environment for renewed productivity, innovation, and competition in the private sector;

Fourth, create incentives for new private jobs while phasing out make-work public jobs; and

Fifth, restore a strong Defense Establishment.

The vote on November 4 was not for a new moral majority or for a reduction in environmental protection; the vote, in my judgment, reflected concern primarily for economic and governmental issues. That vote recognized a primary and historic American principle: government is inherently incompetent and has grown too large. The voters turned out of office, after 26 years in power, a Democratic majority in the Senate, particularly those Members identified with big Government spending. They had been in power too long. They had run out of ideas and energy, and they had lost the faith of the people in their ability to lead.

So power now shifts to us Republicans. The opportunity for change is tremendous, but so also is the possibility of failure.

President Reagan's first 5 months in office can be a period of the most significant change in recent history. If the President and his Cabinet officers know what they want to do, if they can quickly select their subordinates and work in concert with Republican leadership in Congress, we could, within months, enact sweeping new legislation comparable to the changes achieved in 1932 and 1964-65.

We can abolish agencies of Government, simplify laws and regulations, reduce inflation, and in time, balance the budget.

The President could declare that if the Federal budget remains unbalanced at the end of his first year in office, he, his top administrators, and

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



the Congress should subject themselves to a percentage salary reduction commensurate with the proportion by which the budget is out of balance. There was a 10-percent deficit during 1980.

We could see a new acceptance of the concept that service to the Nation is both a privilege and a duty; we could restore the public faith embodied in President Kennedy's words, "Ask not what your country can do for you . . . ."

But, time is short. If the Reagan administration is unable to get its people into place swiftly, to translate its concepts into specific legislative language, and to reach an early consensus with the 40-odd committees of the House and Senate on legislative priorities, the precious 5- or 6-month honeymoon period could pass without significant achievement. Historically, when a new President and Congress have not made substantial progress by the first summer recess, there is traditionally a loss of momentum, direction, and spirit. We tend to bog down in bickering and petty political maneuvering as election results fade from memory and the reality of the next election looms large.

President Carter squandered his honeymoon period 4 years ago; hopefully President Reagan will not. The President's inaugural address last Tuesday could not have been more appropriate; hopefully his new administration will move quickly to translate his words into concrete changes in law and regulations.

There is a sense of electricity and hope in Washington today, a desire to work cooperatively and effectively. That desire is shared as much by Democrats in the Congress as it is by Republicans. All of us want to see the Nation strong again, and all of us want to do our part to restore the public's faith in the American system of government.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not confess to a small but nagging fear that we will fail to put it all together: the mandate, the brief weeks of opportunity, and the specific legislative craftsmanship required to change the rhetoric into reality. It will be 4 years until we have another opportunity of this kind; if we fail now, it will properly and rightfully be a new set of American leaders who will be given that brief 5 months of opportunity 4 years hence.

It may well be a time for national prayer.●

## TRIBUTE TO WARREN CHRISTOPHER

### HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it was through the contributions of many dedicated Americans that the release of 52 Americans who were held hostage by Iran was accomplished. Those persons who played key roles in accomplishing the release of the hostages deserve recognition by and appreciation from the American people for a job well done.

I believe that one man's efforts stand out in his contribution to a peaceful settlement to the Iranian crisis. Warren Christopher, Deputy Secretary of State and a former North Dakotan, demonstrated in these last several weeks in his role as America's chief negotiator with Iran, the special qualities of patience, determination, and honor that have always distinguished the American people when confronted with delicate and explosive international situations.

At a time when it is in vogue to be highly critical of our public officials, it is appropriate I think to stop and pay special thanks to a public official who was faced with a very difficult task and who served our country's interests with distinction and honor.

Warren Christopher, who spent his boyhood in Scranton, N. Dak., is one of those Americans who fit the definition of "hero" described by Ronald Reagan in his inaugural address. I know that my colleagues in Congress join me in saying "thank you" to Warren Christopher.●

## LONG ISLAND JEWISH-HILLSIDE-MANHASSET MEDICAL CENTER PROJECT: AN IMPORTANT STEP

### HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, as my first remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of this body the achievements and developments of two excellent, vital and historically significant health care facilities on Long Island—the Manhasset Medical Center of Manhasset, N.Y., and the Long Island Jewish-Hillside Medical Center of New Hyde Park, N.Y. Over the post World War II years, these two fine institutions have both served individuals directly, as well as providing pioneering health-related research accomplishments. The matter of interest today, Mr. Speaker, is the announced takeover of the Manhasset

facility by Long Island Jewish-Hillside Medical Center. This saga represents in a clear way just how prolonged, bothersome and stifling the maze of regulatory redtape can be. But, the hospitals persevered nevertheless; 5 years and 25 permits later, this plan that will better serve the people of the North Shore of Long Island will finally come to fruition.

Excerpts of this saga deserve reading, and I am placing into the RECORD the portions of an article that appeared in the January 5, 1981 edition of the Port Washington News.

## MANHASSET MEDICAL CENTER SOON TO BE LIJ DIVISION

(By Renee E. Paley)

Five years and some 25 agency permits later, the sounds of hammers and drills may finally be heard at the Manhasset Medical Center (MMC) as Long Island Jewish-Hillside Medical Center (LIJ) prepares to take over the building following the scheduled Feb. 2 closing of the sale.

The saga of the acquisition of the Manhasset facility by LIJ touches on long and delicate negotiations, dwells on bureaucracy's red tape, and skirts roadblocks set up by institutional envy before landing at its successful conclusion. In anticipation of a happy ending, LIJ has had its administrator-designate, Lawrence Gold, working since last June as a guest of the current owners in what will be called the Manhasset Division.

Gold, 33, has been associated with LIJ for 14 years, he said. His position at Manhasset has been mainly that of a liaison between the two institutions, but he is also in charge of gradually converting the administrative system of his host to that of the new parent hospital. "Basically, a voluntary hospital is acquiring a proprietary hospital," said Robert Markowitz, LIJ's vice-president of administration. "For the Weiners, this was a business venture."

The Weiners, the soon-to-be-former owners, have been operating the Manhasset Medical Center for about 30 years. In addition to the hospital, the building housed tenants—private physicians' offices . . . .

Markowitz said plans are to phase out the commercial tenants and replace them with hospital programs. "We are not the official owners as yet, but we have given them (the tenants) informal notice and most of them have already relocated to other space," he said. Markowitz added that the tenants have been very cooperative, understanding the hospital's need to repossess the space.

Although the Manhasset Division will be handling far more complex cases than MMC did, it will not admit multi-specialty cases such as patients needing open heart or brain surgery, or any patient requiring a large variety of back-up services or whose case demands equipment not installed at the new facility.●

## GASOLINE MARKETING LEGISLATION

### HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Small Business

Motor Fuel Marketer Preservation Act. Joining me are TONY HALL, OLYMPIA SNOWE, TOM TAUKE and more than 40 additional cosponsors.

In 1979, the House Small Business Committee held extensive hearings on gasoline retail marketing practices. We found a clear pattern of small and independent businesses being denied the opportunity to compete on a fair and equitable basis. The major integrated oil companies, who are both the suppliers and landlords for these small businesses, increasingly are going into direct competition with these same distributors and marketers. There is no way that the small business can ever be expected to survive when its competitor is in a position to control the rent, supply, and price of product, advertising, credit, and other elements vital to the company's success or failure.

To remedy the problems and inequities we found, the members of the Small Business Subcommittee on Antitrust developed the Small Business Motor Fuel Marketer Preservation Act, H.R. 6722. Mr. HALL, Mrs. SNOWE, Mr. TAUKE, and I were original cosponsors of the bill, as it was introduced by a bipartisan majority of the members of the subcommittee.

The legislation was marked up and reported out of the Antitrust Subcommittee by a unanimous vote. It was reported out of the Small Business Committee by a vote of 25-1. Unfortunately, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to which the bill was jointly referred, was not able to conclude its consideration of the bill in time to get it to the floor before adjournment last year.

In the Senate, a companion bill, S. 2798, was marked up and reported unanimously from the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust. The full committee did not take up the bill until the lame duck session, however, and so it was not sent to the floor last year.

I am pleased to note that a companion bill is again being introduced in the Senate. I understand it is being sponsored by HOWARD METZENBAUM, who chaired the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee's hearings on this subject last year.

The bill we are introducing today is very similar to the marked up legislation that was reported out of the House Small Business Committee and the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust. The only significant change is the replacement of one section with a new provision that was worked out by the Senate Judiciary Committee late last year.

Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous support for this legislation in the small business community. Last year, it was endorsed by the National Federation of Independent Business, the National Small Business Association,

the Service Station Dealers of America and the Chief Counsel for Advocacy at the Small Business Administration. Within the Congress, support for the bill always has been broad and bipartisan. Consequently, I am hopeful that we will be able to act on the Small Business Motor Fuel Marketer Preservation Act quickly as we start this new session of Congress.

The complete decontrol of motor fuel marketing, announced today by President Reagan, makes passage of this legislation all the more timely and important. This bill is intended to help restore some equity to the relationship between small business marketers and the big oil companies. For the past several years, the Federal Government has acted as a sort of buffer between those two groups, but the removal of Federal controls will require some congressional action to assure fair competition in the marketing of motor fuel.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert a summary of the key provisions of the proposed Small Business Motor Fuel Marketer Preservation Act of 1981.

#### THE SMALL BUSINESS MOTOR FUEL MARKETER PRESERVATION ACT OF 1981

##### SUMMARY OF KEY PROVISIONS

##### 1. Dealers' rights; SBA loan guarantees

The proprietor on any leased service station that is offered for sale by a refiner shall have the right of first refusal to purchase that station. SBA loan guarantees are made available for such purchases.

First, the refiner shall make an offer to the lessee dealer. The dealer has 60 days to consider the offer.

Second, the dealer may make a counter offer. If this is not accepted, an independent appraisal of the value of the property shall be made, subject to rules to be established by the Small Business Administration. The dealer will have the right to purchase the property at the appraised value within 30 days.

##### 2. Divorcement; refiner sales rule

Effective one year after date of enactment, major integrated refiners will be prohibited from directly operating any retail gasoline outlets. (They will be permitted to continue ownership and to operate them through lessee dealers.) The refiners who are exempted from the prohibition on operating service stations generally are those classified as small or independent refiners according to the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act.

Small or independent refiners would be subject to a refiner sales rule. Each may sell through its own directly-operated outlets an amount of motor fuel equal to: 1) all motor fuel purchased from others; plus 2) all motor fuel manufactured by the refiner—up to 1978 direct sales total; plus 3) 50% of the excess of motor fuel manufactured above 1978 direct sales total.

##### 3. Wholesale transfer pricing

Effective six months after date of enactment, suppliers of motor fuel will be prohibited from transferring motor fuel to other marketing units within their own companies at prices less than those charged independent wholesale purchasers of their products. Uniform and reasonable surcharges for the use of brand names and related services may

be added to the price charged independent buyers.

##### 4. Open supply

Effective one year after date of enactment, it shall be unlawful for anyone to interfere with the right of a dealer to purchase, store or sell motor fuel products obtained from anyone else. Agreements providing that a dealer shall buy product only from a particular supplier would be permitted only if they specify the dealer's right to purchase product elsewhere if it is not available from the regular supplier. Dealers operating branded stations must provide point-of-sale notice to customers if product being sold was not obtained from the brand-name supplier.

##### 5. Information required

Within three months after date of enactment, refiners must provide the following information to the Federal Trade Commission: (a) total amount of motor fuel sold in refiner-operated outlets during the preceding year; (b) total amount of motor fuel manufactured; (c) total amount of crude oil produced; and (d) total amount of crude oil refined. The FTC shall establish regulations for annual reports. To the extent that the information sought is available from other agencies of the government, the Commission shall waive reporting requirements.

##### 6. Penalties; enforcement

Violation of this Act shall be punishable by fines of up to \$50,000 per month for each service station operated after the deadline for divorcement, and up to \$25,000 for each 25,000 gallons of motor fuel sold in excess of the amount permitted by the refiner sales rule. Violation of the discriminatory pricing provision is punishable by fines of up to \$10,000 per violation. Responsibility for enforcement is given to the FTC. In addition, individuals may bring civil actions against anyone who fails to comply with the Act. ●

#### GASOHOL GROWTH IN SOUTH DAKOTA

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, the results of a recent survey conducted by the South Dakota Auto Club show impressive growth in the number of service stations now selling gasohol in South Dakota. According to the Auto Club survey, more than 125 service stations in 72 South Dakota cities and towns now sell gasohol. The more than 125 stations now selling gasohol in South Dakota represent a 50-percent increase during the last year in the number of stations offering gasohol to motorists in my State. This rapid increase in the number of stations now offering gasohol to the motoring public again demonstrates the remarkable degree of consumer acceptance and support for gasohol, our Nation's first alternative motor fuel.

The South Dakota Auto Club has also reported gasohol sales during the year ending June 30, 1980, accounted for 2 percent of total gasoline sales for



highway use in South Dakota. This important contribution to the motor fuel supply of South Dakota is a significant first step to lessening our dependence on imported energy resources. As the alcohol fuel plants now being planned and already under construction in South Dakota become a reality, gasohol will make an increasingly larger contribution to our State's motor fuel supply and our national goals of increased energy security and expanded renewable fuel production and use.●

# GILMAN CRITICIZES UNITED NATIONS STAMP HONORING "PALESTINIAN RIGHTS"

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 30 the United Nations is scheduled to issue a stamp to publicize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

This action, which came as a result of a vote in the United Nations General Assembly, greatly disturbs me. It represents an example of the inappropriate activities of the driving force behind the stamp, the United Nations Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

This House has made its views on the activities of that Committee known by passing legislation to reduce the U.S. contribution to the United Nations by the amount of our dues which would have been diverted to fund the activities of this Committee and similar activities by other U.N. organs.

During the 97th Congress, Mr. Speaker, I plan to closely scrutinize the activities of the Committee, which has been closely associated with the terrorist Palestine Liberation Organization. I urge those of my colleagues who share my concern in this regard to contact my office so that we may cooperate in this venture.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask permission to insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Secretary-General Waldheim on the matter of the issuance of the stamp in question, and outlining my concerns about the activities of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, as well as a UPI story on the controversy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1981.

HIS EXCELLENCY KURT WALDHEIM,  
Secretary-General of the United Nations,  
United Nations, New York.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY-GENERAL: It has come to my attention that the United Nations will soon issue a commemorative stamp dealing

with the "Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People". I must protest the issuance of the stamp. It represents another inappropriate, propagandistic action by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. This Committee has dealt with the Palestinian question in an arbitrary and one-sided manner, choosing to disregard the rights of the State of Israel and its inhabitants.

The aspect of the Committee that is most disturbing to me is its connection to the Palestine Liberation Organization. The Committee's 1976 report to the Thirty-First session of the General Assembly deemed the Palestine Liberation Organization to be "indispensable in all efforts, deliberations, and conferences on the Middle East which are held under the auspices of the United Nations". The Palestine Liberation Organization has, in fact, clearly demonstrated itself to be diametrically opposed to the noble goals and ideals of the United Nations. I am disheartened that the United Nations seeks to advance the cause of a group which is not peaceable in intent or in method. The Committee's alliance with the Palestine Liberation Organization, a group dedicated to the destruction of the State of Israel, a Member-State of the United Nations, will have deleterious effects on any efforts by the United Nations or its organs to work for peace in the Middle East. A review of the Committee's mandate and actions is of vital importance.

The territory occupied by the former British Mandate of Palestine has been the home to people of many national groups. Indeed, each has "inalienable rights". But these rights must be exercised in a manner acceptable to those of other national groups. These interests of the international community must also be taken into consideration.

It is my understanding that until now, only three United Nations stamps have been issued under a special General Assembly mandate. This latest stamp is, in my view, an inappropriate exercise of propaganda that deals with an inappropriate subject, and I hope that the General Assembly will exercise its powers more judiciously in the future.

The issue of the Palestinians is one of great delicacy which demands a subtle approach. I sincerely hope that the issuance of the United Nations postage stamp marks an end to the offensive manner in which the Committee has operated; heretofore they have only succeeded in lending a sinister meaning to the phrase "the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People."

Very truly yours,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,  
Member of Congress.

UNITED NATIONS (UPI) January 26.—The United Nations Monday defended the issuing of three new U.N. postage stamps commemorating Palestinian rights, which has been attacked by Jewish groups.

The stamps, worth 15 cents in the United States, will be issued Friday at the U.N. offices in New York, Geneva and Vienna. They carry the slogan "Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People" and "United Nations" in English, French and German.

U.N. spokesman Rudolf Stajduhar defended the stamp issue against what he called "recent media and public misunderstanding" in a statement to reporters.

The objections carried by Israeli newspapers and the Jewish press in the United States and Europe assert the United Nations is promoting the Palestine Liberation

Organization, considered a terrorist organization by Israel.

Stajduhar said the issue of the stamps was authorized in the U.N. General Assembly—by a vote of 117-15 with nine abstentions—in December 1979. The United States, Israel, Britain and West Germany were among the countries opposed.

The resolution requested Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim to "direct the United Nations Postal Administration to issue a series of U.N. commemorative stamps to publicize the grave situation and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people."

Stajduhar denied there was any intention "to legitimize terrorism to which the United Nations remains strongly opposed."

"The importance of assuring the rights of the Palestinian people in the process of establishing a permanent peace in the Middle East has been accepted by the vast majority of the world community, including all the parties directly concerned with the question of Palestine," he said.

Proceeds from the sale of the stamps, as in the case of all U.N. stamps, will go to the United Nations general fund for distribution to its members.●

# FOR MORE PRODUCTIVE INVESTMENT

**HON. BILL FRENZEL**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, many Americans today agree that the country faces a shortage of capital available for investment in new plant and equipment, investments which must be made if the United States is to regain its competitive edge over its other trading partners. I believe that one of the reasons we are faced with this capital shortage is the excessive rates at which investment income is taxed.

Currently, all unearned income is taxed at a maximum rate of 70 percent. Put simply, this means that when an individual in the highest tax bracket makes an investment, he only gets to keep less than one-third of his return; the Government takes the rest. When the Government makes more money from a taxpayer's investments than the taxpayer does, there is very little incentive to invest at all. The money would be better invested, in tax-exempt Government issues or into any of a variety of so-called shelters. This flow of capital into such investments merely serves to aggravate the already serious shortage of capital available for productive investment in the private sector.

In order to stimulate more productive investment, and make tax shelters relatively less attractive, I have introduced legislation which would equalize the maximum tax rate for unearned income with that for earned income, currently 50 percent. To lessen the revenue impact on the Treasury of this proposal, my bill would phase in the new rates over a 4-year period. In

the first year after enactment of the bill, the maximum rate would be 65 percent. In the second year, 60 percent. The maximum tax rate would be 55 percent in the third year, and would reach 50 percent in the fourth and final year of the phase-in.

It is important that this legislation be passed during this session of the 97th Congress, so that we can create an incentive for individuals to invest again in the private sector, and we can, in turn, get on with the business of rebuilding our economy.●

#### INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT FOR FOUNDATION PAYOUT LEGISLATION

**HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● **Mr. CONABLE.** Mr. Speaker, present law is rapidly diminishing the capacity of our independent foundations to support the vast array of humanitarian, educational, and other charitable enterprises to which they are committed. Today I am introducing a bill that would eliminate the feature of the tax law which—entirely unintentionally—produces this problem. Passage of this bill is essential if we are to preserve foundations as a vital part of American philanthropy.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF FOUNDATIONS

As a nation we are coming increasingly to see the need for government to strengthen rather than to supplant private institutions and individual initiative. Nowhere is this need so great as with respect to private philanthropy in general, and private foundations in particular.

Private foundations in America play a special and vital role in responding to the needs of our society. Their grants and activities have yielded major dividends in the past. Foundations have provided the research leading to control of diseases like malaria, yellow fever, typhus, and others. Their work produced the phenomenon known throughout the world as the green revolution, which promises major increases in world food supplies. They have provided scholarships supporting millions of American students through school. They have made highly important contributions to the development and continuing support of public television. They have supported local community charitable activities of virtually every sort.

Congress has already enacted detailed rules which insure that private foundations will always be operated for public rather than private benefit. These rules, enacted in 1969, prohibit self-dealing transactions between foundations and related parties, require foundation to make substantial

current distributions to charity, limit foundation involvement in business enterprises, and impose detailed restrictions on the nature of foundations grants. After a decade of experience with these rules—and intensive scrutiny by the Internal Revenue Service—Congress and the American people can be assured that the assets of private foundations are being used in the public interest.

#### IMPACT OF PRESENT LAW ON FUTURE FOUNDATION GRANT CAPABILITY

Generally, current law requires that private foundations distribute annually the greater of an amount equal to 5 percent of the value of their investment assets or their total realized income. This payout rule, adopted in 1969, was intended primarily to deal with certain situations in which foundations maintained unproductive assets and, therefore, distributed little or nothing in charitable grants. It was not intended to eliminate foundations or to diminish their future capabilities to support charitable activities. On the contrary, the legislative history of the 1969 law reflects our clear and repeatedly emphasized concern that the future grantmaking capabilities of foundations be preserved.

However, the past 11 years have brought dramatic reversals of the economic assumptions upon which the payout requirements were based. Inflation continues at rates unimagined in 1969; the real value of equity investments has dropped; and the income yields on many very conservative debt instruments have risen dramatically.

Under these radically different economic conditions, the requirement that foundations distribute their entire current income is producing an effect never intended by Congress—the rapid erosion of future foundation grant capability. Foundations, unlike colleges, universities, and all other tax-exempt institutions, cannot take advantage of the normal steps available to prudent investors to defend themselves—and their beneficiaries—against inflation. Instead, under the present payout rule they face an unrealistic investment constraint which aggravates the effect of inflation.

The real value of foundation assets has fallen sharply in recent years. Data from the Foundation Center show that the value of foundation assets, taking into account both the effect of inflation and the effect of additional contributions, fell by almost 30 percent from 1972 to 1977. A recent Council on Foundations survey found a further 11-percent decline from 1977 to 1979. As these figures indicate, gifts to new and existing foundations have not been nearly large enough to offset the erosion in the real value of foundation assets—and the real ability of foundations to support charitable works. If this trend is permitted to continue, its conclusion is inevitable:

Foundations will for all practical purposes be eliminated from American philanthropy.

#### THE SOLUTION

Under the bill which I introduce today, foundations would continue to be required to distribute an amount equal to at least 5 percent of the value of their investment assets. Studies of the rates of return on stock and bond investment over the past 54 years indicate that foundations cannot reasonably be expected to have real income in excess of this amount. Therefore, preservation of the 5-percent payout requirement will insure that foundations distribute their entire real income to charity, and will thus fully satisfy the objectives for which the payout rule was originally enacted.

At the same time, by eliminating the unrealistic investment constraint imposed on foundations by present law, the proposed payout rule will advance another goal endorsed by Congress in the past, that of preserving the future ability of foundations to meet charitable needs. We must not allow the press of present problems to cause us to forget our obligation to the future. Foundations, like our natural environment, are an important and fragile resource, and we must act now to preserve their grant capability for the future. Passage of this bill will be a major step in that direction.●

#### TRIBUTE TO FRANK HOOD

**HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● **Mr. HEFNER.** Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a key official of the Veterans' Administration has retired. I am referring to Frank R. Hood, who has served the VA for a total of 35 years, during which period he served almost 23 years as Director of Information Services.

While I did not have the opportunity to know Frank Hood personally, I can report that he was held in the highest esteem by members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee with whom he worked closely on veterans' programs and legislative matters. One of the highest compliments attributed to Mr. Hood is the unprecedented record of having been appointed and reappointed by six consecutive Administrators of Veterans' Affairs. During Frank Hood's long period of service to the Nation's veterans, he was called upon to explain and inform most of the benefits and assistance programs Congress has approved for veterans and their families. Frank Hood's expertise and professionalism will be missed by the Veterans' Administration, and those on our committee, who



worked with him on programs of mutual interest.

I take this opportunity to extend every best wish to Frank Hood for a well-earned retirement, and I know that he will continue to serve veterans and their families as he has done so well during his many years at the Veterans' Administration. ●

### TRIPLE ANNIVERSARY AT FATHER BAKER'S

**HON. HENRY J. NOWAK**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, 1981 will mark several anniversaries associated with a great institution in Lackawanna, N.Y.—Our Lady of Victory Homes of Charity, a complex providing a variety of social and health services that is popularly known as "Father Baker's" after the extraordinary priest who dedicated his life to helping the needy.

The homes were made famous by Father Nelson H. Baker, who was known as "The Padre of the Poor."

This year, which also marks the 45th anniversary of Father Baker's death, will also include observances of:

The 125th anniversary of service to Lackawanna and Father Baker's by the Sisters of St. Joseph.

The 75th anniversary of Our Lady of Victory Infants Home.

The 25th anniversary of Baker Hall, a facility serving troubled adolescents.

The enclosed articles from the Buffalo Courier Express and the Buffalo News detail some of the celebrations that are being planned to observe these anniversaries.

Father Baker's is synonymous with community service, extending a helping hand to the needy—the handicapped babies, the unwed mothers, the young boys judged to be delinquent or potentially delinquent.

Father Baker's is a living monument to the vision of a dedicated priest who labored for nearly six decades to help thousands upon thousands of people.

By his life and his example, Father Baker demonstrated that one person can make a difference and that faith, hope, and charity are interwoven virtues.

Today, the charitable complex in Lackawanna, N.Y., that commemorates him and his service continues on a day-to-day basis to help improve the quality of life for our citizens.

It is a genuine pleasure, therefore, to join with so many other well wishers in congratulating the more than 1,200 staff members of Father Baker's and the Sisters of St. Joseph as they mark these milestones of service this year. I know I echo the sentiments of many of my fellow citizens in wishing this

fine institution continued success in the decades and decades ahead.

Newspaper articles follow:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Jan. 21, 1981]

#### OUR LADY OF VICTORY HOMES TO MARK THREE ANNIVERSARIES

The year 1981 is a very big year for Our Lady of Victory Homes of Charity (Father Baker's).

Marking this year's celebrations will be the 25th anniversary of Baker Hall, a service for troubled adolescents; 75 years for Our Lady of Victory Infant Home, which serves pregnant women and handicapped children and a special honoring of the Sisters of St. Joseph (Diocese of Buffalo) for 125 years of service to Lackawanna and the Father Baker child care agencies.

#### OUR LADY IMAGE ON CHAIN

A key chain bearing the image of Our Lady of Victory and noting the year's celebrations has just been made available to the general public.

Measuring two inches by one and one-quarter inches, the emblem and ring are cast in metal with a "brass like" finish.

The medals are available from the administrative offices of Father Baker's at 780 Ridge Road in Lackawanna, N.Y. 14218. An offering of \$2 (\$2.50 if mailed) is requested.

The Rev. Robert C. Wurtz, executive vice president and treasurer of the homes says, "There will be a series of celebrations ranging from May to November. Our kickoff celebration will be May 1, 1981 at 7:30 p.m. at Our Lady of Victory Basilica. At that time we plan to especially honor the Sisters of St. Joseph who have served these agencies and the poor with such dedication. We are expecting over 1,000 people to join Bishop Edward Head, Msgr. Robert Murphy of the Basilica and me for a celebration of the Mass and a reception at Baker Hall School."

#### OPEN HOUSES PLANNED

"During the balance of the year we will be having open houses at our child care agencies, offering a first annual award for service to youth and honoring our employees and donors who have sustained us throughout the years."

Father Wurtz also noted, "We have been truly blessed by Our Lady of Victory and her Divine Son, this is a year in which we would like to publicly acknowledge Our Lady of Victory, the sisters, our employees and our dear devoted donors for all their help."

The homes were made famous by Father Nelson H. Baker who was known throughout the East as "The Padre of the Poor." The year 1981 also marks the 45th anniversary of Father Baker's death.

[From the Buffalo News, Jan. 10, 1981]

#### THREE ANNIVERSARIES HIGHLIGHT YEAR AT FATHER BAKER'S

Plans are under way for a six-month celebration of triple anniversaries this year at Our Lady of Victory Homes of Charity in Lackawanna, better known as Father Baker's.

This year marks the 125th anniversary of service to Lackawanna and Father Baker's by the Sisters of St. Joseph. It also is the 75th anniversary of Our Lady of Victory Infant's Home and the 25th anniversary of Baker Hall, a facility for troubled adolescents.

The Rev. Robert C. Wurtz, executive vice president and treasurer of the homes, said

the triple anniversary will be launched with a Mass at 7:30 p.m. May 1 in Our Lady of Victory Basilica.

"At that time," he said, "we plan to especially honor the Sisters of St. Joseph, who have served these agencies and the poor with such dedication."

"We are expecting more than 1,000 people to join Bishop Edward D. Head, Monsignor Robert E. Murphy, pastor of the basilica, and me for the celebration of the Mass and a reception at Baker Hall School."

Among the other observances being planned are Youth Day, May 22, with an open house in the Infant's Home and Baker Hall, and a commemoration on Father Baker Day, July 26, the 45th anniversary of the death of the renowned priest, he said.

As a part of its triple anniversary celebration, a commemorative key chain has been commissioned. The emblem is embossed with the image of Our Lady of Victory and denotes the 1981 anniversaries.

The key chains are available from the Ridge Road administrative offices. An offering of \$2 is requested.

Our Lady of Victory Homes offer a wide range of services for infants, adolescents and expectant mothers. It also includes Our Lady of Victory Hospital. ●

#### EMANUEL CELLER

**HON. PETER A. PEYSER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1981

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my other Members of the House who had the opportunity of serving in the Congress with Emanuel Celler. His courage to fight for what he felt was right was undeniable and his work on civil rights will certainly go down in history as one of his major accomplishments. His ability to make people laugh at some of their problems, and his general good humor was certainly one of his great assets. We shall all miss him. ●

#### FACING UP TO TERRORISM

**HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Reagan pledged to the American people, and in particular to our freed hostages, that every means of protection the United States can offer will be afforded to the men and women who serve our country overseas. Moreover, the President warned the world that in the future terrorists should be aware of swift and effective American retribution. I fully agree with the President's remarks and encourage the new administration to review the entire question of what to do in response to future acts of terrorism. As a recent editorial in the Washington Post stated:

The old relaxed ways of dealing with terrorism will no longer do. Responsibility for it must be fixed, and new policies, operational and political, must be devised.

To be sure, modern terrorism is not a national policy tool and it will no doubt continue to be used by a number of nations in the 1980's. Moreover, as a substitute for traditional diplomacy, terrorism will have a tremendous impact upon U.S. strategic interests as in the case of Iran. As Dr. Ray S. Cline, director, Georgetown Center for Strategic Studies, pointed out in a presentation at the Jerusalem Conference on International Terrorism in July of 1979:

\*\*\* The truth is that the use of physical and psychological force, involving intimidation, political coercion, assassination, and wanton destruction of property, has become part of the arsenal of geopolitics and will be an important ingredient of international conflict in the 1980's.

Contemporary terrorism largely began when the Soviet Union accepted the Palestine Liberation Organization as a major political instrument in the Mideast, and began to subsidize many of its terrorist activities. There is no doubt that Soviet support for international terrorism often through such surrogates as the Cubans and the East Germans provide a suitable substitute to traditional warfare and as a result threaten free societies, including our own. International terrorism, however, can also transcend simply Soviet design, as evidenced by several hundred terrorist groups who differ in ideology, size, composition, and group purpose.

In the past, the United States has been affected by various terrorist incidents, both here and abroad as evidenced by spectacular airline hijackings, the killing of U.S. representatives in the Sudan and Afghanistan, as well as the more recent Hanafi Muslim takeover in the Nation's Capital. But in those cases, no nation supported the terrorists which was, as we all know, not the situation in Iran.

The terrorism in Tehran was, to say the least, unique to the American experience. Moreover, it was representative of what could become a more commonplace incident in the decade ahead if we and our friends are not sufficiently prepared.

With increasing U.S. strategic interests in the Third World regions, a growing awareness of the interdependency of all people, and the advent of modern communication which can televise events around the world, terrorism has come of age. As a result, the United States must know how to cope with a sizable terrorist threat, and in this regard, the tragic experiences of our former 53 American hostages contain lessons which can serve as the basis for future American efforts to deter terrorism.

As the ranking minority member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee,

and its Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs, I am preparing for hearings on Iran which may, among other things, explore the administration's compliance with the War Powers Act, the development and implementation of international security plans to prevent and/or predict hostage situations, as well as the need to examine crisis management efforts, including an assessment of what changes in organization and personnel are needed in the areas of hostage negotiation and conflict resolution.

As Robert Kupperman and Darrell Trent have pointed out in their book entitled "Terrorism: Threat, Reality, Response," concerning various aspects of a terrorist situation, authority is dispersed over a number of U.S. Government departments in a manner which is convenient to handling daily concerns, but which may impede efforts to deal swiftly with a crisis. In order to more effectively cope with a terrorist incident, I would encourage the administration to improve the capabilities of the Departments of State and Defense, while creating a small interagency working group which could effectively deal with a crisis. Moreover, I have long felt that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), which Mr. Kupperman now directs, should be provided with a mandate to manage domestically disruptive terrorist acts as a part of civil defense preparedness. Terrorism in the 1980's may affect us both here and abroad, and we should be prepared for it.

Most importantly, in order for the United States to better combat terrorism, our weakened intelligence system must be improved, including better coordination and exchange of information among free nations. In short, effective intelligence is our major line of defense against terrorism. Moreover, our Embassies also must be better hardened by limiting access to buildings and having them equipped with such mob control devices as smoke machines and banana foam, the latter being a slippery substance which would spread throughout specific floor areas of the Embassy. In order to deter any future terrorist incidents, we must also have the paramilitary capability to perform rescue operations. This capability must be second to none if we are to truly guarantee the security and the freedom of American personnel abroad. Last, but certainly not least, the Congress must adopt tough antiterrorism legislation. In this regard, the Congress and the new administration must work closely so that we Americans are sufficiently prepared to deal with terrorism swiftly, decisively, effectively, and, if necessary, with retribution.

Never again should we Americans tolerate tales of terrorist torture and torment.●

## SOVIET GRAIN EMBARGO UNFAIR TO OUR FARMERS

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, along with colleagues Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. BEREUTER, a bill to end the current Soviet grain embargo.

I hope this bill will not have to be enacted into law; I hope that President Reagan will fulfill his pledge to end the embargo.

The embargo, while having some negative repercussions for the Soviets, has not had its intended effect—85,000 Soviet troops are still in Afghanistan. Furthermore, the Soviets were able to import 31 of the 34 million metric tons of grain they had planned to import.

Even though the U.S. Government spent about \$3 billion to try to offset the effect of the grain embargo, farm income declined 40 percent in the second quarter of 1980—and the embargo was certainly a major factor in that decline.

The American farmers, who make up only 2.8 percent of our population, were made to bear the brunt of the embargo through uncertain markets and lowered prices. The recently completed structure of agriculture study confirms what we all know—that owning and operating a family farm is a rapidly diminishing profession and that our farm policies have contributed to this demise. The grain embargo is yet another one of our policies which has harmed this struggling profession. It is ridiculous to consciously pursue a strategy which has not worked and which targets the economic burden to a group least able to absorb more economic loss. Should an embargo prove necessary for compelling national security reasons at some future time, the economic burden must be shared more equitably by all segments of society.●

## CAPITATION GRANT ASSISTANCE

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that addresses a problem confronting several medical schools as a result of responding to two Government programs. I introduced this bill in the last



Congress, and it was incorporated in the health manpower bills that failed to be enacted.

One of these schools, Loyola University Stritch School of Medicine, serves the Chicago area. Loyola's Stritch School of Medicine increased its enrollment over the past 10 years in response to several Federal programs, and had a class size of 130 in 1972.

The school received a 7-year grant from the Veterans' Administration which obligated them to admit 13 additional first-year students. Therefore, the school had two separate commitments to two different Federal agencies.

Under the terms of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Stritch School of Medicine had obligated itself to a class size of 130 students. In 1975, they accepted an additional 13 students that obligated them under the conditions of the 7-year Veterans' Administration grant.

The school received Veterans' Administration approval to terminate entry of new students for the year, 1979-80. However, the Department of Health and Human Services notified Stritch that under the terms of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the school had to maintain in the year the same enrollment that it had in 1976, that is 143. The school complied, but with the failure to enact the health manpower bill in the 96th Congress, Stritch finds that the entering class for 1981-82 must also be 143 in order to qualify for capitation grant funds.

This bill allows the Department of Health and Human Services to exclude increases in enrollment due to Veterans' Administration programs for purposes of determining first-year enrollment requirements for capitation grant assistance.

The bill follows:

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide that enrollment increases made by schools of medicine to receive assistance from the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered in determining if the schools have met the first-year enrollment requirements for capitation grant assistance under title VII of such Act

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 771(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 295f-1(a)(1)) is amended by inserting after "first-year enrollment" the following: "(determined without regard to any increase in such enrollment made by the school to enable it to qualify for financial assistance under chapter 82 of title 38, United States Code)".* ●

## FORMER HOUSE MEMBER ADDRESSES RELIGIOUS LEADERS

### HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest Members ever to serve in this House was Representative Jerry Voorhis of California. He was defeated in a House election by Richard Nixon. Had Jerry Voorhis won that election, our history would be significantly different.

There is no better way to judge the contrast than an appeal that Jerry Voorhis has sent to leaders of various Christian denominations.

You do not have to agree with every word in his appeal to recognize that there is both wisdom and compassion in a message that somehow gets lost in all the political oratory and bombast that surrounds us.

I urge my colleagues to read this message which is specifically addressed to leaders of Christian denominations, but in fact is addressed to the consciences of all Americans of whatever religious persuasion.

#### A MESSAGE TO CHRISTIAN CHURCHES THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

The inscription on our American money says: "In God We Trust".

But we don't. Instead we place our trust in the most frightful arsenal of military weapons known to history. We do this despite the fact that we know full well that if those weapons are ever used it will be in a war that will kill most of the people of the world and destroy the Earth as the home for life, which God created it to be.

A nuclear war, whoever "wins" it will be a war not between nations but a war against God Almighty Himself and his whole creation. For it will destroy his greatest and highest work—human kind. Those who do not die will be demented, distorted beings, their descendants some sort of mutation monsters.

Despite our knowledge of these facts we, a supposedly Christian people, go on listening to strident voices urging even more horrendous weapons, advocating a tough, threatening foreign policy—even suggesting that a nuclear war might be waged if our supply of oil were threatened.

Most inexcusable of all are the voices which say that the United States could win a nuclear war and that our people could survive it. There is no competent scientific evidence to support such demagoguery.

Yet in the election of November 1980 at least 5 incumbent Senators whose records were ones of conscientious responsibility in foreign affairs generally, who sought to curb the arms race, who supported Salt II and who voted for the Panama Canal Treaty were defeated by opponents who took exactly the opposite position, who advocated more not less military confrontation and who were supported by an organization that called itself a Christian "Moral Majority."

Today the best resources of mind and material are devoted all over the world to the building of armament, while a billion people

suffer from preventable hunger. Especially is this true in the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

Willing workers are denied the basic human right to work and earn a living. One reason for this is that the best of dwindling natural resources are being poured into ever-increasing armament. What should, according to God's plan, be used to save life, is used instead for its possible destruction.

The so-called super powers lead this march to destruction but even the poorest nations in the world follow their dangerous lead.

In this time of looming scarcities, when sharing should be the rule, nonetheless those who are powerful among men and nations attempt to maintain their privilege by force and threaten to fight wars to gain for the selfish satisfaction of this one generation a lion's share of those fast-dwindling resources.

Whereas the technology for the development of new clean inexhaustible nonpolluting sources of energy is known and tested that development is neglected and given a pittance so that military appropriations can be increased beyond all reason. Were this not the case, were such new energy sources developed with all the fervor and commitment that is given to weapon development, there would be no need to fight wars over the last remaining deposits of petroleum.

It is truly said that man's extremity is God's opportunity. Which means that when humanity faces ultimate dangers and is baffled by problems that appear insolvable, then at such times religious people begin to open their minds and hearts to the guidance of God and begin in earnest to seek to do His Will.

There can be no doubt that these are days of man's extremity.

And there is some evidence that Christian people will turn to their Faith for guidance and follow that guidance wherever it may lead. To that end this message is sent to your Church.

In this time of ultimate danger there are those who are giving God the opportunity. There are increasing numbers of Christians who are willing to risk for peace. There are those who are saying that they do not desire to have the utterly false "security" of huge armaments to "protect" them—when they know that no such protection is any longer possible by military means.

These fully awakened Christians are seeing that God can never bless an economic system that rewards the rich and exploits the poor.

They are seeing that hope lies only in seeking peace and justice according to the Will of their Creator.

They read even in the Old Testament commandments of God to put trust in Him and not in arms. And they look at the entire life, teaching and self-sacrifice of Jesus with clear eyes and understand that nothing could be more contrary to His every precept than the war system as it enslaves people today.

These deeply committed Christians call upon their nation not to pursue further the lethal arms race but instead to risk for peace by offering an end to our own development of any more weaponry and challenging the rest of the world to follow our lead.

They place their trust in God and His guidance and they know full well where that leads. All the effort, all the resources, all the wisdom, they say, that their nation possesses must be put into a relentless drive for economic justice, compassion, and mercy

toward all human beings and to the building of a structure of peace that can make possible the wiping of all nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

Only so, these Christians see and believe, can God's will be done. Only so can the children of God survive on planet Earth. If we must die, they say, let us die in Faith not in disobedience to the clear will and purpose of the Almighty Father of life. Fervently it is to be hoped that the example of these men and women will be followed by increasing numbers of professing Christians. It is also to be hoped that in these critical days of ultimate decision, our Churches and Church Councils will not hesitate to give full support to organizations and movements, within and even outside the religious community, which are devoted to the cause of world peace under law, and of disarmament to that end.●

#### TRIBUTE TO BOB WIRE

### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, last month, Detective Cpl. Robert J. Wire retired from the Ventura Police Department following 26 years of devoted service to the citizens of the city of San Buenaventura, Calif.

Bob Wire began working for the Ventura Police Department on December 12, 1954, at a time when there were 32 officers on the department. He has seen the agency grow to 90 officers today.

Bob came to the Ventura Police Department by way of Oxnard Air Force Base. When the Air Force transferred him to the Oxnard area, Bob decided he liked this part of the country better than the Midwest, and settled here.

He has worked in nearly all areas of the police department. After beginning in patrol, he rode enforcement motorcycle for 8 years. He was promoted to detective on November 1, 1963, and this title changed to corporal on August 11, 1980. His many assignments have included working burglary, checks, auto theft, narcotics, warrants, and traffic investigation.

Bob Wire's many community activities have included membership in the Avenue Lions Club (past president), the Poinsettia Masonic Lodge, and the Ventura Shrine Club. He was also instrumental in working with the police boys club and getting it into a full-time organization with the Boys Club of America in Ventura.

Bob and his wife, Betty, have been married for 29 years and they have three children—Bob Jr., Bonnie, and Cynthia.

On behalf of the citizens of Ventura and the Members of the House of Representatives, I would like to extend our gratitude and very best wishes to Bob Wire and to his family.●

#### TRIBUTE TO ANDRE GALERNE

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district, there lies an oasis away from the hustle and bustle of the Bronx—yet it is in the Bronx. I refer to City Island, where the people are hardworking and fiercely independent, an area where pride in neighborhood is evident everywhere. On November 7, the City Island Chamber of Commerce, at its annual dinner dance paid tribute to a true friend of City Island, its president, and my good friend, Andre Galerne.

Andre was honored for his work as president of the chamber. Yet in reality, the people of City Island have had Andre Galerne as a friend for many years. In 1971, the International Underwaters Contractors, Inc., was established on City Island. Andre Galerne who today is the distinguished president of the IUC group, has followed a policy of buying their materials only from City Island merchants or as Galerne himself says "I support local merchants. We need to bring business here so residents will not leave the island to shop."

I have known Andre for a number of years and have found him to be a most educated and interesting person. He is a man of feeling and of commitment. He deserved all the accolades which he received at the dinner.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert an article entitled "Probing the Depths of Andre Galerne" as printed in the December 1980 edition of the City Island Current.

#### PROBING THE DEPTHS OF ANDRE GALERNE

(By Maria Gil)

With a mixture of Gallic insouciance and robust American enthusiasm, Andre Galerne presides over International Underwater Contractors, an organization as colorful and multi-tentacled as Captain Nemo's Giant Squid. He sits baronially in a tilt-back swivel chair and surveys "la vie Americaine" from I.U.C.'s office at 222 Fordham Street.

"You know," he says, "I first wanted to be a test pilot, to go up, up, up." (A sweeping arm gesture.) "But now . . ." The arm reverses position, the shoulders hunch up in a shrug, and fathoms of underwater adventure are expressed in a bright-eyed, dolphin smile.

Mr. Galerne was born in Paris in 1926. At 17 he joined the Resistance, and later the French Air Force, but was thwarted in his dreams of an airborne career by the ravaged condition of post-war aviation in France.

He also served as a frogman with the French Navy, which led to his meeting Jacques Cousteau and joining the diving team aboard the oceanographic research vessel Calypso.

#### HIS FIRST DIVING BUSINESS

After the war, Mr. Galerne cast bread upon the water, so to speak and founded Sogetram (Societe Generale de Travaux Mari-

times et Fluviaux), the world's first international organization of professional frogmen.

"Young people were shell-shocked, traumatized by the war," he recalls. "To help, I became active with the Boy Scouts. I took the older ones on physical explorations, spelunking, canoeing. Sometimes, deep inside a cave, we'd find water so mysterious, it seemed very wrong not to go down and explore it. We got some aqualungs and we learned how."

Mr. Galerne developed expertise with the scuba, unknown during those days of heavy diving suits and cumbersome copper helmets.

The first big break for Sogetram came in 1952, when Mr. Galerne and his partners surveyed the freezing murky depths of a crater lake for Electricite de France. From then on, he says, "It was no job too big or too small. We will do anything anywhere underwater."

It's a satisfied, dapper Galerne who puts his feet up on this desk and grins. "We studied everything we could about diving. We wanted to be the best. I remember we even got a U.S. Navy training manual, and then couldn't read it because it was in English."

#### I.U.C. BEGINS

Canada became the first overseas arm of Sogetram in 1958, and the name International Underwater Contractors was born. In 1962, a branch was established in New York City. "We chose New York because all the big oil companies were based here. It used to be excellent for business, but now . . ." he runs his agitated fingers across his forehead. "That Lindsay, he ruined the city. All the companies, they leave, move right out. And business here . . ." Another shrug, deprecatory head shaking. Volumes in a gesture.

A most Latin man is Andre Galerne, in the Mediterranean sense, and a man of paradox. Clearly given to extremes of feeling, he talks to a man phoning from New Orleans to sell a boat. "Yes, yes, my friend. We will look at your boat. We will be happy to see it." And then, with predatory charm, "But of course, you are asking far too much."

He appears at times ill at ease, a man preoccupied with much, yet conversely always willing to shoulder another burden. The list of organizations both here and abroad of which he is a member or officer (including our own Chamber of Commerce) is staggering. One gets the impression of energy and action fueled by a mind that hums like a computer. The quintessential buccaneer turned businessman; the fullback in a pin-stripe suit and Sulka tie.

#### "I AM A BUSINESSMAN"

Are there any regrets? Would he rather be out on the Calypso with Cousteau, his old friend and partner?

"I am a businessman," he says. "I own I.U.C. 100 percent, and it is important to me that the image of businessmen, especially American ones, is positive. Historically, business has had negative connotations for people. Chambers of commerce become social clubs rather than forces for community change and growth."

"I came to this country and became naturalized, even though my wife and children chose to remain citizens of France, because I believe in it, in democracy and the free system of capitalism."

There is more than money to capitalism, Mr. Galerne believes. For the system to survive, he feels it must be responsible to itself and to the society which gave it birth. "The



people of the Third World view us through television eyes, unrealistically, like gangsters, exploiters. We must change that impression. Business has a trust placed in it which it cannot betray."

There is the spirit of the old cave explorer as Mr. Galerne speaks, the fearless crater diver. The company head who can afford to sit back and rest on considerable laurels does no such thing.

#### I.U.C.'S ACHIEVEMENTS

I.U.C. and Mr. Galerne not only developed tri-gas (Helium/Nitrogen Oxygen) for more cost-efficient short dives, but pioneered safe and practical procedures for long-term deep dives, and the use of underwater closed-circuit color T.V. for salvage diving.

Innovation and diversity are evidenced by the formation ten years ago of I.U.C. International, a separate company serving the offshore drilling industry and employing the use of manned freeswimming submarines like I.U.C.'s own Pisces VI.

The Undersea Medical Society was pleased to have Mr. Galerne serve as committee chairman in a study it undertook for the National Institute of Safety and Health to insure the well-being of divers in the ever-expanding quest for alternative subsea energy.

The North Sea Hyperbaric Center in Aberdeen, Scotland which was created to provide emergency medical treatment for divers under pressure, owes its conception, design and construction to none other than Andre Galerne.

#### SOME OF HIS COMPLAINTS

He wants to talk about taxes and how unjust they are to American businessmen. "It costs me \$15 or 20 thousand a year just to live in New York State." And about laws which mandate the use of American-made equipment on overseas jobs but forbid hiring American workers. "The whole thing is foolish. It is bad for good will and also discriminates against the businessman. Do you know that I cannot bring my wife with me on a business trip because of the added expense even though I would welcome the companionship and even though it would present a proper image abroad? No, no, according to these American laws, the wife is a hindrance. But the secretary, she can come for free! Completely deductible! Silly, non?"

#### HIS FEELINGS FOR CITY ISLAND

He is more generous where City Island is concerned. I.U.C. and the diving school need accessible waterfront and Mr. Galerne likes a community where he does not have to "carry a machine gun to get to my car at night," he says, he cites many needed improvements which are dear to his heart, like the return of small businesses, a public fishing pier and mini-van service to help control the traffic problem.

"I.U.C. buys from Island merchants whenever possible. I support local merchants. We need to bring business here so residents will not leave the Island to shop. That will be death of us. Those misguided people who removed the City Island signs are insulationists. They do not belong to this century."

But Andre Galerne most definitely does. He speaks for a revitalizing force in the American economy with business forging the way, investing in itself, providing new jobs, a new sense of pride.

It's a proud man who rises, shakes hands, bows slightly. One final question elicits that he has four children and lives in Larchmont with Jeannine, his wife of 31 years.

"I am a lucky man," he admits somewhat ruefully. Encore the Gallic shrug. "Happy?"

Yes, I suppose, but most assuredly, very, very, lucky."●

### BILL TO REQUIRE CBO TO PREPARE ESTIMATES OF COSTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

#### HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today I joined with my colleagues, Mr. LUNDINE and Mr. ZEFERETTI, to introduce the State and Local Government Cost Estimate Act of 1981. This legislation would require the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to estimate the costs incurred by State and local governments in carrying out every significant bill or resolution reported in the House or Senate. Under current law, CBO prepares estimates of the costs to the Federal Government only.

Section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 does require CBO to "the extent practicable, to prepare for each bill or resolution of a public character reported by any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate \* \* \* an estimate of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out such a bill or resolution in the fiscal year in which it is to become effective and in each of the 4 fiscal years following such fiscal year, together with the basis for each such estimate."

CBO has gradually implemented this section, adding more bills each year as it built up capability to handle the large volume of reported legislation. In fiscal year 1980, CBO did cost estimates of 830 bills, which represented 98 percent of the bills reported with spending impact.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 required each committee to provide a cost estimate with their reported bills. At that time, the estimates submitted by each committee were not standardized and were of varying quality and reliability. Section 403 required cost estimates to be made by CBO—a professional, nonpartisan organization with independent estimating capability.

The time has come to extend the cost estimate requirement to State and local governments. As communities try to cope with inflation, growing demands for services, and dwindling revenue sources, we here at the Federal level must be much more cognizant of the intergovernmental ramifications of our legislation. Many times Federal mandates are cumbersome and costly to State and local governments who devote many man-hours to meet federally imposed requirements for aid; in some cases the return is not worth the amount of Federal aid received.

For instance, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act will cost San Jose \$100,000 in unanticipated costs in fiscal year 1981 to meet the regulations requiring access for the handicapped to public buildings. I strongly support this provision, but the point I wish to make is the city had not planned or budgeted for this contingency. Under this legislation, State and local governments will have some indication in advance of the cost of federally imposed regulations and can plan for them. Another more substantial expense is the \$7.8 million local cost to San Jose for the tertiary water treatment plant required by Public Law 92-500. This is a heavy burden for any local government and should be planned for well in advance. By having the cost impact to State and local governments available at the time Congress is considering the legislation, an assessment can be made by Congress whether the requirements are unnecessarily burdensome or time consuming. In some cases Congress may decide to change the legislation to make the requirements more realistic.

While there has been considerable discussion over the past few years concerning the issues of Federal constraints on locals, I am afraid analysis has been short and rhetoric long. Enactment of the State and Local Government Cost Estimate Act of 1981 will better equip us to undertake detailed analysis rather than rhetorical speculation.

Because of the diversity of population, financial conditions, and structure of governments among the States, the cost of legislation may vary widely. The estimates of cost to States which this bill would require could not possibly factor in all of those differences State by State, but it would be possible, according to CBO, to prepare reasonable approximations of the costs to the State and local sector as a whole, using estimates of average impacts on various categories of jurisdictions.

It seems ironic that after the decade of "New Federalism" and consolidated block grants, that we must once again raise the issue of excessively compartmentalized arrays of Federal programs. I am not taking issue with the nearly 490 categorical grant programs, but simply with the fact that no matter how justifiable they are individually, collectively they present an unworkable and confusing mass of programs, each with its own conditions and requirements and deadlines.

Joint hearings by the Task Force on Budget Process and Task Force on State and Local Governments were held on this legislation during the 96th Congress. The hearings further emphasized the impact of the myriad and often contradicting Federal requirements on State and local govern-

ments. As a result of these hearings, the Task Force on Budget Process and the Task Force on State and Local Governments recommended to the Committee on the Budget to endorse the bill.

This legislation has been endorsed by the Council of State Governments, the International City Managers Association, the National Association of Counties, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Governors Association, the National League of Cities, the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

This legislation is a reasonable approach to the underlying purpose of fiscal responsibility in the Congressional Budget Act, and I would strongly urge that Members of the House support this bill. ●

REMARKS OF NORMAN Y. MINETA TO THE 79TH CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN ROAD & TRANSPORTATION BUILDERS ASSOCIATION

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the remarks which our colleague, Congressman NORMAN Y. MINETA, delivered at a recent meeting of the American Road & Transportation Builders Association. Congressman MINETA's speech makes a strong case for continued investment in the capital plant of our transportation system. As he points out, our transportation system is basic to the entire economy and if we allow the system to deteriorate the effects will be far reaching.

Congressman MINETA also discusses the need for continued public investment in the development of major airports. He supports renewal of the airport development assistance program (ADAP) in which airport development is funded from a trust fund financed entirely by fees paid by users of the airport system. Congressman MINETA points out that ADAP is the most efficient and reliable system of financing airport development and that there are legal barriers which prevent many major airports from financing development through other means.

Congressman MINETA's remarks will be of great interest to all who are concerned with the future of our national transportation system.

REMARKS TO THE 79TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN ROAD AND TRANSPORTATION BUILDERS ASSOCIATION BY CONGRESSMAN NORMAN Y. MINETA, JANUARY 24, 1981, HOUSTON, TEX.

It's a real pleasure to be here with you this morning, with this distinguished panel,

to discuss what I consider to be some of the major challenges confronting us as a nation.

We were asked to comment on the new Washington scene, so before I flew down to Houston, I looked around to see what was new about Washington.

It didn't look much different.

The Republicans were everywhere on the upswing, of course, buoyed by having taken over the White House and the Senate. But if you look beyond that change in party labels, you find that the hard realities haven't changed, the tough choices haven't changed, and the factors that eliminated all the easy solutions haven't left town either.

I think you'll find that once the Inaugural hangover has worn off, the new Washington scene will be face to face with the same hard tasks the old Washington scene had to face.

One of the hardest of those tasks, and one that you will be hearing a great deal about in the coming months, is the task of balancing the Federal budget. Don't let anyone's campaign rhetoric deceive you. It won't be any easier this year than it was last year.

In the weeks ahead, President Reagan will be attempting eleventh-hour cuts in the budget just proposed by President Carter, in order to balance the budget, or to make room for tax cuts, or some combination of the two.

The politicians are under pressure from their constituents to cut expenditures, without of course cutting any of the worthy programs which benefit that particular constituent. Add up all these constituents and you have a clear mandate to cut spending without cutting any services. And many of those politicians won their office by promising that they could do just that. They've made the oldest promise in the book—something for nothing—and it got to be the oldest because, no matter how many times it proves false, it always seems to play well one more time.

But how to cut expenditures without cutting services, or without at least appearing to cut services?

In that bind, politicians from city councilmen to Presidents are prey to a constant temptation, the temptation to slide the necessary cuts over onto the capital side of the budget, where the benefits of that spending—and therefore the pain of the cut—are generally several years in the future.

This gives the appearance that you can cut spending today without cutting services.

The tragedy is that for the sake of short-term appearances, we end up trifling with long-term investment in the basic infrastructure on which all economic vitality in this country ultimately depends.

Now I am not here to minimize the importance of cutting the budget and of controlling Federal spending. As a Member of the House Budget Committee, I've devoted much of the last four years to the very painful process that is essential to regaining control of the budget. And I am not arguing that the capital construction programs in the Federal budget should be held sacrosanct at budget cutting time. Everybody is going to have to feel some belt-tightening.

But my message to you today is that we cannot allow others to load their budget-cutting disproportionately on the Federal capital-construction programs which are our investment in the economic future of this nation. We cannot allow the Federal government to be cavalier with badly needed ongoing capital reinvestment in this nation's infrastructure. This is one area where the health and vitality of the private sector depends on an active public sector.

As an example, there has been a great deal of discussion about "reindustrialization". Many have called attention to the need for massive private capital investment in the traditional basic industries in which this nation once excelled. Some of these industries, such as coal, steel, auto, and shipbuilding have fallen to weak competitive positions due to a lack of continuing investment to keep their plants and technology current. But what good does it do to make those kinds of investments if we don't also make the investments needed in port facilities to handle coal, steel, and ships; in the highways, bridges and rail systems needed to move those goods and people; and in the transit systems and airports needed to keep those workforces mobile and productive? Reindustrialization, like industry itself, will go no further than the transportation network which supports it.

There has also been a great deal of discussion about the need for private capital formation, the need for capital to be consistently generated to meet the essential investment needs of the private sector. But the same needs apply equally to those segments of our economic life which are in the public sector, and these are mainly the transportation systems upon which all industrial activity depend. Government in general, and, because of the interstate nature of transportation, the Federal Government in particular, has played a key role in the capital formation needed to keep these essential transportation links growing apace with private sector needs. A variety of capital formation devices have been used at various times and in various modes: Trust Funds, dedicated user taxes, general funds, contract authority, annual appropriations, and so on. But whatever the device, the purpose has been the same: to make possible the continuous investment and reinvestment in our transportation systems and other public facilities so that these can continue to meet the needs of our economy for years to come.

In too many quarters, there has come to be a quick and facile belief that if it's public sector spending, then the private sector would be better off without it. In many instances, that is just not true. And, in the case of transportation, that statement is a potentially disastrous falsehood.

In aviation, for example, the industry has a tradition of concern for future aircraft capacity and productivity. There is considerable thought given to how the capital can be provided, over a period of many years into the future, to create the kind of aircraft fleets needed by the airlines. But too often the questions of airport capacity, of airway capacity, and of the capital investment necessary to provide for them, are just left to somebody else. They are thought of as a separate issue. And that is a mistake, because fleet capacity and airport capacity and airway capacity are all part of a single system and we ought to deal with them as a system. We shouldn't be deceived into a fragmented approach to capacity issues simply because on the fleet side we have private capital investment, while on the airport and airway side the public sector is heavily involved in the capital investment effort.

The costs of underinvestment certainly do not observe the boundary between the private and public sectors, as a recently published study by the Aerospace Industries Association clearly shows. They found that airport and airway congestion and delays cost the airlines dearly in increased fuel and other operating costs. A study of just three of the U.S. airlines (American, Eastern, and



United) for just one year (1977) showed that delays cost them 237 million gallons of fuel wasted and a total of \$273 million dollars in additional operating costs. Just these delay-caused operating costs alone were more than those three airlines made in net earnings for that entire year. So a dependable system of investment in airport and airway system capacity and productivity is essential to the long-term economic viability of the airlines.

And we shouldn't kid ourselves about where we stand on airport and airway capacity in 1981. We haven't got much of a margin above us before we hit capacity in many key areas, and one of the reasons we've got even that much margin is that demand has been temporarily depressed. We have in recent years fallen behind the curve of needed reinvestment in these facilities and we have definitely failed to keep pace with the rate of inflation for construction costs. It has gotten to the point where this past year for the first time, the Department of Transportation and the FAA testified that in the next few years they may be forced to constrain traffic growth, due to the saturation of runway and air traffic capacity.

And we are at the beginning of a decade in which the number of air passengers is projected to double.

Whether it's highways, transit, or airports, what we are talking about is the same pattern of deferred reinvestment and deferred maintenance which many of the railroads of this country used just to get by a few tough years. But they found that once you start slipping behind the curve of needed reinvestment, you get pulled into a vicious cycle, and it becomes nearly impossible to get out. We face the threat of more and more of our transportation systems following in the footsteps of Penn Central. And that is one of the key issues facing this country today.

To prevent that from happening, we have to make sure:

(1) That national policy makers understand the vital importance of this nation's infrastructure in general and of its transportation systems in particular;

(2) That they appreciate the key role the Federal government must often play in generating and investing the capital on which these systems depend; and

(3) That they not upset those long-term investment mechanisms casually or without the most thorough kind of deliberation.

One of our transportation programs has been particularly challenged in the past year and a half. It is certainly not the largest of the programs we have discussed here today, but it is under the most pointed assault. The issues involved are the same issues of Federal participation in the generation and investment of needed capital that apply to any of the transportation modes we have discussed. If we don't effectively deal with these issues in this particular program, we may find our other programs under similar attack.

The program is the airport development program, known as ADAP. The challenge to the program is a concept known as "defederalization", introduced in the Senate in 1979.

The ADAP program was created in 1970 in response to severe airport capacity problems in the late 1960's. Through the imposition of dedicated user taxes it put the Federal government in the role of guaranteeing that capital would be steadily accumulated and made available to supplement local capital investments in airport facilities, and in the

air traffic control and en route airway systems.

The Senate ADAP bill in the last Congress, however, contended that for the larger airports—the so-called large and medium hubs which comprise roughly the 72 largest airports in the country—a Federal role in airport development was no longer necessary. These airports, in the view of the bill's authors, should be able to raise their own capital and were therefore to be "defederalized", to use the Senate's term. The Federal Government would henceforth raise no airport development capital on their behalf.

The Senate's bill, including defederalization, passed the Senate last year, but died at the end of the 96th Congress in the face of overwhelming House opposition to defederalization. The likelihood is for a repeat of those positions in the coming year.

The bottom line issue here—and it could be asked of any mode of transportation, not just of aviation—is why have the Federal Government involved at all in the capital formation and investment necessary in a particular mode? Why have federally mandated highway user taxes? Why have a Highway Trust Fund? Why not have the States and localities deal directly with those who use the highways and hope they can all work something out? That is the core of the defederalization issue, only at this point expressed in terms of airports.

The answer, of course, is one of practicality. And in reviewing last year's deliberations on defederalization, I am struck by what appeared to be an almost casual acceptance of many of the key assumptions behind defederalization, without ever really challenging how practical they would be in the real world. Let's look at a few of these assumptions.

First of all was the general impression that we were just kicking the biggest airports out of the program, the ones that were big and tough and could take care of themselves. Everyone immediately pictures New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Los Angeles, San Francisco. But the 72 large and medium hubs that would be defederalized go a lot farther down the list than that, to airports like Norfolk, Virginia, El Paso, Texas, and Birmingham, Alabama. The large and medium hub airports account for nearly 90 percent of all passenger enplanements. This is no small piece of the total airport system that would be defederalized. And many of these larger airports are the ones where capacity and congestion problems will be the most severe in the 1980's.

Secondly, there was a general assumption that the larger airports really did not rely on ADAP funding for much of their capital needs. Again this assumption does not seem to be supported by the facts. A 5-year survey of the 72 airports showed that an average of 38 percent of all capital spending at those airports was ADAP funding. This has to be measured against the fact that all projects are not ADAP eligible, and for those that are a local match of at least 10 to 50 percent is required. About half of all capital projects in the survey relied on ADAP assistance.

Third, and most important, was the assumption that big airports could deal directly and as equals with the airlines to assure that needed funds were raised at each airport for capital investment. This assumption sounded good as stated in the rhetoric, but in practice airlines and airports bring with them binding contractual commitments which more often than not would make this assumption invalid. Many air-

ports have come to rely, either before ADAP or in addition to ADAP, on revenue bonds to raise capital for necessary construction projects. In many cases, particularly until the last few years, the successful issuance of those bonds depended on long range contracts with the airlines. The airlines in effect guaranteed that their landing fees would be as high as was necessary for the airport to cover its capital program and/or operating budget. These are generally called "break even" or "net lease" provisions. And in return the airline usually got a "majority of interest clause", giving any group of airlines who enplaned a majority of passengers at that airport virtual veto authority over airport expenditures.

Compounding this situation was the fact that these agreements typically ran for many years (up to 30 years in some cases) and often contained explicit prohibitions on any airport attempts to renegotiate the contract during its term.

Looking at the operators of the large and medium hubs, over half have "break even" type contracts with their airlines, nearly half have majority of interest clauses, roughly 40 percent are specifically barred by their contracts from renegotiations of those contracts, and over half have contracts which include at least one other provision that would impede their ability to force a renegotiation of long term agreements with the airlines.

Put all that together and the result is that most of the airports slated for defederalization would bring with them one or more contractual commitments which would make it highly questionable that they could negotiate as equals or that they could drive a bargain which would raise new capital to replace the missing ADAP funds. This obviously raises serious concerns as to whether necessary long-term capital projects would receive the funding they need, and whether they would receive it on a timely and predictable basis.

The fourth assumption which pervaded the Senate discussion of defederalization was the name itself. Defederalization implied getting the Federal government out of the airport business and returning that function to local government. That is not what the bill would have done, however. The Federal Government would still be involved as the air traffic control operator and the determiner of approach and landing aids and air traffic patterns and procedures. It would have remained to decide whether an airport had met all applicable Federal standards and should be certificated. It would have retained the Federal prohibitions on what kinds of revenues the airports could raise and from whom they could raise them. And most importantly, it would still collect Federal user taxes for flights originating from those "defederalized" airports. In fact, the airports to be defederalized generate roughly 80 percent of all the passenger ticket tax revenues to the Trust Fund, yet under defederalization those airports would be barred from using any of those funds for airport development.

In short, we weren't getting the Federal government out of airports at all; we were just getting Federal funds out of airports. It wasn't airport defederalization, as advertised, it was just airport defunding.

In fact, the closer you looked at defederalization, the less workable it seemed and the more it sounded like a half-baked idea getting a free ride under a misleading name.

It is ironic that the proponents of defederalization have chosen as their target the

mode and the program where the ability of the local authorities and the users to raise their own capital has to the greatest extent been recognized and incorporated into the program. More than transit, highways, or waterways, airports under ADAP are expected and in effect required to raise much of their own capital. It can hardly be argued that the existence of a Federal program has stifled airport initiative or responsibility for doing their own fund-raising. Atlanta, as an example, has undertaken a massive expansion program, and spent \$234 million in capital investment in the 1974 to 1978 period. ADAP funds only covered about one-fifth of that. Atlanta went through the usual array of bond agreements and airline contracts to get the rest.

And the ADAP program has recognized the generally greater fund-raising ability of the larger airports and has required them to use that ability to a greater degree. It does this by requiring greater matching funding from the larger airports and by allowing the larger airports less in formula funds per passenger than the smaller airports are allowed.

But we have never before gone that extra and critical step of a flat-out ban on funding eligibility for the major airports of this country. And that is the key, because ADAP funding, even though it might be only a relatively modest proportion of the total capital budget at an airport, has proved repeatedly to be a bridge that enables a long range capital program to move forward even where a variety of conflicting airline views cannot be reconciled. Airlines at an airport often have widely divergent points-of-view; some may be prosperous, others just scraping by with no means to look to the future; some may hold hopes for future growth at that airport, others may hold no such hopes; some may need one kind of facility, others may want different kinds of projects all together. Most airport development waits for those differences to be worked out. But there are those occasions where needed work must proceed with or without consensus, and ADAP can make that possible.

If anybody bought defederalization thinking they were buying into a get-the-Feds-off-the-backs-of-the-local-governments position, they got it completely backwards. In this case, it is often the availability of Federal ADAP funding that preserves the option for the local airport operator to carry out his needed capital improvements.

And for many of the same reasons, ADAP provides the airlines with needed stability and uniformity in their contributions to airport funding. The airline industry is a chronically cyclic industry. Whether it's airplanes or airports, when times are good airlines need more capacity and they need it now. But those investments take several years to become operational. Too often you have to buy in a down cycle to benefit in the up cycle, and airlines caught in down cycles can rarely afford to do that. As a result, the aircraft manufacturers are plagued by the cycles of the airlines: aircraft orders are up when traffic is up and nearly evaporate when it is down. The same would be equally true of airport development if it were not for the steadying influence of ADAP user taxes and funding. With ADAP, if people are flying, they're contributing to the Trust Fund which provides at least some of the capital funding needed to make the system work: it's automatic because its collection is required of all airlines by the Federal Government.

If ADAP were ended, the cost of making up for those withdrawn funds would fall ultimately to the airlines.

Either in the form of higher landing fees haggled out at each local airport, or in the form of costly delays or capacity constraints which would ultimately result from not making timely capital investments in airport capacity.

In the final analysis, it is in the best interest of the airlines to have an ADAP program and to having the Federal Government using its national authority to act as an impartial and stable collector of revenues for capital investment in a national system of airports. It protects the airlines, as well as the airports, from the occasional corner-cutter in the industry who would block long-term investment for a short-term competitive edge. ADAP provides an element of long-range investment and of stability, both of which the aviation industry could use more of. The ADAP program has traditionally been a kind of capital formation service. It has not been the kind of Federal program that is highly regulatory and an unwanted intruder into the affairs of either local government or private industry.

The final irony is that those who saw the label "defederalization" and thought they were getting something that would help bring the Federal budget under control, were sold a bill of goods. The Senate proposal would have reduced the user taxes to the Trust Fund by so much that the net effect would have been to increase the Federal deficit and make it harder to balance the budget.

In the months ahead, I expect to be working hard on the capital investment issues we have discussed here today, and especially on ADAP. There is a message that needs to be carried in defense of these programs, and I expect to carry it as forcefully as I possibly can.

Where defederalization in particular is concerned, the message is that this is one book that should not be judged by its cover. You've got to look at the real world and how defederalization would perform in actual practice. I don't think it looks very promising. I think you find that in airports, as in many other modes, vitally needed capital reinvestment is more likely to occur where the Federal Government lends its authority to the relationship between the providers and the users of transportation facilities.

And I hope I can count on your assistance in carrying that message.

Thank you very much.●

#### THE HOMECOMING CELEBRATION FOR 52 AMERICANS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues and fellow Americans across this great land in welcoming home our 52 countrymen who were held hostage in Iran for over 14 months. In many respects, this Nation during the last few days has hosted a great homecoming celebration. Parades, receptions, cards, gifts, and fireworks exemplified our relief and hap-

piness about the release of our countrymen.

Ironically, it has taken this crisis and the final resolution of it to bring us together as one big family. Every American, regardless of the city or region of the country they live in, has shared in the suffering of the hostages and in the jubilation about their release in some way.

Their release was a sweet moment for us all. Appropriately, the American public chose to decorate our homecoming celebration with American flags and yellow ribbons.

Mr. Speaker, keeping in tradition with great homecoming celebrations and reunions, I think that we should pause to pay tribute to our fellow Americans who are no longer with us as a result of the hostage crisis in Iran. I am referring to the eight courageous American soldiers who gave their lives in an attempt to free the 52 hostages. They not only gave their lives but also gave us a renewed sense of patriotism and courage.

I hope that this homecoming and rekindled patriotism signals a new beginning for our Nation as well as for the 52 freed Americans and their families.

With that thought, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the 52 Americans home.●

#### HUMAN RIGHTS: AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL REPORTS SOVIET REPRESSIONS

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, Amnesty International reported last week that more than 200 dissidents have been imprisoned in the Soviet Union in the last 15 months. Furthermore, in order to silence opponents of the Soviet regime, courts are handing down severe sentences.

Amnesty, an international human rights organization and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, further states:

In the general repression of the last 15 months, three types of dissenter appear to have been especially hard-hit, . . . members of unofficial groups trying to monitor Soviet observance of human rights agreements reached at the 1975 Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, national rights campaigners in the non-Russian Soviet republics, including Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Estonians and Armenians; and religious believers, particularly Baptists, Seventh Day Adventists, Pentecostals, and Russian Orthodox believers.

It should be noted that Soviet Jews have not been immune from this special treatment. In 1979, 54,320 Jews were allowed to emigrate, but in 1980 that level fell to 21,470 persons.

The Soviet Union has put its name to international accords guaranteeing



freedom of thought, expression, conscience, association, and movement, the right to work and exchange ideas, to enjoy equal protection under the law, and freedom from arbitrary invasion of privacy. But the U.S.S.R. dishonors its commitments by systematically victimizing citizens who seek to exercise their rights, and we must continue to reveal to the world how the Soviet Union treats its citizens.

I commend to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the following news release from Amnesty International:

**AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL SAYS HEAVY SENTENCES HANDED DOWN IN SUSTAINED SOVIET CRACKDOWN ON DISSENTERS**

Amnesty International said today (Tuesday, January 20, 1981) that Soviet courts are handing down severe sentences as the authorities keep up a drive that has already imprisoned more than 200 dissenters in the last 15 months.

The international human rights organization pointed to sentences of up to 15 years of combined imprisonment and internal exile imposed for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" in recent months.

The sustained crackdown has hit dissenters of all kinds all over the Soviet Union—religious believers, human rights activists and campaigners for national rights in the non-Russian republics of the U.S.S.R., Amnesty International said. Heavy sentences have been frequent: since December 1979 at least 12 people are known to have been sentenced to more than 10 years each, the organization said.

All the members of a group monitoring political abuse of psychiatry have now apparently been rounded up. The fifth and last active member, Felix Serebrov, was arrested on January 9, 1981. Amnesty International cited the compulsory confinement of Ukrainian librarian Anna Mykhaylenko in November 1980 as evidence that dissenters were still being put in psychiatric hospitals for political rather than medical reasons. She had been arrested for circulating unofficial reports of human rights violations.

The organization called attention to long sentences given to five dissenters convicted on the "anti-Soviet agitation" charge in recent months: Mart Niklus, 46, a leading Estonian activist, was sentenced on January 8, 1981 to a total of 15 years' imprisonment and exile. Vazif Meylanov, 42, a mathematician from Dagestan who demonstrated peacefully against the internal exile of a dissident physicist Andrei Sakharov, was sentenced on December 2, 1980 to a total of nine years; two Ukrainians, Dr. Stepan Khmara, 43, a physician and Vitaly Shevchenko, 46, a journalist, were given 12 and 11 years respectively for circulating an unauthorized Ukrainian journal; and Nikolai Goretoi, 59, a leading Pentecostalist, was sentenced in November 1980 to 12 years.

In the general repression of the last 15 months, three types of dissenter appear to have been especially hard-hit, Amnesty International said: members of unofficial groups trying to monitor Soviet observance of human rights agreements reached at the 1975 Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, national rights campaigners in the non-Russian Soviet republics, including Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Estonians and Armenians; and religious believers, particularly Baptists, Seventh Day Ad-

ventists, Pentecostals, and Russian Orthodox believers.

Recent arrests include those of Natalya Maltseva, a feminist activist, Viktor Brailovsky, activist in the Jewish emigration movement, and Viktor Nitsoo, an Estonian dissenter.

The trials of a number of people arrested in 1980 are believed to be imminent. They include Helsinki monitors Vytautas Skuodis (Lithuania) and Tatyana Osipova (Moscow) and feminist Natalya Lazareva, Amnesty International said. ■

**ROBERT McNAMARA DELIVERS  
A NEEDED LECTURE**

**HON. PAUL SIMON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive public officials I have known during my 6-plus years in Congress is the President of the World Bank, Robert S. McNamara. All of us of all nations will be experiencing a great loss when he steps down as the President of that organization.

Recently, the U.S. News & World Report had an interview with him in which he says, among other things, that:

No other industrial nation today, with the single exception of Italy, is doing as little in relation to the size of its population and the level of its income as the United States.

A little later in the same interview he notes that:

The average of all other industrialized nations, excluding the United States, is 0.42 percent—more than double what we do.

And then he has this significant statement to which we should pay heed:

It is a time to do more. If we don't do more, we are going to be in worse shape economically than we are. And we're going to have to face all of those social and political problems in the developing world I mentioned earlier.

I would urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to read this perceptive, thoughtful interview with Robert McNamara:

[From U.S. News & World Report]

INTERVIEW WITH ROBERT S. McNAMARA, PRESIDENT, WORLD BANK—A PLEA FOR AID TO "800 MILLION ON MARGIN OF LIFE"

Americans may have given away billions, but they aren't helping enough now, contends the head of the 134-nation agency. He argues that assistance for the "absolute poor" is a game in which all win—including the U.S.

Question. Mr. McNamara, you've been pleading with the U.S. and other industrialized nations to provide more money to poor nations—and rapidly. What's so urgent about this need?

Answer. The fundamental point is this: All of us are living in an increasingly interdependent world—interdependent both economically and politically. And that combination offers many opportunities for actions from which everyone will benefit. This is why it's urgent that the U.S.—in its own na-

tional interest—act now to deal more effectively with the plight of the poorer nations.

Yes, I am pleading—to use your word—for a more realistic understanding of this basic point, and pleading for additional economic support for the less developed countries, not only through the transfer of resources but through expanded trading opportunities as well.

And I'm pleading for two reasons: It is very much in the interest of the developed countries themselves to do this, and it is very much in the interest of the developing countries that it should happen. The developing countries require economic support so that they can buy what they need from the rest of the world—an expense that is exacerbated by recent increases in oil prices. Those increases alone have more than doubled the current-account deficits these countries are facing in their trade and financial dealings with other nations.

Their social and economic advance will be crippled unless they are assisted. If they are to make a reasonable rate of progress, they will need additional external financing. That's why I am pleading for them.

Question. Why is it in the national interest of the U.S., as you put it, for us to provide such help?

Answer. For the U.S., the fastest-growing markets for exports—and the greatest potential stimulus to U.S. employment and trade—are in these oil-importing developing countries. So it is a plussum game. If the U.S. does not act intelligently, there will be a deflationary impact on the world, and the U.S. will be hurt as a result.

Question. What's the source of opposition? Is it ignorance, or is it a feeling of irritation that some of these Third World countries ganged up on us in the United Nations?

Answer. It's both, but basically it's ignorance. You can put up with some of the irritations if you understand where your fundamental interests lie.

If we in the U.S.—I'm speaking now as a U.S. citizen, not as the president of the World Bank—really believed that or fundamental interests would be served by additional assistance, whether it be in the form of trading opportunities or financial assistance, we'd be very shortsighted to let our irritations guide our behavior.

Question. On the negative side, what can happen if we aren't forthcoming in the Third World? Political turmoil? Collapse?

Answer. In simple terms, one would expect a greater degree of economic disorder, lower rates of economic and social advance, which in turn would lead to political disorder.

The truth is that the U.S. can no longer isolate itself from political disorder in other parts of the world as easily as it could in the past. We see ample evidence of that today in the Middle East. And I think we'll see evidence of it in many other parts of the world.

Beyond that, there are the humanitarian and moral considerations. They are very important. They move me; I hope they'll move others.

Question. Can you elaborate on the humanitarian stakes involved?

Answer. The World Bank today serves roughly 100 developing countries, containing some 2.25 billion people, excluding China. Of those 2.25 billion people, roughly 800 million are literally living on the margin of life—just bordering between life and death. If these countries do not advance economically, the number of people who are trapped in poverty will increase. It's a disgrace to the human race that we tolerate such a situation.

So one has these two considerations: Very narrow national considerations of economic and political interests, and then the much broader humanitarian and moral considerations.

**Question.** You're talking about a role that obviously is bigger than the World Bank's role. What should the industrialized countries be doing beyond what the bank does?

**Answer.** The World Bank can play three very important roles: One is the narrow one of being a major source of funds. We have expanded our financial commitments roughly tenfold in the last 12 years.

Second, we can also play a role as adviser to the developing countries' governments. We have been increasingly active in that field.

For example, the oil-importing developing countries must ultimately pay for the higher-priced oil. There's no way to finance that indefinitely simply by piling up debt. In the end, the only way they can pay for it is by expanding their exports or reducing their imports—or by some reasonable combination of the two. But it's going to take time for them to make those policy changes, and we can be helpful on that process.

And, third, we can serve as a focal point for discussion of key development issues and of the actions required to deal with them—issues, for example, such as absolute poverty, the population problem and the energy situation. Over the past decade, we've sought to stimulate more thoughtful and practical discussion of these and other critical issues.

**Question.** Who are these 800 million people on the margin of life that you refer to? What countries do they live in?

**Answer.** They are what we have termed the absolute poor. One can divide the approximately 100 developing countries into two broad groups: One group comprises the low-income countries, with roughly 1.25 billion people. These include countries such as India, Bangladesh, Kenya and most of sub-Saharan Africa. And the other group comprises the middle-income countries, with roughly a billion people: Countries such as Brazil, Korea and Turkey.

There are absolute poor in each of these two groups of nations—some 600 to 625 million in the low-income countries and some 150 to 175 million in the middle-income group.

**Question.** Many of these countries have been getting aid for years. Why haven't they been able to make it on their own? Why haven't many been able to feed themselves?

**Answer.** If you mean why haven't they been able to get along without external capital, I don't believe that historically any of today's developed nations did, either. At a comparable stage of development, for example, the U.S. was a borrower on a tremendous scale. Our railroads were financed by external capital. Much of our industry was financed by external capital. That's typical of a certain stage of economic development.

**Question.** But beyond that, why aren't the developing nations able to grow faster than they have? Why can't some feed their people?

**Answer.** On balance, they have learned to feed their own people. Take India. The World Bank is very active in agriculture there. Compare the years 1966 and 1980, for example. Both were drought periods. In 1966, India produced 72 million tons of cereal grain. In this past year, it produced 116 million tons. That is a 60 percent increase in 14 years, and India did not have to import grain this time.

What I am saying is that there has been great progress in these countries. Life expectancy increased on the order of 40 percent, on average, between 1950 and 1975. Never before in the history of the world has life expectancy of any large number of people increased 40 percent in a quarter-century.

**Question.** The more people there are, the bigger the problem becomes, doesn't it?

**Answer.** It does in one sense but not in another. Almost 12 years ago, I began to talk about the problem of population. We were absolutely right in recognizing it as an extremely important problem. But we were wrong in believing in too simplistic a solution, which was that if you supplied the world with contraceptives, the problem would be taken care of. But that is not the case.

It's a supply-and-demand problem. In terms of supply, you've got to have appropriate contraceptive services if fertility is going to be reduced on any broad scale. But you must also have a demand for their use, or not much is going to happen.

One of the things that research has revealed is that there is a direct correlation between the percentage of females that have passed through primary school and the desire for small families. And there is also a direct correlation between fertility rates and life expectancy.

In India, for example, in order to be fairly sure that a male child would survive into his parents' old age, you needed statistically about 6.7 births per woman throughout her reproductive years. And actual births were around 6.8. Obviously, the number of births was at least partly a function of parents' desire to have a male child to help take care of them in their later years.

If you can reduce infant mortality and increase life expectancy, there will be a marked change in the desire for large families. So the improvement of life expectancy—immensely desirable in itself—also has a beneficial effect on fertility reduction.

**Question.** You're saying aid is working—

**Answer.** Yes. Now, having said that, I want to emphasize that one has to insist on good management of scarce aid resources. We're proud of our efficiency in the World Bank. And one of the things I think we have proved is that you can be a hardheaded investor. You can demand efficiency in the investment of capital while at the same time being sensitive to social advance and social objectives and social values.

**Question.** Americans, as a whole, probably believe that they have given more aid than others and ask why they should do more—

**Answer.** Yes, they do believe that, but they're not fully correct. They're wrong to believe that they have done more over the last decade and that they shouldn't do more now.

No other industrial nation today, with the single exception of Italy, is doing as little in relation to the size of its population and the level of its income as the United States. Official development assistance by the U.S. amounted to 0.19 percent of gross national product in 1979. That is on the order of \$20 per capita. Now, that's very little out of a GNP of about \$10,000 per capita. A substantial portion of that, by the way, is really directed to security purposes—to Israel and other countries that do not fall in the category of low-income countries.

The average of all other industrialized nations, excluding the U.S., is 0.42 percent—more than double what we do. Yet our income per capita is higher, on average,

than the others. In a speech at Harvard a few months ago, former Secretary of State Vance called the U.S. effort disgraceful. And Secretary of State Muskie has made the same point. I certainly believe they're right.

**Question.** Do Americans confuse our military assistance with development assistance?

**Answer.** Absolutely. And it's a confusion that contributes in part to the belief that we're doing more than we should. In every single poll I've ever seen on this subject, people invariably say we're doing five or 10 times more than we are.

The other part of the problem is that they also believe that in a time of inflation, at a time of inflation, at a time of high unemployment and at a time when the federal government is—and should be—operating under substantial fiscal constraints, the U.S. should simply not try to do more.

I contend that's wrong. It is a time to do more. If we don't do more, we are going to be in worse shape economically than we are. And we're going to have to face all of those social and political problems in the developing world I mentioned earlier.

**Question.** Why do you say that?

**Answer.** Consider the deflationary impact of our doing less. Today, there exists in the capital-surplus oil-exporting countries—members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries—roughly 100 billion dollars more in surplus capital than existed two years ago. Those surpluses aren't going to be buried in the sand. They're going to move into the money markets of the world.

If they do not move into productive investment in the developed or developing countries, the surpluses will have a deflationary impact on the whole world. It's absolutely essential to the developed economies that those surpluses be put to work. One way to put them to work is to use a modest portion of them for development assistance.

**Question.** What's the answer to this complaint: Why should we send millions of dollars to a country that I've never heard of when hundreds of thousands of people in the U.S. are in deep poverty?

**Answer.** My response is this: If the U.S. as a nation restricts this market of 2.25 billion people in the developing world—3.25 billion, if China is included—if it holds back their advance, it is going to sell fewer goods and have fewer jobs in this country. There's just no question about it. One out of every 7 manufacturing jobs in the U.S. depends on foreign trade. One out of every 3 farm acres is producing for export. More than 25 percent of U.S. exports are going to these oil-importing developing countries. Hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs depend on their growing markets.

Manufacturers like Caterpillar or Ford know this. They know where their markets are. The markets that are growing the fastest are the markets in these 100 developing countries with 2.25 billion people.

**Question.** No farmer in Bangladesh is going to buy a Caterpillar tractor, is he?

**Answer.** Well, the farmer in Bangladesh is beginning to produce more. Henry Kissinger called Bangladesh a basket case. It's not a basket case today.

It's still in great difficulty. There are 90 million people in Bangladesh in 50,000 square miles—which is the size of the state of Florida—and two thirds of Bangladesh is alternately flooded or arid. There is high infant mortality, high illiteracy, high mal-



nutrition and low life expectancy. But that economy is growing.

We believe that in the next five years Bangladesh will increase its food output by roughly a third. When they do that, they will be able to buy more from the U.S. Their imports are rising substantially every year. Where do those imports come from? They come from the developed world.

**Question.** What is the World Bank doing to recycle oil money?

**Answer.** In the simplest of terms, the World Bank is recycling it by increasing its lending. Those surplus funds flow into the world's money markets, and the World Bank borrows them for relending. In the year that ended June 30, the total financial commitments of the World Bank group were 12 billion dollars. In 1985, they're planned for 20 billion—an 8-billion-dollar-per-year increase in commitments in these five years. That is a major contribution to the recycling.

**Question.** Haven't the Arabs been reluctant to go along with that?

**Answer.** The Arabs are very anxious to see those funds recycled. They understand it is in their broader interests. They have played a growing role in what I'll call "direct recycling"—providing direct aid themselves to the developing countries—but there are some who would like them to do even more.

**Question.** Some critics contend that countries get excessively dependent upon foreign aid—

**Answer.** If aid sources—whether it be the World Bank, the U.S. or others—permit that, they should be severely criticized. I don't believe the World Bank has. One bit of evidence that it hasn't is that in 35 years the Bank hasn't lost a single dollar on either its soft or hard loans.

Countries do recognize that they must use World Bank loans productively and that they must repay them—and repay them on time. We insist on it.

**Question.** Are there any prospects that the Communist countries will give more aid to the very poor countries?

**Answer.** You'd have to address that question to them. Today, aid by the Soviet bloc is so small it's virtually not measurable. It's roughly 0.04 percent of their GNP.

**Question.** Mr. McNamara, you're planning to retire in June as president of the World Bank. What do you see as the greatest challenge facing the industrialized countries?

**Answer.** I think their greatest single challenge, both in philosophical terms and in practical terms, is to better understand the nature of the world they live in and where their own national interest as industrial countries lies.

To erect trade barriers, to reduce foreign assistance, to isolate oneself politically from these developing countries would be very, very shortsighted. U.S. citizens do not always perceive this. If they did, the U.S. performance on development assistance would be very different than it is.

People talk to me about Congress: Congress won't do this; Congress won't do that. But Congress reflects the views of the American people. If the Congress will not support increases in financial assistance, if the Congress will not support appropriate participation in political terms, if the Congress will not support opening our markets, it's because it reflects the views of our people.

I do not believe the average American sees the world of the '80s yet as it really is. It is an interdependent world, and the U.S. is not yet acting fully in its own interest in that world. That's the long and short of it.

**Question.** Are you pleased with the election of A. W. Clausen, president of the Bank of America, as your successor?

**Answer.** I am delighted. President Carter asked my recommendation for candidates, and Mr. Clausen was high on my list.●

## PENSION OFFSET REQUIREMENT MUST BE REPEALED

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● **Mr. OTTINGER.** Mr. Speaker, today, I am reintroducing legislation I sponsored last year to eliminate the pension offset which requires States to deduct retirement benefits from unemployment benefits. This cruel and unfair provision is causing great financial hardship for older workers in New York and around the country and must be repealed immediately.

Effective April 1, 1980, Federal law required all States to reduce a person's unemployment compensation benefits, dollar-for-dollar, by the amount of any governmental or private pension or retirement pay received by the individual. Last fall, Congress modified the offset provision to reduce the harmful effects of the law, but thousands of retirees are still suffering, barely able to make ends meet as inflation eats up their pensions. Corrective action is needed desperately.

Under present law, States may disregard a pension that is based on work performed prior to the employment upon which his or her eligibility for unemployment is based. Specifically, the new law requires States to make the offset only in those cases in which the pension was maintained or contributed to by a base period or chargeable employer. These are employers whose accounts will be charged for unemployment compensation received by the individual.

In addition, States are allowed to reduce the amount of the offset by an amount consistent with any contribution the employee made toward the pension. This allows States to limit the offset to one-half of the amount of a social security pension received by an individual who qualifies for unemployment benefits.

While these changes lessened the impact of the offset and fewer retirees are receiving reduced unemployment benefits, further congressional action is needed.

The key issue in my mind is: Should an individual who is involuntarily unemployed and looking for work be denied the same unemployment benefits as those received by other job seekers simply because that individual has earned certain retirement benefits? Clearly the answer is "No." I find it appalling that Congress has singled out retirement income from all other

income to reduce or eliminate unemployment benefits. Hardworking Americans have a right to unemployment benefits. We must recognize and insure that right.

Recently the United Auto Workers, the American Association of Retired Persons and other groups filed suit in U.S. district court in Washington challenging the legality of the unemployment compensation offset law. I wholeheartedly support their efforts, but feel it is incumbent on Congress to take immediate and effective action to insure that this injustice is eliminated by repealing the pension offset provision.

The text of my bill is printed below:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the requirement that States reduce the amount of unemployment compensation payable for any week by the amount of certain retirement benefits, and for other purposes

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

SECTION 1. Subsection (a) of section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to requirements for approval of State laws) is amended by striking out paragraph (15) and by redesignating paragraphs (16) and (17) as paragraphs (15) and (16), respectively.

SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this Act shall apply with respect to certifications of State programs for 1980 and subsequent years.●

## ANOTHER LOOK AT MILITARY MANPOWER

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● **Mr. MAZZOLI.** Mr. Speaker, the beginning of a new Congress offers us the opportunity to take a fresh look at our most pressing and crucial national problems.

No issue is of greater importance to the United States than insuring our national security. And, one vital aspect of our national security is our military manpower.

In this connection, I recommend to my colleagues the following article which appeared in the Washington Post on January 12, 1981:

### TOUGH, EFFECTIVE ARMED FORCES

Accusations of military incompetence should come as no surprise when the ball is fumbled deep in enemy territory. Defeats resulting from inadequate preparation, crossed signals or an ill-conceived game plan can hardly be blamed on the opposing team. A recent essay by Jeffrey Record called into question our military's competence. His comments are part of a rising chorus of critical commentary from responsible circles.

Many Americans in uniform are similarly concerned that our win-loss average since

World War II has been discouraging: a stalemate in Korea, a rout in Cuba, a pointless bloodletting in Vietnam, and a desert raid launched with all the hope of an Apollo moon rocket only to fizzle embarrassingly before the world audience.

Given the general doubt that America is unable to employ its military power to achieve even limited objectives, some of Record's observations merit comment:

A historically illiterate officer corps is obviously unacceptable. At the company level, however, a deep awareness of historical precedent is of little value. As a young lieutenant, I went to Vietnam as familiar with Clausewitz as most of my contemporaries were with Playboy. It was poor preparation for the shock of battle. Perhaps this is because there are a good many books about war, but relatively few about fighting. Green troops in every war quickly learn that no classroom exercise is adequate preparation for the dry-mouth fear and confused anxiety of the battlefield. It makes more sense to spend less time teaching the cadets at West Point the finer aspects of the Peloponnesian War and more time on basic, small-unit tactics—ours and theirs.

It is risky to generalize that today's officer corps possesses an "unbounded faith in the power of technology." If anything there is a healthy skepticism, particularly in the "people intensive" Army and Marine Corps. Anybody who has been in a fight knows that how much gear one has is irrelevant—how much of it works does count. Perhaps we have fallen into the trap of trying to design weapons to compensate for the shortcomings of our troops. Instead of producing smart warriors trained to maximize the effects of relatively simple weapons, we have built "smart" weapons to mechanize capabilities frequently beyond the ken of the typical front-line troop. There is little doubt that the imaginative application of technology often opens new possibilities; placing it in the hands of functional illiterates is foolishness.

Late in World War II, a "blitzkrieg" attack on the Americans was proposed to Gen. Heinz Guderian, chief of the German General Staff. The latest tanks, guns and materiel would be available. "Nonsense," snorted Guderian, "we haven't got the troops we had in 1940." Neither do we have the troops in 1980 that we had in 1965.

It is a pity that our officer corps does not generally equate "leadership with managerial ability." The officer incapable of managing his resources is wasting the people's money and he unduly hazards the lives of the fellow citizens entrusted to his care. The Department of Defense is one of the largest species of dollar-eating agencies in the federal zoo, where even slight economies can yield substantial savings. Yet, million-dollar tanks, \$20 million fighters and cost overruns are practically the norm rather than the exception. Perhaps designing to cost, rather than spending whatever is necessary to achieve an idealized capability, is one way out of this dilemma.

In any event, a sound familiarity with the tools of management is the bread on which the modern officer's tactical "butter" is spread. The officer unfamiliar with the means of maintaining a spare parts inventory is hardly capable of leading an armored brigade, however brilliant his tactics. Patton understood this; his charisma was matched by a penchant for detailed planning and the skillful and adroit use of an expert staff. Management and leadership are synonymous: to suggest otherwise leads to officers

more concerned with running marathons than doing their homework.

It should not be forgotten that good staff work, i.e., sound management, has been key to many military successes. The Germans' 1941 Ardennes offensive was considered by Liddell Hart to be a model of solid preparation and staff functioning. Careful and detailed planning, however compressed in time, is the key to successful amphibious assaults such as the Inchon landing. Some of our best military minds, MacArthur and Marshall to name two, made their reputations as managers.

None of these factors excuses or allays the sense of embarrassment we all feel about our military shortcomings. Compared with Israel's much briefer martial legacy, we appear as the big clumsy kid on the block who isn't feared as much as the small wiry runt who invariably fights "all out" and is not above a dirty punch or two below the belt.

Unfortunately, it is much easier to lament problems than to propose solutions. "Equitable conscription" is hardly the solution of first resort: how is it possible to "equitably" draft half a million conscripts annually out of a pool of millions? Moreover, armies of hastily trained draftees have hardly left a legacy of distinguished battlefield competence. They have usually prevailed more through overwhelming numbers than skill, usually at terrific human cost.

Now, for the first time in our history, we are outnumbered by our potential foes. Clearly, a professional military is vital, and there is much room for improvement. Some possibilities:

We can retain the positive features of both a draft and a volunteer force by considering a hybrid: discard any pretense of social equity and draft the fraction of annual enlistees required in the upper mental groups. The remaining needs can be satisfied by taking the best qualified volunteers.

Emphasize the basics. Marksmanship, crew drill and battle exercises too often take second place to meeting an unrealistically compressed operational tempo. Army tank crews may have difficulty shooting as well as their NATO counterparts because they don't spend enough time on the firing range.

Another reason they don't spend this time together is that base support has been cut to the bone, forcing tenant combat units to lend people necessary to provide essential base services. In the interest of "efficiency" we have siphoned off needed NCOs and fragmented combat units to mow grass and wash dishes. A more robust base support establishment makes sense on two counts: fighting units are kept together to train together, and the bases are better manned to handle any wartime buildup of tenant commands.

The notion of careerism as typically practiced in the officer corps tends to produce rather more generalists than true experts. The route to the top is usually the road of orthodoxy: following a progression of varied (and usually brief) assignments in accordance with a stereotyped career template. This practice of career "ticket punching" encourages orthodoxy and entails incentives for officers to avoid those assignments perceived to delay promotion. Thus, claims Frederick Mosher, "careerism is an important discourager of creativity, innovation, and risk-taking because of the perceived . . . dangers of stepping out of line."

Our tactics in Vietnam bear witness to the price of orthodoxy; as in Korea we tried to "dollar the enemy to death" with a rain of steel as original as the dismal battles of the Somme, Ypres and Paschendaele.

The need for well-rounded officers of varied experience remains, but there is also a need for creativity and original thinking. Our officer assignment and career development practices can be modified to achieve a better balance.

Of equal importance is an honest assessment of our state of discipline. The principal element of military discipline is the subordination of individual prerogatives to the needs of the unit. Unfortunately, the administration of military justice has been placed in the hands of lawyers more concerned with the "right" of their clients than the commander's problems. The accused now waits weeks for trial; he usually remains with his unit, where additional transgressions may be overlooked because adding them to the original charges only creates further delays. Thus it comes about that a state of indiscipline is too frequently accepted because the price of imposing high standards is an unbelievable administrative nightmare of writs, statements, charges and testimony.

There are many worthy features of the military judicial system, but much can be done to provide swift justice to those who break the rules. As in the civilian community, the military community must also be protected from those who would threaten its cohesion and stability.

The American experience has proven that the U.S. soldier will rise to any standard of excellence demanded of him. The best trained, most disciplined units invariably reflect a swagger and pride that extends down to the last private in the rear rank. No real man can take pride in being part of a mob, and the kind of men we want in uniform will enlist in the needed numbers when we quit serving up the military as some sort of experimental playpen for would-be sociologists.

It is time to stop kidding ourselves that spending more money and keeping up the numbers are a sufficient national sacrifice to maintain tough, effective Armed Forces. Gen. Sherman was right to say, "Every attempt to make war easy and safe will result in humiliation and disaster." If we are unhappy with the current state of military proficiency, it must be recognized that we brought it on ourselves, and the old palliatives won't work anymore.

#### THE MANDATE MILLSTONE

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my distinguished colleagues, Mr. LUNDINE and Mr. MINETA, I am pleased to introduce today the State and Local Government Cost Estimate Act of 1981. This legislation is a necessary and commendable step in forcing the Congress to begin to address the direct cost impact of Federal legislation on State and local governments. This bill requires the Congressional Budget Office to prepare and submit



an estimate of the costs to State and local governments of significant bills reported to the House and Senate by congressional committees. As two former mayors, Congressmen LUNDINE and MINETA have long been concerned with the costs of federally mandated programs for State and local governments for some time and I am happy to have their assistance and support.

We in the Congress almost recognized the inherent need for such legislation last year. A companion measure, introduced by Senator SASSER, was approved unanimously by both the Senate Budget Committee and the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee. Here in the House, the bill received the bipartisan support of 143 Members of Congress and was endorsed by the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, and the National Governors Association, and many others. In hearings before the House Budget Committee last year, the bill received the unanimous support of the State and local public officials who testified. And the House Rules Committee had almost finished action on the bill when the 96th Congress came to an end. Now it is time to act again.

The idea behind this legislation is to act as a brake on the Federal Government. This brake is necessary because of the rapid growth over the last two decades in the costs, scope, and quantity of mandates imposed on State and local governments. Mandate proliferation puts increasing amounts of stress on the budgets of State and local governments—they force them to either rechannel resources from other efforts or else raise local taxes or fees.

The city of New York, as an example, and I use my city because I know its problems best, is driven by 47 Federal and State mandates. The cost to the city of meeting these requirements over the next 4 years will be \$711 million in capital expenditures, \$6.25 billion in expense budget dollars, and \$1.66 billion in lost revenue. An example of one such mandate is the handicapped access program required by regulations promulgated in response to section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 for the New York Metropolitan Transit Authority. The cost of implementing the 504 handicap requirements breaks down as follows:

The purchase of equipment and placement of 481 elevators in the system; \$649 million.

Costs for property acquisition; \$50 million.

Costs to change the collection system; \$1 million.

Structural modifications for stairs and ramps; \$11 million.

Removal of obstacles and placement of emergency exits; \$150 million.

New graphics in the stations; \$5 million.

The total cost estimates for the Metropolitan Transit Authority of New York will be equivalent to the U.S. Department of Transportation's total estimate for retrofitting all rail systems throughout the Nation. The numbers be larger in New York but these mandates have an equally significant impact on the budget and local autonomy of every city.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to enact legislation imposing significant costs on State and local governments, we should be aware of those costs at the time we are considering the legislation—not afterward. Currently, 33 States require that State bills be accompanied by estimates of their impact on local budgets, and those requirements have worked to improve the operation and fairness of State governments.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is an important step toward full disclosure of the cost of Federal policies. In the past, many Federal mandates have imposed unsuspected costs on States and localities. This bill will provide an essential managerial oversight tool for Congress and provide a vehicle for determining the financial obligations placed on State and local governments in meeting national policy objectives.●

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LEFKOVITS

#### HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, the story of how Max Lefkovits got his start in America late in the 1800's is familiar: He carried a pack on his back, peddling goods about the countryside.

Eventually, he owned a business which he passed on to his sons, a business that gradually changed from one with a country store atmosphere where farmers brought in their bales of cotton to a small town department store.

The story recently came full circle, when the remaining son, Norman Lefkovits and his wife Sonya, closed the Columbiana business as 1981 began. It had been in continuous operation by members of the Lefkovits family since 1896, and was apparently the oldest business in Shelby County, Ala.

The founding of the store antedates the memories of almost all living Shelby Countians. Max Lefkovits, who immigrated from Hungary, was first involved in the Columbiana Mercantile Co.—located across the street from where the Leader now stands—which opened in 1907.

The store in its early days had furniture, men's overalls, piece goods, and notions, some groceries, and just about anything else one might need. People

would trade chickens or eggs from their farm for clothes.

Among the changes that have occurred in the store since World War II, according to Sonya Lefkovits are:

We quit being a country store and became a "small town" store. By the late 1950's all the stores in Columbiana took on a more modern look.

Norman and his wife regret having to close the store with its long traditions and history, but both agree that among the rewards were the great many friends they made—both in customers and the people who worked in the store through the years.

It is my pleasure to have this opportunity to wish Norman and Sonya Lefkovits well on the occasion of their retirement. They have truly been a special asset to the Columbiana community and Shelby County. This kind of devotion to a family business should serve as an example to us all.●

#### THE FACTS

#### HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, at the Adjutant General Conference held this month in Texas, the California National Guard presented a white paper entitled "Uncompensated Time, Members of the Guard and Reserve." Maj. Gen. Frank J. Schober, Jr., Commander of the California National Guard, and Col. Donovan L. Burton, special representative to the commander, have requested that I bring this report to the attention of the U.S. Congress.

We are all keenly aware of the vital role that the Guard and Reserve play in service to our Nation. However, many of us are unaware of the tremendous personal and financial sacrifice that these men and women are required to make. I believe the information contained in this report will help each of us better understand the needs of these individuals, and thereby to make better decisions concerning their well-being.

I am pleased to present the following excerpts from the white paper:

#### THE FACTS

1. As a means of reducing the Federal Budget, the Department of Defense and certain members of Congress have attempted each year, for the past several years, to eliminate benefits that are being provided for members of the Reserve Components.

2. Two of the more prominent benefits considered for reduction or elimination are military pay leave for public employees and administrative function pay for unit commanders. Under current law, federal employees are entitled to 15 days of paid military leave each fiscal year. Administrative function pay for unit commanders, \$20 per month, was eliminated effective 1 October 1980.

3. A reduction of the limited benefits for members of the reserve components, particularly federal and public employees, will impact adversely on the ability of the reserve components to perform their missions.

4. This study was conducted to determine the amount and nature of uncompensated time being expended by key personnel in the California Army National Guard (ARNG) in accomplishing their missions.

5. For the purpose of this study, ARNG respondents were selected from a stratified random sample of key officers and non-commissioned officers. Key personnel are defined as battalion commanders, their executive officers, personnel officers, training operations officers, and selected officers considered as being key to the battalion mission. Enlisted personnel considered at the battalion level are the command sergeant major, the sergeant major and other selected enlisted members essential to the battalion mission. Personnel considered at the company level are the commander, first sergeant and other selected officers and enlisted members vital to the company mission.

6. The statistical methods used by the researchers in this study process are deemed to be valid and could be expected to produce the same responses in 99 percent of any set of surveys conducted by similar methods on this same subject.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Members of Congress and State legislature should consider expanding benefits available to key managers of the Reserve Components, not reducing or eliminating ones that are already established. Administrative Function pay for unit commanders should be restored immediately and military pay leave for public employees must be retained.

2. A minimum of four full-time employees, for administration, supply, maintenance and training be employed at unit level to accomplish the missions being assigned to Reserve Components and to meet minimum readiness requirements.

3. Establish a means to reimburse key members of the Reserve Components for personal expenses related to accomplishment of their unit's mission.●

#### THE COMING ECONOMIC EMERGENCY AND WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there is a need for frank and nonpartisan discussions about the state of our economy. We cannot afford to luxuriate in rhetorical analyses or magical elixirs any longer. A recent article by Felix Rohatyn provides a sensible analysis of our economic situation, and I want to share it with my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE COMING EMERGENCY AND WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT

(By Felix Rohatyn)

What is the outlook for American society and, more specifically, how can our society adapt to an economy in distress? It is a vast

question that I can only speak to from a rather limited, but nonetheless eye-opening, experience, as chairman of New York's Municipal Assistance Corporation. But, in brief, I would say that the outlook for American society is highly uncertain and that it cannot, in the long run, adapt itself to an economy in distress.

Austerity and democracy do not walk hand in hand in the United States, except in wartime. The near-bankruptcy of New York City created in 1975 something like a "moral equivalent of war" for city and state politicians, as well as business and labor leaders. Before then the city had, for years, plunged toward disaster. Year-to-year deficits were papered over by accounting gimmicks; pension plans were underfunded; industries were driven away by high taxes and low productivity; borrowing was more and more relied on to finance operating deficits while capital programs were starved; the political leaders refused to face reality: all of these made disaster inevitable.

It was only when this became apparent, when month after month one bankruptcy deadline after another had to be faced, that Governor Carey called on business and labor to join forces with government in order to devise a program that would head off the crisis and bring the city back to life. The programs that accomplished this were initially harshly deflationary, then followed by a gradual shift to moderately relaxed fiscal policy and support of business, which led this year to New York City's first truly balanced budget in memory.

It is worth analyzing what we were able to do in New York as well as the limits beyond which we could not go, under the severest kind of pressure, since New York is, in certain respects, a mirror of the US. There is after all little difference between New York City's mounting year-after-year deficits from the mid 1960s to 1975 and the fact that the national budget has been in balance only twice during the last fifteen years; little difference between New York City burying its operating expenditures in its capital budget and the \$15 billion annual financing of the US government that is "off-budget" (i.e., the loan guarantees and similar commitments that do not appear in the budget); little difference between New York City having driven business south and west as a result of high taxes and low productivity and the US driving business abroad for the same reasons; little difference between New York City selling short-term notes to finance its deficits and the US financing with the shortest of all notes, namely demand deposits of OPEC oil producers; little difference between New York City's sky-rocketing pension costs and the requirements that social security be adjusted to the cost of living (COLA). New York City faced actual bankruptcy by its inability to pay off its debts when they came due; the US is facing the national equivalent of bankruptcy in the form of uncontrolled inflation requiring increasing levels of national debt to be paid off in currency worth less and less.

Looking back over the last five years in New York, during which a deficit of \$1.8 billion annually was brought to zero with a minimum of social disturbance, one can see two distinct phases. First came the brutal shock of actions intended to stop the hemorrhaging: these included a wage freeze coupled with deferrals of past increases; a 20 percent reduction in the work force; increases in transit fares and tuition at City University for the first time in 120 years; re-

duction by the banks of interest rates paid by the city and extension of the time period of the city's loans; shifts in pension costs from the city to the unions; increased taxes and the creation of a state-run control board to pass on the city's budget.

These programs, most of which were negotiated or set in motion by the Municipal Assistance Corporation, were coupled with limited federal credit assistance. They enabled the state-created MAC to provide a total of \$7 billion of long-term financing to the city, both to refinance past accumulated short-term debts as well as to finance its increasing deficits and increasing capital programs over the period. The large initial layoffs of city employees were followed by a period of limited attrition and then by a stabilization of the work force at its present level; the wage freeze was followed by a two-year labor settlement at 4 percent annually.

But then austerity had to yield to the reality of society's pressures, and a more recent settlement was made at essentially market rates between management and labor. Tax increases were replaced by tax cuts designed to favor businesses. Harmony was broken by a transit strike this spring. Increasing social tension in the ghettos of Harlem and Bedford/Stuyvesant culminated in ugly demonstrations to block the closing of just one facility of the city's sprawling municipal hospital system. Civil service reform is still politically impossible and real progress on improving management and productivity is largely confined to rhetoric. Some of the city's essential services have deteriorated.

Still, what saved the city was a limited period of austerity, imposed under the direst of threats, followed by gradual relaxation while a prosperous city economy, together with inflation, generated the growth in revenues to bring about a balanced budget. From 1975 to 1980, the expenditures of New York City grew in the aggregate by less than 10 percent, while the state's expenditures grew by 35 percent and the federal government's by 80 percent. The secret of our success, both at the city and state level, temporary though it may be, was to clamp a lid on expenditure growth while business activity and additional state and federal aid generated enough revenue growth to allow us to survive. As John Kennedy said: "A rising tide floats all ships."

It must be remembered that our imposition of extreme austerity was temporary, that it was essentially imposed by outside forces—i.e., the state, the federal government, and the workings of the bond market—that it required the courageous political leadership of the governor, as well as a true social contract with business and labor. The people of the city were willing to make real sacrifices as long as they believed that those sacrifices were relatively fairly distributed, that there was an end in sight, and that the result would be a better city, a better environment, and a better life. What we did in New York City was completely alien to the concepts of "No Growth" and the "Zero Sum" society so fashionable in economic circles these days.

Americans today are confused and dispirited. They have seen our country, over the last twenty years, dissipate its world-wide economic, military, and spiritual leadership at a more rapid rate than any other major power in history. They are accused, with some justification, of being wasteful and lazy by political leaders whom they perceive at best as inept and at worst corrupt; they hear business leaders calling for belt-tight-



ening and conservative orthodoxy from the comfort of their corporate jets. No wonder people are dispirited.

The United States today, like New York City in 1975, is on the edge of crisis. Financially, militarily, spiritually we are like an airplane about to stall. The answer, however, does not lie in a simple acceptance of "less for everybody"; I would invite economists of the no-growth school to walk in the South Bronx and convince people there that a reduced standard of living is required to curb inflation. I believe that most Americans, just like New Yorkers, would accept a limited period of austerity provided they are assured that we are in a crisis that justifies it, that their particular group is not bearing an unfair share of the burden, and they have a clear sense of how their sacrifice will ultimately lead to a better life for themselves and their children. This requires courageous political leadership with a program that has the following objectives:

A. Opportunity for private employment for most Americans who want to work;

B. A strong currency with reduced inflation;

C. A military policy that will insure U.S. security against any aggressor.

Just as New Yorkers accepted a period of higher taxes, lower services, and, in many cases, loss of income for a perceived goal, i.e., the solvency of the city, so now Americans in the rest of the country would, in my view, accept a period of austerity if they really believed there was serious prospect of change. They have no reason to believe it at this point. The presidential campaign has offered little hope in that connection. At this writing it is clear that whoever is elected, we are condemned, because of uncertain leadership and a Congress unwilling to face responsibility, to stumble from inflation to recession and back, with each stumble worse than the one before. I do not believe that our society will stand the strain over the next four years. Our next president will face an emergency during his term of office, either internationally or domestically, possibly both, and the real issue now is how it will be faced.

It seems to me that we face different types of critical problems today:

1. Problems like that of energy, which should have been apparent for years, where solutions are obvious, but to which the political structure cannot respond.

2. Problems of inflation and productivity, about which there is a great deal of theoretical—one might say theological—controversy, and very little knowledge, in which the spectrum of professional opinion is exceeding broad, and therefore no political consensus can even begin to be formed.

3. Problems of our security vis-a-vis Russia. We do not seem able, at a cost of \$140 billion a year, to project a credible sense of the U.S. as a world-wide power. At the same time, we seem incapable of continuing a process of reduction in weapons competition by ratifying SALT II.

4. Problems like those in the Middle East, which is vital to our security and our economy, where governments tend to be irrational in conduct and far removed from the exercise of our power.

5. Problems like employment and education in the urban ghetto, which have baffled all attempts at improvement, and which will, with continued "benign neglect," have consequences that are anything but benign.

6. Problems like the great shift in wealth from the Northeast and Midwest to the energy-producing areas of the US, as a

result of price decontrol. This trend will ultimately turn the country into "have" and "have-not" regions. One has only to look at Canada for its political implications and to be mindful of the fact that Canada does not have our existing social strains. This is a problem the political leadership resolutely refuses to acknowledge.

7. The problem of the West and the third world, which must be faced by a coherent policy of the Western nations, a willing OPEC, and a realistic third world, none of which exists today. Western technology must combine with OPEC financing to help the third world. It is beyond the West's capacity to bear any but a small part of the financial costs of third world development.

8. The problem of the coming capital shortage, which will be created by at least three forces: the enormous financing requirements of the US government; the equally enormous financing that American industry will require to increase productivity and create energy independence; and the drain on our economy of a \$100 billion annual payment to OPEC for imported oil. Nonetheless, our economic leaders deny the possibility of a capital shortage.

9. The problem of our relations with Mexico and Canada, which both pose large risks and large opportunities for the US. Mexico, with its oil resources, its fast-growing population, and its distrust of the US, may be our most important long-term foreign policy problem. The potential benefits of a North American Common Market should be explored. But this is not even being discussed peripherally.

These problems are all vital to our future, are all directly related to each other, and require inspired political leadership as well as intellectual honesty to find solutions. It is also well to remember that there are no permanent solutions to anything, only continuing adjustments to continually changing situations. It seems likely that the current political structure and the existing trends will exacerbate rather than help resolve this series of interrelated problems, and, in my judgment, this makes a crisis inevitable.

Our energy problem, together with our exposed strategic position in the Middle East, can only be resolved by a strong commitment to practical independence from imports. This would, in addition, strengthen the dollar by eliminating a \$100 billion a year outflow and would help reduce inflation. A stiff gasoline tax; rational development of coal and nuclear energy with a realistic appreciation of the difficulties with each one, a willingness to compromise on environmental issues—none of these proposals is mysterious or new, and yet current politics make efforts to explore and implement any of them practically impossible.

Insofar as the economy, inflation, and productivity are concerned, we cling to theological explanations that are as tired as they are unworkable. Liberal demands for public works and public jobs have to be matched against the failure of such policies during the past twenty years. But the current conservative proposals for tax cuts that favor production, and for tight monetary policy coupled with tight fiscal policy, have failed with equal consistency. When Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Carter tried these methods, they were quite successful in inducing recession, but they wholly failed to reduce inflation; quite to the contrary.

The purest attempt so far is Mrs. Thatcher's United Kingdom, where the Anglican Church seems to have been replaced by the "Sayings of Milton Friedman." Income tax

cuts coupled with sales tax increases, government spending cuts together with tight money have, after a year and a half, resulted in a 20 percent rate of inflation, an 8 percent reduction in manufacturing output, and the highest level of unemployment since the Depression in spite of the enormous cushion provided by England's North Sea oil. In view of the record during the past twenty years, it is relatively easy to understand why liberal economic thinking has become discredited; it is, however, more difficult to understand how the conservative monetarist theology continues to enjoy such uncritical popular support while the current example of England's struggle is vividly in front of us, along with its extraordinary potential for social explosion.●

#### BOY SCOUTS HONOR J. C. AGAJANIAN

#### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow evening, the Los Angeles Area Council of the Boy Scouts will honor my good friend, J. C. Agajanian, for the contributions he has made over the years to scouting.

"Aggie" needs little introduction to anyone who has ever had even the most passing interest in auto racing. He has entered cars in 33 consecutive Indianapolis 500 races. That is but one of his incredible records in the sport. Because one of my first endeavors as a young man was in motorcycle racing, I have long had a special admiration for the very special place J. C. Agajanian holds in racing. You never get the grease and the dirt and the fumes out of your system, no matter how far you get from the track.

But, the most important of his accomplishments do not show up in the record books. Auto racing has always been in the vanguard of progress for our entire automobile industry, the racetrack frequently being the first place that changes are tested, in grueling conditions, to provide advances in safety and efficiency. And in that select effort, J. C. Agajanian has been in the forefront of innovation. He has served on the Safety and Rules Committee of the U.S. Auto Club (USAC), and in that capacity has made significant improvements in racing safety. He has not been afraid to risk his own resources on revolutionary advances, like the turbine racing car, in order to be on the cutting edge of changes with effects far beyond the limits of the speedway.

He is also a successful businessman in Gardena, Calif. If for no more than what I have already mentioned, I am proud to have had J. C. Agajanian as one of my constituents.

But, it is for a different, and far more important, aspect of his life that the Boy Scouts will honor Aggie to-

morrow night. In business and racing, one of his chief talents has been as a promoter. The Boy Scouts have also been beneficiaries of that talent. Aggie has made a number of generous contributions to the Scouts. One of the most notable and successful has been the Boy Scout benefit nights at Ascot Park, where he is the president. In fact, there seems to be no limit to Aggie's generosity in behalf of the community, especially when it comes to the benefit of our youngsters. It is for this community commitment that the Boy Scouts will pay tribute to J. C. Agajanian.

My wife, Lee, and I wish J. C. Agajanian, his wife Faye, and their four children continued success in all of their endeavors, and we join with the Boy Scouts in expressing our pride in his accomplishments for which he will be recognized tomorrow. ●

#### LOW INCOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

#### HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, while our Nation's Capital is enjoying this warm weather, it is important that we remember the millions of low-income families who are struggling with increased heating bills. Only a few weeks ago, our communities were subjected to brutally cold weather, but that cold blast was a tropical breeze compared to the normal winter temperature in the northern half of our country. In addition to the inflationary pressures which low-income families must face, these families have had to absorb a 100 percent to 200 percent increase in the cost of heating their homes since decontrol. The Reagan administration's plan to totally decontrol the price of domestic oil will surely aggravate this situation.

Congress and the Carter administration have not been totally insensitive to this problem. The low income energy assistance program has increased from a token \$200 million in fiscal year 1977-78 to \$250 million in fiscal year 1979, \$1.6 billion in fiscal year 1980 and \$1.85 billion in fiscal year 1981. A cursory look at this program would show a dramatic increase in Federal aid, but it would not reveal that the number of eligible families has greatly expanded and the program has expanded to serve the cooling needs of persons in warm climates.

The program has also evolved from the original "crisis intervention" orientation for families with heating emergencies to a less targeted program. The program is not sufficiently funded to provide adequate assistance to all eligible families nor is it flexible

enough to protect very low income families from heating emergencies. In Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District, the area I represent, the net effect of the expanded mission of this program has been an ironic reduction in assistance for an expanded and different universe of beneficiaries than were previously eligible.

It has become the policy of this country to remove the restraints on the cost of energy, but we have not provided sufficient consideration for those persons disproportionately affected by this policy. A study published by the Department of Energy demonstrates that although low-income families use 25 percent less heating energy than the average American family, in Northern States energy costs may consume up to 35 percent of total family income which is four times the national average.

The following article in the Christian Science Monitor vividly demonstrates the burden we have placed upon the low- and moderate-income families. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and urge the continued support for this needed program.

#### FEDERAL FUEL AID FALLS FAR SHORT OF MEETING NEED OF U.S. POOR

(By D. K. Piot)

Members of the Harold Hulce family in Milwaukee, Wis., make a total of \$227 a month. They pay \$250 for a tankful of home heating oil, which lasts six weeks in this winter's colder-than-normal weather.

Social workers in Midwestern and Northeastern states say the financial bind this places on the Hulces is not at all uncommon. This heating season more and more low-income households are finding that fuel bills can exceed total family income.

With the prices of food and other necessities rising along with the cost of fuel, and with unemployment on the increase, a lot of families are unable to cope.

"We're seeing far more people with fuel emergencies this year than we've seen historically," says Tony Maggiore, director of the energy crisis assistance program in Milwaukee.

"Thousands of low-income people who never before sought public assistance are seeking it now because they have no other alternative. They're finding that the higher energy prices coupled with unemployment and inflation are impossible to handle."

Mr. Maggiore says his staff has received 40 percent more energy emergency phone calls since Dec. 1 than during the same period last year. "In many cases, lives are in jeopardy because open kitchen ovens and gas flames from stoves have been used to keep the family warm."

Critics say the \$1.85 billion appropriated by Congress for this year's low-income fuel assistance program under the Home Energy Assistance Act won't begin to help all those who need it.

Says Carol Werner, a legislative advocate for the National Consumer Law Center in Washington, "The appropriation is larger than the \$1.6 million allocated last year, but this year's eligibility pool has grown considerably. There are now almost 21 million households eligible for assistance compared with the 17 million eligible last year."

"If the expected 70 percent of all eligible households participated, each one would receive an average of only \$128—and that's before administrative costs are deducted. That's hardly an adequate level of assistance when you are looking at fuel bills which will run upwards to \$1,000 and \$1,500."

If the Reagan administration goes ahead with immediate decontrol of oil and natural gas prices, the spiraling costs will create additional "intolerable pressure" upon poor people, Ms. Werner says. Sixty percent of all low-income households heat with natural gas.

Says Bob Coard, executive director of Action for Boston Community Development: "Poor people are pressed to the wall with nowhere to go. They have a tremendous amount of anxiety over what's going to happen to them under the [Reagan] administration. I hope things don't get back to the '60s with riots and all that. Last year people without fuel were siphoning it from other people's oil tanks."

"For low-income people it's a catastrophic situation. They depend on a hand-to-mouth delivery system. They don't have the cash to pay for home heating oil ahead of time. Small delivery companies don't give them credit. They won't deliver under 100 gallons of oil, and some charge a premium to do that."

A recently released study published by the Department of Energy's Fuel Oil Marketing Advisory Committee (FOMAC) says of low-income households in the US:

On average nationwide they will spend at least 21.8 percent of their income on household energy. In the Northeast and Midwest, they could spend up to 35 percent.

They will continue to pay nearly four times more of their income on household energy than the average American household.

They lost over \$6 billion in purchasing power last year due to soaring energy costs.

By necessity, they occupy low quality and energy inefficient housing stock that further penalizes them and their efforts to cut energy costs.

They use 25 percent less energy than the average American household for heat. ●

#### FAHD'S CALL FOR JIHAD AGAINST ISRAEL DAMAGES THE SEARCH FOR PEACE

#### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSTENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Crown Prince and Deputy Prime Minister of Saudi Arabia Fahd ibn 'Abd al-Aziz damaged the cause of peace and threw a serious obstacle in the way of continued Saudi-American friendship with his shrill cry for a holy war against Israel.

I recognized the difficulty which the Saudis have in achieving the modernization of their country while they preserve the positive values of the tribe and family which lie at the core of a stable society; and in the context of these efforts the spirit of compromise needs fostering.



Unfortunately neither compromise nor moderation has yet to find a place in the Saudi attitude toward the Arab-Israeli conflict. For more than 30 years Saudi Arabia has refused to recognize Israel's right to exist. In 1948, 1967, and 1973, the Saudis supported the wild adventures of the Arab countries determined to destroy Israel by force of arms. Since the Camp David accords the Saudi policy has been one of outspoken opposition to any negotiation with Israel.

Prince Fahd's call for a jihad can only inflame passions on the Arabian Peninsula and throughout the Arab world.

His remarks raise the question of whether Saudi Arabia can be a reliable partner of the United States of America. Lest he think the U.S. Congress does not listen to speeches marked for a solely Islamic consumption, I insert his remarks of January 21, 1981, as reported by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service:

His Royal Highness the Crown Prince and Deputy Prime Minister Fahd ibn 'Adb al-Aziz has asserted that the call on Arabs and Muslims for long and persistent holy jihad is the only reply to the Zionist racist arrogance, now that all masks have dropped and talk of peace with the Israeli enemy has become a mere illusion.

In a statement published in today's Al-Madinah, his royal highness said that the call for jihad has not [word indistinct] in our struggle with the Zionist enemies, for a number of reasons connected with controlling matters, moderation and also hope for a just peace which preserves for the Arabs their legitimate rights.

His royal highness added: Words and statements have become of no avail in these critical and difficult circumstances. The Arab and Muslim nation is being confronted with a unique challenge which is supported by the strongest military power in the world. As far as we are concerned it is a question of to be or not to be.

His royal highness said that the Zionist enemy, having usurped the entire land of Palestine and some other Arab territory, is today declaring Jerusalem its united capital, defying by this the feelings of the Arabs and Muslims and also the UN resolutions. Hence we wonder: Of what avail has moderation been? Is this the West's concept of a just peace? Where is the comprehensive peace framework which they imagine they laid down at Camp David and which they promised us?

Referring to the question of autonomy for the Palestinians, his royal highness said that this issue requires from those who still wage on it a stand of pride and a lofty mind in order to admit failure and back down from what has taken and is taking place.

We in Saudi Arabia, he added, firmly believe that the Zionist enemy has embarked on [words indistinct] our territory gradually and is annexing Arab territory to itself at the appropriate time so that this territory becomes part of its so-called empire.

His royal highness stressed that putting the Arab house in order quickly has become a pressing and urgent matter on our list of priorities. He stressed that Saudi Arabia, in cooperation with other brothers, has embarked on unifying the ranks so that we

adopt a united stand in a single battle, regardless of cost—a battle in which we place all determination, faith, resources and energies and everything dear to us. We shall not rest until our usurped land is liberated and until the Palestinian people return with dignity and pride to their homeland to set up their independent state, with Jerusalem its capital.●

#### BRAZIL'S ALCOHOL FUELS PROGRAM AS A MODEL FOR THE UNITED STATES

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this report to my colleagues is to assess the Brazilian alcohol fuels program, describe the research undertaken and technology used, indicate possible areas for cooperation and assess the applicability of the Brazilian experience with alcohol fuels to the United States and other nations. This report is largely a condensation of a January 1980 report of the U.S. State Department, prepared in Brazil and dated January 2, 1980. It is, however, further supplemented and substantiated by this Member of Congress through observations and discussions held with governmental and private sources during a visit to Brazil on January 10-18, 1981, as part of the Latin American study tour by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the U.S. House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—led by the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Nevada, the Honorable JAMES SANTINI.

#### SUMMARY OF BRAZILIAN ALCOHOL FUELS PROGRAM

While Brazil depends on the renewable resources of hydropower and biomass—largely firewood—for over one-half of its energy consumption as the largest industrial power in Latin America, it also has developed a dependency on oil.

Despite refreshing Brazilian optimism, the future may realistically hold little promise of dramatic increases of domestic oil production. Currently, it imports 85 percent of its oil; payments for oil imports were \$6.2 billion in 1979, with a level for 1980 projected at \$10 to \$11 billion. Thus, the overall goal of Brazil's energy program is to reduce oil imports by increasing domestic oil production, adopting conservation measures, and replacing oil with domestically produced products: Coal—limited known reserves—and electric power—great potential—for fuel oil, and ethanol for gasoline.

The Brazilian alcohol program established in 1975 by Presidential decree specifically seeks to increase alcohol production for the gradual re-

placement of oil derivatives. The program's main objectives are to: First, reduce demand for imported oil, and hence reduce balance-of-payments problems; second, increase the security of energy supply; third, utilize excess capacity for producing sugarcane; fourth, decentralize industrial development now predominately in the south; fifth, increase income and create jobs in rural and underdeveloped areas; and sixth, develop a chemical industry based on alcohol.

As a target for 1985, the Government has set an overall production of 10.7 billion liters, to be used as follows: 6.1 billion liters or 57 percent, of hydrous ethanol to fuel vehicles designed or adapted to run on 96-percent ethanol; 3.1 billion liters, or 29 percent, of anhydrous—waterless—ethanol to blend with gasoline, in proportion of up to 20 percent; 1.5 billion liters for chemical industry—14 percent.

The Government program is being implemented entirely through private enterprise. Loans are reportedly being provided to enterprises covering 80 percent of needed investment for sugarcane distilleries and 90 percent for cassava distilleries—at 17-percent annual interest—inflation in 1979 was forecast to be 75 percent. To accelerate the program, the present administration plans to spend US\$5 billion from 1979 to 1985. As of November 1979, 248 proposals have been accepted for funding at a governmental expenditure of about \$1 billion. When completed, these approved projects will add a capacity of 4.6 billion liters per harvest, bringing the total Brazilian capacity to produce ethanol up to 5.5 billion liters. In addition, the Federal funds under the national alcohol program are being expended on research. As estimated in 1978, the Secretariat of Industrial Technology (SIT) was spending \$20 million to support research on raw materials, 14 percent, development of processes and products, 55 percent, utilization, 12 percent, and residues, 15 percent. The chief recipients are the National Technology Institute (INT) in Rio, 61 percent, Planalsucar of the Ministry of Agriculture, 22 percent, and the Center for Aerospace Technology (CTA) 8 percent.

Ethanol production quadrupled from 1976 to 2.5 billion liters in 1979. A distillery capacity of 4.8 billion liters is being installed for the 1980-81 harvest. Once again production is expected to quadruple to 10.7 billion liters in 1985. Almost all ethanol is now produced from the fermentation and distillation of sugarcane, using conventional technology. Process heat is supplied by burning plant residue, called bagasse. Brazil has also already begun the industrial production of ethanol from cassava, using plant residues and firewood for process heat. Early prob-

lems of an unstable supply, inadequate organic residue for processing energy, and technical problems in fiber removal make the goal of producing 10 percent of Brazilian alcohol from cassava by 1985 seem optimistic. However, INT claims that the prototype plant at Curvelo is now operating satisfactorily.

Several projects are underway to demonstrate the feasibility of converting wood into methanol and into both coke and ethanol. Three demonstration plants for gasifying wood will be built.

Another option for which INT is said to have developed technology is the production of ethanol through acid hydrolysis. A pilot plant for this process was planned and may now be in operation.

A planned pilot plant in Caucaia will demonstrate a third approach. It will attempt to convert cassava and black marmeleiro, a shrub tree native to the northeast, into ethanol to fuel a turbine electrical generator, whose waste heat would be recycled into the distillation process. The stillage would be converted into animal feed. Finally, in a cooperative, governmental/private sector project, the Brazilian Institute of Forestry Development (IBDF) plans to build a pilot plant to produce ethanol from a rotational cutting of timber from an area 20,500 hectares in size. The president of IBDF is quoted as saying that the cost of ethanol will be one-half that of the ethanol from sugarcane plants because of the value of the coke produced in the process.

Finally research is underway on the use of the babacu palm and sorghum. Coconuts from the palm are to be used in a plant in Maranhao to furnish edible oil, charcoal from the endocarp, ethanol from the mesocarp, and process heat from the apicarp. While the research on the use of sweet sorghum to produce ethanol is still in the research stage, its use especially intrigues the Brazilians for it could be used to extend the operating season of the sugarcane distilleries.

Up until 1980, ethanol had been mainly used in gasoline blends of up to 20-percent alcohol without engine modification. By 1985 Brazil expects to meet two major objectives in ethanol use: First, to serve as a fuel for automobiles—about 60 percent of 1985 ethanol production; and second, to replace naphtha by using ethanol as a base raw material in the chemical industry—about 15 percent of 1985 ethanol production.

#### GASOLIN-FUELED ENGINES

The addition of 20-percent ethanol to gasoline has a number of advantages. Most obviously, it saves gasoline—about 16 percent according to researchers at Volkswagen and the Aeronautical Technology Center (CTA), which has primary responsibility for testing alcohol fueled engines. While

ethanol provides 30 percent less power than an equal volume of gasoline—40 percent per kilogram—the gasohol mixture tends to be burned more efficiently in the automotive engines, which in Brazil are typically set for fuel-rich mixtures. Second, ethanol acts as an octane booster. Brazilian gasohol with 20-percent ethanol shows an average octane rating of 81 compared with 73 for regular gasoline. Automakers have been unable to take advantage of the octane-boosting effects by increasing the compression ratio because of regional and seasonal variation in alcoholic content of gasohol. Nevertheless, Petrobras has been able to reduce the lead content of gasoline while complaining that even so they are now "giving away octane," that is, delivering gasohol with an octane number higher than required. The 20-percent blend not only saves an estimated 16-percent gasoline, but also has an increased octane number—81 versus 73 for gasoline—thereby reducing the need to add lead. Third, alcohol reduces engine knock. Fourth, emissions from gasohol are less, particularly carbon monoxide and certain hydrocarbons. Nitrogen oxide emissions, however, may be higher—though not exceeding USG standards.

#### ALCOHOL-FUELED ENGINES

The future success of the Brazilian alcohol program depends greatly on the large-scale introduction of automobiles designed or adapted to run on near hydrous ethanol. This phase is by far the most ambitious use of alcohol fuels that Brazil, or indeed any other nation, has attempted. It will require the simultaneous coordination of the manufacture of alcohol cars, production of hydrous ethanol, geographical distribution of alcohol fuel supplies, and incentives for consumers to buy alcohol cars.

By agreement with the Brazilian Federal Government, Brazilian automakers last year easily met the goal of producing 250,000 vehicles that use pure alcohol. Certainly the cars seemed to be popularly received by the Brazilian public. The price of gasoline per gallon is pegged twice as high as alcohol, and the Brazilian Federal Government has guaranteed that there will be adequate suppliers of ethanol fuel for the public. The goal for 1981 has been boosted from 300,000 to 400,000 vehicles using pure alcohol. Including plans to adapt 470,000 cars to alcohol combustion, there could be well over 2 million cars using pure alcohol in Brazil by 1985.

Based on research and development including the experience of 730 alcohol-fueled vehicles, which have run a total of 22 million kilometers, Brazilian engineers and authorities are convinced that the major problems of using ethanol as a standard fuel have been solved. The first such problem is the low calorific value of ethanol rela-

tive to gasoline which thermodynamically implies that an engine would consume 43 percent more ethanol than gasoline for the same distance. However, the alcohol engine is being adapted to run more efficiently by increasing the compression ratio from about 6 or 7—standard in Brazil for ordinary gasoline with an average octane number of 73—to 10 or 11, thus accommodating the higher octane number (89) of ethanol. In addition, alcohol engines are adapted to run on a leaner air-to-fuel mixture. All in all, researchers estimate that, given their increased efficiency, alcohol engines consume only about 20 percent more fuel by volume than gasoline engines.

Another problem is the relatively high amount of heat required to vaporize ethanol, causing difficulties in operating when the engine is cold—at temperatures below 10° C.—50° F. For cold starts, a small auxiliary tank of gasoline is installed with a capacity of about 2 liters of gasoline. During ignition, the gasoline is fed through an electric pump, solenoid injector, or even by hand, into the ethanol fuel stream in mixtures of 5 or 10 percent gasoline. Thus far, this has proven satisfactory. In normal operation, the fuel intake system is preheated with hot exhaust gas for increased temperature and better distribution of the fuel mixture.

In addition, the solvent action of ethanol on certain plastic and rubber parts requires replacement by nonethanol soluble parts. Ethanol produced in Brazil also contains varying concentrations of sulfuric acid residues, which require careful monitoring and when necessary, correction. Otherwise, the acid could combine with metals like zinc to form sulfates harmful to engine performance. Ethanol also tends to absorb water thus decreasing engine efficiency, lowering calorific value of the fuel, and increasing the possibility of corrosion of parts by water. To insure quality control and to prevent illegal additions of water, densitometers may be installed on all ethanol pumps.

In road tests, CTA reports no unusual amount of mechanical difficulties, except for the fuel pump. Volkswagen researchers said that in test runs of 100,000 kilometers, no unusual mechanical problems were observed. Indeed they quoted Texaco that the lubricating oil behaved better, metal content was lower, and viscosity extended. Research and road testing have determined that optimum engine performance is obtained from a mixture of 96-percent ethanol with 4-percent water. Further dilution with water is tolerable down to 91-percent ethanol. Beyond this point, engine efficiency deteriorates, described by one engineer as "the steam engine effect."



Brazilian authorities and automakers are confident also that the public will buy the alcohol cars. Volkswagen claimed that customers are now postponing purchases to have the opportunity later to buy alcohol cars. There are significant economic incentives. The Government plans to keep the price of ethanol at the pump at least 25 percent less than that of gasoline, thus making the price of deliverable energy from ethanol slightly less than that from gasoline. According to Volkswagen, the annual licensing tax will be reduced from 7 percent for gasoline cars to 3 percent for alcohol cars and the terms of financing will be extended from 12 to 16 months to 36 months.

#### PROBLEMS AHEAD FOR BRAZIL

In order to meet the ambitious targets set for 1985 and beyond, Brazil must solve several looming problems:

##### 1. COST

Ethanol from sugarcane or cassava costs about twice as much to produce as gasoline because of the high cost of feed material, which comprises two-thirds of overall cost. Also sugarcane distilleries operate only 180 days a year; large and costly storage capacity is required. The real cost of ethanol according to the U.S. State Department report of January 1980 was, at the cruzeiro equivalent, estimated at US\$40 per barrel by Petrobras—the Brazilian nationalized oil giant—and at US\$35 by the Brazilian Secretariat of Industrial Technology—values assigned before the December 1979 devaluation.

##### 2. FOOD VERSUS FUEL

Ideally, crops for both food and alcohol would be produced on good farmland near population centers. However, such areas are already heavily cultivated, even though, generally speaking, unused arable land in Brazil is immense. Thus, there is a Brazilian concern that Government-guaranteed markets for alcohol will displace food production. There are obvious parallels here to the concerns that have been heard within the U.S. Department of Agriculture on the dangers of displacing grain production.

##### 3. INSTABILITY OF SUGAR SUPPLIES

An increase in world sugar demand or a bad harvest would drive up sugar prices and thus cause a shortfall in sugarcane available for conversion to alcohol. Until 1980 Brazil exported ethanol to the United States and other foreign nations, but in January 1981 governmental officials indicated that such exports have been stopped and are not likely to be resumed in the immediate future. Since Brazilian and West German alcohol has in substantial amount been used to produce gasoline marketed in the United States, additional American alcohol production is an immediate requirement.

##### 4. STILLAGE

The waste effluents from distilleries are often disposed in rivers thereby creating heavy pollution. The stillage, and organic effluent, is in volume over 12 times that of the ethanol produced. Extensive research is being conducted in creating useful byproducts from stillage, such as animal feed and methane gas.

##### 5. CONSUMER PREFERENCE

Although initial enthusiasm with alcohol-fueled cars seems high, it is not known with certainty how consumers will ultimately react to them. If sales slump and automakers then cut back production, an excess of ethanol production capacity will result. Shortages of ethanol also, of course, would have a drastic effect on consumer acceptance.

##### 6. EMISSIONS FROM ALCOHOL ENGINES

No conclusive research has been done regarding the health effects of emissions from ethanol fueled engines. They are, however, generally considered to be less harmful than those from gasoline combustion.

##### 7. DIESEL FUEL IMBALANCE

As alcohol replaces gasoline, and coal replaces fuel oil, an imbalance at refineries will develop, creating further diesel shortages. With railroads moving proportionately far less freight in Brazil than in the United States, its economy moves largely on diesel trucks. Thus while a barrel of crude oil can be—within limits—and is being, refined to produce more diesel fuel and less gasoline, the need for proportionately more diesel fuel still propels Brazilian demand for foreign crude oil. Currently it is actually exporting some of the excess gasoline produced to meet its diesel fuel requirements. Naturally, research for a diesel-fuel substitute is a Brazilian priority.

##### RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

Considering the aforementioned problems, opportunities exist for collaborative research with Brazilian agencies and institutes, including the following areas: First, sugarcane and cassava productivity; second, useful stillage products; third, health and environmental effects of emissions from ethanol-fueled cars; and fourth, development of low-cost additives to enhance ignitability of ethanol in diesel engines.

##### LESSONS FOR THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER NATIONS

Overall, the Brazilian alcohol program can thus far be judged a successful response to the exigencies of oil dependence, given Brazilian conditions.

Already within a significant part of its total fleet of 8 million cars Brazil has demonstrated that ethanol can be used nationwide in blends with gasoline up to 20 percent, with no engine modification, with good driveability, and, in all likelihood, with reduced

pollution. In performance, ethanol can be considered an environmentally acceptable substitute for lead additives as well as gasoline. By 1985 Brazil will probably have demonstrated the economic and technical feasibility of using ethanol as a base material for the chemical industry and, in neat form, as a fuel for automobiles. Its success in producing and marketing alcohol-fueled automobiles is, of course, even more impressive.

However, Brazil's alcohol program has benefited from the following unique factors:

First, the jump in production of ethanol from sugarcane from 1976 to 1979 was possible because of existing excess capacity to grow sugarcane and low sugar prices.

Second, Brazil has unutilized arable lands, which can be cultivated to produce sugarcane, cassava, and other feeds for ethanol production, as well as tropical growing conditions and the water resources necessary for irrigation.

Third, large-scale cultivation of cassava is not feasible in temperate zone nations like the United States.

Fourth, because of balance-of-payments problems and rural unemployment, Brazil has been willing to incur the high cost—in local currency—of ethanol in order to save the cost—in foreign currency—of importing oil.

Fifth, the energy requirements for producing ethanol in Brazil are entirely met by local biomass. Feed materials other than sugarcane do not necessarily leave sufficient residues for processing heat.

Sixth, Brazil was willing to embark on its alcohol program before completely resolving pollution problems.

Nonetheless, considering the following factors, the United States and many other nations do have immense resources and the capability to produce alcohol:

First, agricultural, industrial and even municipal organic waste can be used. Wood also has tremendous potential for alcohol production.

Second, reductions in costs and energy requirements could be expected from scientific and technological innovations by the U.S. chemical industry, once the alcohol industry develops.

Third, environmental problems probably would be less in the United States because stillage is already routinely used as an animal feed. Additionally, catalytic converters now in use would sharply reduce emissions of noxious aldehydes.

Ethanol looks even better when compared to alternative fuels for automobiles. Oil prices undoubtedly will continue to rise. Total reliance on electric power could prove costly. Regardless of fuels used in the immediate or near future, eventually a substitute

for oil will be needed as world oil reserves dwindle. Alcohol derived from biomass appears to be one likely and practical alternative.●

## A SECOND CHANCE FOR FEDERAL RETIREES

**HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the 96th Congress, my colleagues and Federal retirees throughout the United States expressed a great deal of interest in and support for my bill to give a second chance to Federal retirees who did not elect survivor benefits at the time of their retirement. I have therefore decided to reintroduce this legislation today.

Under current law, a Federal employee must choose to elect retirement benefits at the time of retirement, or, if not married at that time, must decide if he or she wants survivor benefits within 1 year from the date of marriage. This bill would give civil service retirees a year from the date of the bill's enactment or date of retirement to take advantage of this opportunity.

Our office has received numerous letters and phone calls from retired senior citizens indicating their support for this legislation. Most of these people were not aware of their rights at the time of retirement, and therefore missed the opportunity to elect survivor benefits. These retirees have expressed their willingness to pay back the necessary funds to the Federal Government for this second opportunity. This legislation provides for such repayment.

There are also cases where individuals, although married at the time of their retirement, were in the midst of divorce proceedings, and decided not to elect survivor benefits. However, many of these individuals later remarried, and were then unable to elect survivor benefits for their new spouses. Passage of this bill would provide relief to these deserving retirees.

As I have already indicated, there is widespread interest in this bill, and I am hopeful that this legislation to give our Federal retirees a second chance will be considered and passed in the near future.●

## PENNY WISE, POUND FOOLISH: U.S. FOREIGN AID POLICIES

**HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unfortunate and widely held

misrepresentations concerns the level of foreign aid which this country bestows on Third World countries.

Every time a foreign aid appropriation or authorization bill appears, a hue and cry arises concerning the extravagant level of U.S. financial and technical assistance to impoverished countries in the Third World. Yet, that rhetoric ignores the fact that the share of the U.S. gross national product going to foreign aid has fallen to 0.19 percent, which is less than every other Western country with the exception of Italy. That figure stands in dismal comparison to other Western nations, such as Sweden, Norway, and the Netherlands, which contribute 0.9 percent of their GNP to foreign aid. Even the notoriously parsimonious Swiss donate a larger share of their GNP to this worthy cause.

Although the humanitarian aspect is obvious, there is an equally important side to this declining trend in U.S. foreign assistance. That downward trend has been naturally accompanied by a declining level of respect and admiration for the United States among Third World countries. It should come as no surprise that a leader of a country with a per capita income of \$200 should feel some hostility to a country with a per capita income of \$8,750, which decreases its actual contribution to foreign aid. Ironically, many of those who favor a stronger and more assertive U.S. posture on the world arena are adamantly opposed to bilateral and multilateral U.S. foreign aid, which demonstrates a somewhat incomplete understanding of the nature of modern diplomacy.

For example, after Zimbabwe received its independence, Prime Minister Mugabe immediately turned to the West and particularly to the United States for assistance to rebuild his war-torn country. He pointedly ignored the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet bloc, despite his somewhat socialist leanings. However, due to a congressional refusal to support an adequate level of foreign aid, this country was only able to offer him a pittance in assistance, which ran the risk of forcing the Prime Minister to turn to the Soviet bloc. It is to his credit that he has not done so.

I want to commend to all of my colleagues attention an article from the Economist, which quite accurately analyzes this country's "penny-wise, pound-foolish" foreign aid policies. The article is entitled "Hard Luck Story" and appeared in the September 13, 1980, edition of this requested and conservative English journal.

The article follows:

### HARD LUCK STORY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Last year Americans spent more on potted plants and flowers (over \$5 billion) than they did on aid to the third world (\$4.6 billion). Opinion polls show that, when it comes to federal budget

cuts, foreign aid is the favorite candidate of more than four in five Americans, a sentiment not lost on Capitol Hill.

Congress has not managed to pass a foreign aid bill for the current fiscal year, which ends this month. And with congressional elections only two months away, few politicians at present want anything to do with the bill for the next fiscal year, 1981. So for the second year running the administration may have to resort to a "continuing resolution", a tactic which allows it to finance its aid programmes, but at levels much below its original request to congress.

In the late 1960s, when America devoted just over 0.4% of its gross national product to help for the third world, only France, Australia, Belgium and Holland gave a bigger slice of their national income. By last year, when the share of America's gnp going to aid had fallen to 0.19%, only Italy, among the rich countries of the non-communist world, was more parsimonious. Austria also gave just 0.19%, but the American effort had even been bettered by the incorrigibly stingy Swiss.

Bilateral aid accounts for 80% of America's total aid bill. By last year the United States was spending 38% less, in real terms, on this kind of direct aid than it had in 1962. At the same time the aid given has been concentrated in the hands of a few favoured recipients. In 1973 congress decided to direct foreign aid to the poorest of the less-developed countries (ldcs). In 1979, however, about 40% of all America's bilateral aid went to Egypt and Israel to further the Camp David agreements.

A recurrent issue in this year's presidential election campaign has been whether or not America's foreign policy has suffered through an apparent reluctance, even inability, to use military force. What is never mentioned, however, is the possibility that the unwillingness to spread foreign aid at all thickly in more than two Middle East countries has robbed American foreign policy of a useful tool elsewhere in the world. Foreign aid does not necessarily produce client states (which is why some Americans have turned against it). But it can do something for the donor's prestige and influence.

Bilateral American aid falls into three categories. "Development assistance," administered by the Agency for International Development, is widely shared among 68 of the world's poorest countries: last year 81% of assistance loans and grants went to nations falling within the World Bank's poverty criterion (those with an annual income per head of less than \$625). Measured in constant (1972) dollars, spending on this type of aid, largely for basic rural development, has fallen from \$2.5 billion in 1962 to \$1.4 billion in 1970 to \$968m last year.

By contrast, spending from the "economic support fund" has more than doubled in real terms in the past decade. This aid is much more political in nature, designed to promote the economic and political stability of countries in regions that America regards as vital to its interests. In the early 1970s up to 85% of the fund went to South Vietnam. Now Egypt and Israel are the big beneficiaries: more than three quarters of the fund last year went to these two signatories to the Camp David accords which they used partly for industrial projects but mainly to finance imports.

The shift in emphasis from development assistance to the economic support fund means that the poorest countries have been hit not only by the decline in America's for-



eign aid budget but also by the growing chunk allocated to Egypt and Israel within that declining budget. There has also been a fall in American food shipments—the third form of bilateral aid—to third-world countries. Last year America gave or sold through soft loans \$1 billion of wheat and rice—in real terms only half the value of food shipments made 10 years ago.

Bilateral belt-tightening, of course, could be offset by American contributions to the multilateral development banks. In fact, congress has been even more suspicious of foreign aid over which the American government has no direct control. Congress has now started to cut administration requests for funds over the next three years for the International Development Association (the World Bank's soft-loan affiliate) and the regional development banks. Failure to appropriate enough money to meet its capital obligations means that America's subscription share in the World Bank has fallen from its original 34% to below 24%. Indeed, American voting strength in the World Bank is only just above the 20% share it needs to protect its veto over bank charter changes. Partly because of this, the convention of America naming the bank's president—Mr. Robert McNamara, the current president, resigns this autumn—is now under attack.

The Carter administration has started to wake up to the dangerous trends in American foreign aid policy. It wants to increase development assistance, freeze spending on the economic support fund and go for higher contributions to the World Bank group. The secretary of state, Mr. Edmund Muskie, has been pointing out that of every \$1 "given" as foreign aid 70 cents is spent in the United States, to the benefit of 600,000 jobs. But the conservative mood in congress is thwarting these plans. It killed an \$8 billion foreign aid appropriations bill for fiscal 1980, forcing the government to continue its aid programme at 1979 levels, that is, 30% below the budget requested.

The appropriations committee of the house of representatives has agreed on a \$7.2 billion budget for fiscal 1981, \$400m less than Mr. Carter timidly asked for. But the bill has an uncertain future. Plans to bring it to the floor of the house this month have been shelved. It could face the same fate as its predecessor. It is unlikely to be considered by the whole house until after the election.

The most immediate casualty of the current anti-foreign aid mood is Zimbabwe. Its prime minister, Mr. Robert Mugabe, was greeted by President Carter as a "notable world leader" when he visited Washington last month. But the president was less forthcoming when Mr. Mugabe pressed for "massive financial help". He wants \$350m for immediate reconstruction and \$5 billion for long-term development. No doubt Mr. Mugabe was over-ambitious. But America's offer of \$25m this year and \$30m next is far short of what Mr. Mugabe could use.

Mr. Mugabe's problem is not just American tight-fistedness. Washington is divided on how to treat foreign aid requests from governments it thinks are suspiciously left-wing. After months of wrangling, congress at last agreed this summer to a \$75m package for Nicaragua. But it stipulated that the money should be disbursed only if the left-wing revolutionary leaders of Nicaragua were not fomenting revolution elsewhere in Central America. When reports came that arms were being shipped from Cuba to Nicaragua for use by other guerrilla groups Mr. Carter was forced to freeze the aid until the

rumours could be clarified. The state department (which wants the aid) and the defense department (which does not) are singing different tunes to the president, and Mr. Carter is in a mood to procrastinate. Coherence, never mind growth, in American foreign aid programmes will have to wait.●

## THE IMPACT OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER DECONTROLLING CRUDE OIL PRICES

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan's Executive order issued today decontrolling crude oil prices will result in an unfair burden on consumers and homeowners who use oil to heat their homes and gasoline in their cars. This effect will be felt particularly in my State, which relies on oil more heavily than any other State in the Nation.

It seems incredible that oil companies, which directly benefit from decontrol, claim they need such an action, when the industry as a whole recently revealed its extraordinary profit margins. The higher prices decontrol will create for consumers will result in grossly increased profits for the oil companies. Administration sources estimate the profit increase conservatively at as much as \$10 million over the next year, but we can anticipate a much greater amount. Unexpected changes in the market supply of oil, such as the interruption of supply by events in world affairs, could double or possibly even triple the cost of oil to consumers and the profits accrued by oil corporations.

The program of gradual decontrol which was cut short yesterday provided a short period of adjustment for oil consumers, but President Reagan's action makes it still more difficult for many oil-product users who already spend disproportionately large parts of their income on heating costs and vital transportation needs.●

## BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE OF BEAVER COUNTY, PA.

HON. EUGENE V. ATKINSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. ATKINSON. Mr. Speaker, among the many groups and individuals that visited Washington last week to attend the inaugural festivities and tour this great city was a particularly distinguished group from Beaver County, Pa. I had the distinct honor and pleasure to host the more than 40 members and guests of the Blue

Ribbon Committee of Beaver County during their 3-day visit to Washington.

Arriving in Washington on Monday they spent Tuesday participating in the many activities centered around the inauguration of our 40th President, Ronald Wilson Reagan. This was in keeping with the avowed purposes of the National Blue Ribbon Committee and its local affiliates which is to foster civic pride, work to better our community, and recognize those who contribute in many ways to make this such a great country to live and work in.

On Wednesday, I was pleased to sponsor a reception for the committee at the National Democratic Club. While not every member of the Pennsylvania delegation was able to attend, most were on hand to honor the committee members who traveled by bus to Washington at their own expense. Louis Uihlein, the president of the Blue Ribbon Committee of Beaver Valley made some brief comments at that time which I feel would make worthwhile reading for all of the Members of this body. At the close of my remarks today I will submit them for inclusion in the RECORD.

For the remainder of Wednesday they were escorted on VIP tours of such local landmarks as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of State, and the Washington Monument. It was a particular pleasure for me as their Congressman to arrange these activities for them.

To conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment to read for the RECORD the names of the members and guests of the Blue Ribbon Committee of Beaver County who were in Washington on this historic trip last week:

Camden L. Williams, Dorothy L. Williams, Marguerite E. Zaperach, Terry E. Zaperach, Marguerite M. Zaperach, Lilyan A. McKelvey, James K. Glitsch, Jr., Dolores Boyle, Mary C. Knopick, Anna Dzubak.

Elizabeth Barto, Anne Yount, Dorothy D. Happ, Janice Happ, Ann Bufalini, Elizabeth Banyo, H. Louis Danneker, Geraldine C. Zugay, Velma J. Bleasdale, David Cuteri, Guido P. Lamark.

Lois J. Sanvito, Anthony A. Sanvito, Lee Uihlein, Marie K. Smith, D. Susan Pratt, Earl R. Pratt, Irene H. McCullough, Hazel M. Masson, Florence D. Musgrave, Mildred S. Shane.

Audrey E. Davidson, Katherine Wozniak, Jo A. Delivuk, Stelle Kilpatrick, Sarah Kostal, Marianne Kostal, Louis Henry Uihlein, S.E.T., Frank Struggs, Sgt., Michael J. Diaddigo, Kenneth L. Young, and Charlotte Sommerville.

## STATEMENT OF LOUIS UIHLEIN

Let's have your attention, please. We will now have the pledge of allegiance led by Colonel Louis Danaker. . . .

Thank you Colonel. Please remain standing. Our chaplain for this historical occasion will now give the invocation. Ann Zoo-back . . .

Thank you, Ann.

Ladies and gentlemen, Honorable Eugene Atkinson, Congressman representing the 25th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, ladies and gentlemen, elected officials from the governmental offices of the United States.

Each and everyone here today is a V.I.P., a very important person. We have traveled many miles to be here for the Presidential inauguration of Ronald Wilson Reagan and Vice President George Herbert Walker Bush. We are here today to salute our Representative, Eugene Atkinson from the 25th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. Ladies and gentlemen, this is a very historical occasion. We have with us today constituents, both Democrats and Republicans, members of the Blue Ribbon Committee of Beaver County, Pennsylvania. We are here on this visit to the Capitol of the United States to fellowship with our elected and appointed officials representing the people of these United States. We call all the States united and that is as it should be, united, a government of the people, and by the people, and for the people. Our forefathers did a great job and over the years we have become the greatest nation in the world.

United States means just what it implies, the state or fact of being one—wholly united and complete within itself a state or quality of general concord and mutual understanding with a goal of harmonious agreement forming a oneness—working as a united unit with equal rights—therefore we should strive to preserve the moral principles that this Nation was founded upon—one nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all.

We have many, many outstanding buildings here in Washington, each a monument to the people and the greatness of these United States of America. I could go on and on elaborating on the wonders of this Nation. I want to give thanks to all the congressional staff—a special thanks to Congressman Eugene Atkinson's staff at the Beaver Valley Mall—Michele Joseph, Barbara Kay, Irene Taylor, Peg Turcic, Ruth Ann Spears, and Staff Director Paul O'Palka. Their gracious assistance was coordinated with the Washington office.

A special thanks to Nancy, Bernice, Robb, and a special thanks to Jewel Lee Huff, who did an outstanding job in assembling the many added privileges and sightseeing arrangements that have been afforded us on this 20th day of January and this 21st day of January, 1981.

A special thanks to all the members of the Blue Ribbon Committee of Beaver County who have given many hours of themselves. A special thanks to Charlotte Somerville, recording secretary and treasurer of the Blue Ribbon Committee. I, Louis Uihlein, president of the Blue Ribbon Committee, thank you one and all for being such a wonderful group, and do look forward to our next trip. Susan and Earl Pratt will entertain you as will my wife Lenore. Let's all join in—this reception was made possible today by our Congressman Eugene Atkinson, who personally planned this luncheon. Today is your day, a day that should long be remembered in your life, a day in the pages of history of these United States. These wonderful buildings are your buildings, and each and everyone here in Washington are our representatives, and they represent each and everyone of us, we the people. Gene wants you all to fraternize and enjoy the good fellowship of oneness—united in the knowledge that we have dedicated leaders here in Washington.

Please feel free to contact your Representative any time. Together we shall continue to be great. This Nation knows no ethnic, religious, social, political, regional, or economical boundaries—the spirit of our forefathers, immigrants from every corner of the Earth, came here to make this the greatest nation on Earth. We the people shall continue to maintain the Constitution of the United States.●

#### "MURTHA MISTREATED," EDITORIAL STATES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, anyone who serves in public office or occupies a position of public prominence is vulnerable to unwarranted, unfounded, and unproven attacks on their character and integrity which frequently appear in the Nation's media under the guise of "news".

Too often, it seems, these insinuations, allegations and innuendoes are "leaked" to the media by "unidentified sources" and, despite their lack of confirmation or verification, they may be interpreted by readers or listeners as fact. Such reports can cause extreme anguish, humiliation, and embarrassment to an individual. They can disrupt a family and ruin a friendship. They can do irreparable damage to a career. They can cost a life.

It is a risk, I suppose, that goes with the territory. The first amendment of the Constitution gives those who report the news the right to protect their sources of information. I find no quarrel with that. I support the concept of a free press. I strongly believe in the philosophy that "news" must never be allowed to be suppressed in our country.

But, I become concerned when facts and fiction become confused. I cannot help but question the fairness of permitting an unconfirmed report, perhaps one that is totally false, to besmirch someone's character or stain a career while the source of the report remains unidentified and protected by the Constitution. Certainly, the maligned individual has some rights as well.

While he may be held up to public question, scorn and, in some cases, ridicule, the source remains hidden and safe from public scrutiny. The source's reputation is not sullied. His integrity and motives are not questioned. His family is not publicly humiliated or embarrassed. His job or career remains secure.

This feeling of concern was expressed in a recent editorial broadcast by KDKA-radio and KDKA-TV in Pittsburgh, Pa. The editorial dealt with the Abscam scandal and the mistreatment accorded our colleague, JOHN MURTHA.

It said:

The Abscam scandal has been in the news since February. When the story broke, Johnstown Congressman Murtha was linked to the mess.

When there was talk of indictments Murtha's name came up. When a grand jury started to meet in May, Murtha's name was mentioned again. When indictments were handed down in June, Murtha's name popped up once again, even though he wasn't indicted. Finally, in November, the Federal Justice Department said there won't be any more indictments. This time Murtha's name wasn't mentioned.

It's generally agreed now, Murtha wasn't on the take in Abscam. But for nine months his name was blackened across the country. And there's plenty of blame to go around. Last February somebody in the Justice Department had to leak the story lumping seven Congressmen together—one of them Murtha. The news media never took the time to separate the cases and investigate each individually. The innocent and the guilty were painted with the same brush.

No amount of apologies can remove the personal pain and embarrassment Murtha has had to live through. What happened to him proves something. We have to find a way to protect the reputations of people who happen on the fringe but not in the center of a publicly damaging event. That's the lesson all of us can learn from Murtha's mistreatment.

Mr. Speaker, I commend KDKA-radio and KDKA-TV on its efforts to clear the name of a respected colleague. I admire the call for responsibility in reporting the news.●

#### TARGETED TAX CUTS

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the 97th Congress will be able to devise a tax package this year that capitalizes on the growing popularity of providing Federal tax incentives to stimulate economic growth and job creation in the private sector.

In particular, however, I believe that a key component of that tax package must be targeted to address the special expansion needs of small- and medium-sized businesses located in the economically distressed urban centers of our Nation.

While broad-based, across-the-board tax incentives are needed to speed investment and increase productivity in our business community as a whole, at the same time I believe we must provide special incentives to meet the special needs of our older central cities.

What I am advocating is a broader use of the Federal tax code as a tool of urban revitalization and to help these communities counter the adverse impact of long-term high unemployment, population loss, local tax base erosion, and the resultant disincentive to private investment.



I have already communicated this view to President Reagan and I trust that serious consideration will be given this concept as the new administration develops its tax policies and legislative proposals.

I have long been an advocate of tailoring and targeting Federal tax incentives to assist economically distressed communities. I firmly believe such targeted incentives would provide multiple benefits, including assisting localities address in a meaningful way the problems of the chronic jobless and aging, deteriorating physical plants, and abandoned structures.

A carefully tailored and targeted tax incentive package in the long run would result not only in increased revenues for the Federal, State, and local treasuries but also would help curb unproductive governmental expenditures for items like welfare and unemployment compensation.

That is why one of the first bills I introduced in 1975—my first year in the House—was a measure seeking to provide a 5-percent bonus—in addition to the regular 10-percent investment tax credit—for both plant and equipment expenditures in targeted distressed areas.

My experience during the last 6 years and my work during the last 2 as chairman of a House Small Business Subcommittee, reaffirm my belief that this type of incentive would be a viable and valuable economic development and expansion tool.

It is one of six incentives I have included in H.R. 390, the Job Expansion and Urban Development Act of 1980, which I introduced in October. I would like to bring this package to my colleagues' attention in the hope of spurring debate and interest in the viability of this targeting concept.

This bill is intended to help foster the growth of employment and industrial development—particularly among small- and medium-sized firms—in targeted depressed urban areas. The targeting criteria includes levels of poverty, unemployment, and the lag in per capita income.

In general, the bill would:

First, stimulate new investment by providing increased depreciation allowances.

Second, provide a 5-percent investment tax credit on new structures placed in service by a qualified business. This will encourage new construction and business development.

Third, increase the amount of used property eligible for the investment tax credit from \$100,000 to \$400,000.

Fourth, provide for a 25-percent investment tax credit on the rehabilitation of commercial buildings.

Fifth, help start up companies through a refundable investment tax credit of up to \$100,000.

Sixth, expand the present targeted jobs tax credit.

This six-pronged approach would,

therefore, provide a range of incentives that would stimulate a variety of economic development initiatives, from new construction to rehabilitation, in the targeted areas. This type of stimulus would do much to improve the physical plant condition in these areas, improving the quality of life and the areas' attraction to both investors and residents.

An important aspect of this approach is its total reliance on Federal—rather than local—tax incentives to stimulate this economic expansion and revitalization.

Cities, like my hometown of Buffalo, N.Y., for example, are levying property taxes at or near their constitutional limits. And still, they are having trouble making ends meet.

Thus, I do not believe that such hard-strapped cities could afford the revenue losses that would be incurred if they sought to provide such investment incentives to target areas by using local property tax abatement as the vehicle.

In addition to the revenue loss, such cities' fiscal woes would be compounded by the continued need to provide costly basic services to the target area that was the beneficiary of such tax abatement.

Thus, adapting Federal tax laws to provide the desired relief and economic stimulus would be the most appropriate and effective route to pursue.

Of course, the all-encompassing intent of my proposals is to create jobs . . . permanent, long-term jobs in the private sector, particularly among small business and medium-sized growth firms.

Another major goal, however, is to deal in a meaningful way with the problems of the chronically unemployed. My proposed expansion and targeting of the jobs tax credit program would be a major step in addressing the needs of the long-term jobless. It would give special tax incentives to firms in the target area who hired residents of the target area. This is in line with my original point that we need to provide special incentives to meet special needs.

Despite various Government-sponsored training programs, thousands of inner-city residents remain trapped in the vise of long-term unemployment. We must enlist the broader involvement of the private sector in dealing with this serious problem and my proposed jobs tax credit would stimulate just that kind of activity.

As our efforts intensify in the months ahead to curtail inflation and achieve a balanced budget, greater and greater constraints are expected on our limited Federal resources.

If we really want to insure that our older cities do not become wards of the Federal Government, if we really want to enable localities to help themselves, if we really want to reduce Federal spending and yet achieve urban

revitalization, I suggest that the new administration in cooperation with the 97th Congress seriously address the potential of the targeted tax incentives approach. It will certainly be a top priority item for me.

Cosponsors of H.R. 390 are: Mr. YATRON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. AUSTIN MURPHY, Mr. FISH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. NELLIGAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. NEAL SMITH, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. BARNARD.●

#### FOREIGN MILITARY SALES TO THE MIDDLE EAST AND PERSIAN GULF DURING THE 1970'S

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues Department of Defense figures on U.S. foreign arms sales during the past decade.

During the 1970's, foreign military sales (FMS) have assumed a larger importance as an instrument of foreign policy. Arms sales increased from \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 1971 to \$15.2 billion in fiscal year 1980, current year dollars. While this quantum increase in dollar value can in part be attributed to inflation and the ability of many nations, particularly in the Persian Gulf, to purchase arms and military services with cash, it is clear that more and more states of the Third World want to buy advanced weaponry.

As the following charts show, the Middle East and Persian Gulf have, since 1973, consistently been the recipients of over 50 percent of all arms sales. These areas are increasingly important for the United States.

Arms sales remain an important part of our foreign policy and of our friends' and allies' security but we need to be careful to insure that they dovetail with political and economic policies and do not dominate other instruments of American foreign policy.

Two charts prepared by the Defense Department follow:

#### TOTAL FOREIGN MILITARY SALES WORLDWIDE, IN THE PERSIAN GULF AND THE MIDDLE EAST

[In millions of dollars]

	Worldwide total	Middle East and Persian Gulf	Worldwide total <sup>1</sup>
1971	1,390	690	701
1972	2,950	1,190	1,760
1973	4,848	3,465	1,383
1974	10,343	8,551	1,792
1975	16,053	8,622	7,431
1976	14,371	11,146	3,225
1977	8,305	5,397	2,908
1978	10,177	6,256	3,921
1979	13,014	8,293	4,721
1980	15,277	8,100	7,177

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of the Persian Gulf and the Middle East.  
Source: Data from (B) report as of end of fiscal year 1980; that is, Nov. 20, 1980. Rounded to dollars in millions.

TOTAL FMS FOR PERSIAN GULF COUNTRIES, EGYPT, ISRAEL, JORDAN, LEBANON, LIBYA, MOROCCO<sup>1</sup>

[In thousands of dollars]

	Bahrain	Egypt	Iran	Israel	Jordan	Kuwait	Lebanon	Libya	Morocco	Oman	Qatar	Saudi Arabia	Tunisia	UAE	Yemen	Total
1971			354,613	300,530	16,282		187	632	2,259			15,245				689,748
1972			455,815	399,829	18,877		232	2,672	7,490			305,426				1,190,141
1973			2,133,680	162,488	8,861	40	5,155	130	2,489			1,152,036	2,137			3,465,026
1974			3,935,069	2,450,583	64,506	31,693	9,775	12	8,192			2,048,234	722			8,551,392
1975			1,290,509	828,322	77,547	365,256	240		281,324	1,610		5,775,999	383			8,621,577
1976			62,192	1,558,797	979,547	359,946	202,480	244	105,374	223		7,742,087	2,247			11,145,694
1977			1,671	2,760,650	503,015	99,726	31,248	28,505	37,228	764		1,888,155	42,670	268	130,355	5,396,506
1978			162,883	913,494	867,328	71,776	85,581	22,545	7,337			4,121,519	2,156	37	1,285	6,255,968
1979			449,693	35,862	987,791	88,775	11,780	32,130	3,580	59		6,468,701	33,802	2,847	177,749	8,292,797
1980	6,072	2,408,920		290,421	351,419	126,496	10,947		321,410	23,710	78	4,536,777	21,833	154	1,525	8,099,762

<sup>1</sup>As of the end of fiscal year 1980.●

## PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE RESPONSIBILITY

## HON. CHARLES ROSE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, recently the following editorial appeared in one of the major newspapers in my district, the Robesonian in Lumberton, N.C. Because I feel that this editorial raises some very interesting points about public versus private responsibility in an economic crisis, I thought that my colleagues would be interested in this article.

I certainly agree with the editors of the Robesonian that we are facing a difficult and trying economic period. I firmly believe that we need to encourage all Americans to look first to themselves for guidance. The Federal Government cannot possibly solve every problem. I am encouraged by the insight shown in this editorial, and I hope my colleagues will find it as useful as I did.

## EVIDENT EMERGENCY

A "national economic emergency" may be declared by President-Elect Ronald Reagan as soon as he is inaugurated. That is hinted by his transition director, Edwin Meece, who admits that any such step would be largely a public relations gesture. No presidential powers exist by which Reagan could take control of the economy and impose "solutions" on which he and his advisers are working.

As a public relations gesture, a declaration of emergency would seem like an anticlimax. The condition of the economy was fully recognized by the public in voting for a change in national administration. If anybody did not get the message throughout months of political campaigning this year, the re-escalation of interest rates should make the point.

The usual purpose of such a declaration is to generate demand for emergency legislation and emergency executive powers, either or both increasing federal control and regu-

lation. That would be contrary to campaign advocacy of less government control. It might be consistent, however, if emergency powers were sought to reduce federal regulation in the interest of a freer economy.

Temporarily, the Reagan administration might win support for doing something, right or wrong, as a show of activity. Yet within a few months, results would become more impressive than intentions. False starts could throw the economy further out of balance and make recovery all the more difficult.

It is the duty of Congress to examine administration proposals and use the judgment of its membership in evaluating them. This is as necessary as ever, or more so, when proposals ride on a wave of non-critical enthusiasm for political promises. A Congress with more Republican clout will need to be as cautious about drastic Reagan proposals as a Democratic Congress was about the liberal plans offered by the highly popular Senator Kennedy.

Nevertheless, the existence of a national economic emergency might be reaffirmed, without arousing unrealistic expectations, in an appeal for public cooperation at the individual and community level. Ways in which the economy could be stabilized by changes in the pattern of general economic activity might be pointed out, and local governments could be asked to cut down on their applications for federal funding of projects they could get along without.

In a national economic emergency, if people are shown what they can do for their country, there will be less reliance on what it can do for them, which has reached limits under an administration.●

## IOSIF MENDELEVICH SHOULD BE RELEASED BY SOVIET UNION

## HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the case of Iosif Mendelevich, an original defendant in the Leningrad trials, who today remains incarcerated in Perm Camp 36.

For the past 2 months, Mendelevich has been waging a hunger strike and from all indications his condition is rapidly deteriorating. The apparent motivations for the hunger strike are several. Mendelevich is the only remaining defendant from the Leningrad trials who is still in prison. It is noteworthy that in February, the 10th anniversary of these trials will be observed. Further it is apparent that Mendelevich has been the victim of cruel treatment by his Soviet captors. In a letter he sent to his sister Rifka Drori, he described his life in prison as intolerable. He indicated that his jailers compelled him to work long hours without any breaks in his new duties as an iron cutter. Mendelevich indicated further that as an Orthodox Jew, he had asked to be able to work longer hours so as to be able to meet his religious obligations, but this was refused. Then as a final act of brutality, the jailors confiscated his prayer book. Mendelevich according to his letter relied on his religion to sustain him and now that has been taken.

I have dispatched a letter to Soviet President Brezhnev urging a release of Iosif Mendelevich. I feel his case is especially compelling and worthy of our attention.

I am growing increasingly concerned about an apparent hardening of Soviet attitudes toward the treatment of Jewish dissidents and citizens. One revealing indication is the alarming reduction in the number of Jews emigrating from the Soviet Union. According to figures provided to me by the Library of Congress, the total number of emigration visas granted in 1980 were 21,471 as compared with 51,320 in 1979. In the last 2 months of 1980, only 1,678 visas were granted as compared to 8,338 in 1979 and 7,397 in 1978. I would hope that the Reagan administration would look into this matter in some detail and communi-



cate its concern at the first possible opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank two prominent Jewish organizations for bringing the case of Mendelevich to my attention—the Jewish Identity Center and the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry.●

**BILL SIMON—LESS  
GOVERNMENT**

**HON. JAMES COLLINS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to face realities. Bill Simon speaks out in plain language on the crises facing America. William E. Simon was one of America's greatest Secretaries of the Treasury. He understands economics and believes in the free market. Bill Simon is now a contributing editor to the Dallas Morning News. His hard hitting report should get through to everyone on the Hill.

Here are some of the key sections in the Dallas News story as written by Bill Simon.

**FOR AMERICA, NOW OR NEVER**

There is no more leeway! I do not think I exaggerate when I say that we are faced, quite literally, with our extinction as a bastion of freedom, prosperity and democracy.

Could anything be plainer? We have so disregarded the tenets of free enterprise, and so interfered with the natural workings of the economy in a desperate attempt to repeal universal economic laws by government fiat, that in 1980 we became a 7-times multiplication table of disaster: 7 percent unemployment, 14 percent inflation and 21 percent interest rates.

The two basic industries in the United States, steel and automotive, have had a calamitous year, battered by the one-two punch of inept domestic fiscal and monetary policies, and of international competitors who freely subscribe to policies that were once our pride.

Did you ever expect to see all three of our major automobile makers running in the red, with one quite literally propped up by Uncle Sam?

How many times can the housing industry be knocked flat within a few months before structural damage impairs it permanently?

When have you seen the federal budget jump in such uncontrollable increments? In three years' time, federal spending has jumped by more than 30 percent.

We talk about the strangling burden of overregulation and it has now become a chiche, but we quickly lose sight of the fact that proposed regulations in the Washington pipeline are worse than any that are already on the books. One distinguished economist has put the cost of overregulation at \$125 billion. How many nations in the world would like to see their country's entire GNP at that level?

I assure you that my Washington experience has shown me how fast people in all walks of life abandon principles when it requires them to give up some government largesse. The labor unions will recklessly

scream for more. The bureaucrats will resist any tampering with their fiefdoms and domains. Those on the public payroll will scream to maintain their prerogatives and their jobs whether they are needed or not. And sadly my experience in Washington—still painful—showed me that businessmen, captains of industry, those who should be in the forefront arguing for the government to back off and allow competitive free enterprise to work, are in the forefront of the mob with their hands held out.

How easy it will be for congressmen to accept the goodies—the tax cuts, the new programs, etc.! And oh how they will resist the tough ones—the budget cuts, the program cutbacks, the agency eliminations, etc.

This time, though, will be the last time we will ever have the choice. Indeed, if all of us as a people, and our leaders, are not steadfast now, we will have few if any choices about anything ever again.●

**OPPRESSED JEWRY WEEK—THE  
ABRANZON FAMILY**

**HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1980, I brought the plight of Zina and Arkady Abranzon to my colleagues' attention as a part of the Spirit of Helsinki Vigil, 1980. Unfortunately, this imprisoned couple's situation has worsened since then, so now, during Oppressed Jewry Week—January 23 through January 30, 1981, I would like to speak again on their behalf.

Mr. and Mrs. Abranzon are Soviet Jewish citizens who had planned to apply for exit visas. Mr. Abranzon was the director of several electronics stores, and his wife was in charge of a jewelry and gift store.

The Soviet police broke into the Abranzons' apartment on October 5, 1979, confiscated all of their possessions, and incarcerated them at Ivano-Frankovsk, a trail-isolation prison in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, where they were held without trial for more than 1 year.

I deeply regret that Soviet officials have recently found the Abranzons guilty of the crime of possession of resources. Arkady Abranzon has been sentenced to 14 years in prison, and his wife, Zina, has been given a prison term of 6 years.

I would like to take the occasion of Oppressed Jewry Week to reaffirm my strong belief that releasing the Abranzons and granting them exit visas would not only indicate to the world the Soviet Union's compliance with the Helsinki accords, but would also affirm the Soviet's desire to ameliorate relations between our two great nations. I hope the new year will mark the beginning of an end to the disturbing mistreatment of Soviet Jewish citizens, and that statements

such as this will no longer be necessary.●

**ARLINGTON BAPTIST SCHOOL**

**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 29, 1981, 164 young men and women from the Arlington Baptist School in Baltimore, Md., will journey to Washington to augment their studies of American Government with a firsthand look at their Nation's Capital.

These students, led by Marsha Gevadan, Robert King, Chuck Dickert, John Lee, John Schuit, Bruce Barber, Linda Bond, Sharon Janicki, and David Wheelock will tour the White House, the Capitol Building, observe the House and Senate in session, and visit the Federal Bureau of Investigation as part of their day's activities.

I look forward to meeting with these students, their teachers, and parents to discuss with them the legislative process, their studies of our Government, and their questions about national issues. I am delighted that they are taking the opportunity to expand on their classroom learning.

Students who will visit us Thursday include:

Virna Alexander, Larissa Belt, Michael Bender, Ruth Bergman, Donald Boone, Artruelle Boyette, Steven Boyd, Samuel Brown, Scott Brown, Dawn Calvert, Eric Caraway, Hurraina Chapple, Chris Cole, Donald Cook, Reed Correll;

Sean Craddock, Julie Cress, Melissa Crump, Melissa Davis, Peggy DeYoung, Stanley Furrow, Jane Gallman, Gwen Gates, Jeff Gill, Steven Green, Robin Griffin, Joyce Hartsock, Rhoda Hayes, Laura Heuvel, Dennis Hollar;

Barry Hubble, Judy Hurlburt, Michele James, Brad Johnson, Tony Johnson, Lisa Keith, Cindy Kelly, Tyrone Kelly, Song Kim, Duane Khrum, Le Hai, Jeff Leach, James Marshall, Phillip Martin, Lisa Morrison.

Jay Murray, Tim Norris, James Parker, Janice Parker, Jeanne Peters, Alayna Phillips, Dionne Plowden, Kim Powell, Kathryn Racer, Diana Raiford, Robert Reverski, Dennis Ross, Catherine Roy, Laura Sebol, Jacqueline Sewell;

Pan Smeltzer, David Smith, Gary Smith, Stephen Smith, William Smith, Sharon Sporny, Laura Sterling, Paul Stevens, Brian Stokes, Lisa Stonesifer, Glen Summerfield, Renard Teal, Leslie Thompson, Charmaine Tomago, William Traband;

Kay Trombero, Sharon Turner, Kim Twigg, Rudy Tyrell, Andrea Waker, Jeff Weaver, Julie Westfall, Lisa Wilhoit, Wendy Woodruff, Daniel Zepp, Clair Andrae, Helen Atkinson, Brenda Ault, Gregg Bender, Bonnie Best;

Jeri Brothers, Heather Brown, Sue Brown, Cindy Burdette, Monica Cockrell, Keith Conley, Nancy Conway, Twilah Cope-land, Valerie Curry, Carol Davis, Charlotte

DeColigny, Mary DeHaven, Tracey Emerson, Rosemary Farkas, Towanda Fletcher; Lisa Gaddis, Marvin Glick, Craig Garrett, Mark Hammett, Danny Harlow, Gail Hartman, Julie Haynes, Justus Heger, Dana Highland, Kathy Hinegardner, Robin Jachens, Karen Jenny, Marcia Johnson, Lynn Jorda, Bonnie Kelbel;

Darryl Kelly, Sonah Kim, Nancy Kiser, Victoria Larkin, Bruce Leake, Lloyd Leverett, Lisa Licon, Doris Lindley, Robin Lindsay, Katrina Litzau, Lisa Ludwig, Lily MacFadden, Deborah McFadden, Karen McInnes, David Miller;

Robin Mills, Paul Morris, Dawn Nicholson, Jerry Perryman, Nancy Peterson, Jamie Petrides, Steve Heintzelman, Brian Rabette, David Rent, Gordon Rent, Kim Robinson, Marie Robinson, Marc Rowan, Marilyn Russell; and

Dawn Rutter, Anne Sewell, Kay Sewell, Susan Shank, Scott Sparks, Darryl Stokes, Dean Summers, Belinda Switzer, Michael Trescott, William Waller, Beth Walter, Janice Williams, Barbara Wootton, Hea Yoon, Wendy Zink.■

#### LEGISLATION TO DISCOURAGE THE USE OF TAX STRADDLES FOR TAX EVASION

#### HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation with Congressman BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL and several other members of the House Ways and Means and Government Operations Committees to stop the spread of tax shelter schemes used by the wealthy to avoid paying their fair share of income taxes. These tax avoiders deduct paper losses from transactions motivated solely for tax avoidance and involving no real risk and no potential for real economic gain. The Internal Revenue Service ruled years ago that these schemes, called tax straddles, are illegal. Despite this 1977 IRS ruling denying tax-straddle losses, an increasing number of high-income individuals—often unwittingly enticed into these deals by their broker—are attempting to reduce their incomes and their tax liabilities by claiming artificial losses from straddles. Apparently they hope that IRS auditors will not discover their returns, or that even if audited, they can at least postpone paying taxes for several years. The Treasury estimates that this scheme would be used by wealthy Americans to avoid paying \$1.3 billion in taxes in 1982 alone. If this loophole is not closed, it is estimated that the revenue loss could double and triple in the next few years. Congress must act soon to stop this billion dollar gross injustice to the average taxpayer.

At present, the IRS position is being contested in the courts. Even if the IRS prevails in these cases, it may be years before the courts reach a final

decision. In the meantime, the abuse is growing by leaps and bounds and brokers are devising ever more complicated schemes for their clients to avoid detection. Congress must enact new, strong statutory rules which clearly outlaw these tax-avoidance schemes. My bill, which is similar to a recent legislative proposal by the Department of the Treasury, would establish rules denying these fake losses in order to discourage the use of straddles to shelter income from taxation.

I first became aware of this abuse last year when Congressmen ROSENTHAL and VANIK introduced similar legislation to discourage the use of commodity straddles for tax avoidance purposes. I learned that the commodity futures markets are manipulated through these devious and complex schemes to subvert the tax system. The futures markets are supposed to exist primarily for the use of hedgers—producers or users of a particular commodity who hold futures contracts as a hedge against price increases.

Yet tax straddles which have no economic purpose (except tax avoidance) already constitute a growing and significant percentage of the activity in certain futures markets. Such tax shelter activity may adversely affect the functioning of a market and introduce noneconomic factors into price determination. Thus, a true hedger, such as the average farmer, may suffer from the impact of taxtrading on futures markets because he enters the futures market for an economic reason—not for tax considerations.

For example, a farmer might want to insure the price at which he will sell his grain for 6 months from now. He would enter into a futures contract in which he promises to sell it for, say, \$2 a bushel next June. A speculator, betting that the price of grain will go up, may take the other side of the contract promising to buy the grain at that price. If the price of grain goes up, the speculator makes money. If it goes down, he loses (he might have to buy \$2 grain and sell it for \$1.90).

However, the taxpayer who creates a tax straddle is not interested in speculating for profit or hedging to protect a price. Rather, he wants to enter into an even-sided transaction (simultaneously holding both "buy" and "sell" contracts for different months in the same commodity) to generate a loss which he deducts in 1 year and a gain in the following year. Because gains are taxed at a lower rate than ordinary income, a huge tax reduction and deferral can be realized. I am including a Washington Post article which explains in more detail how this scheme works.

Several glaring examples provided by the Treasury from actual tax returns will illustrate how beneficial tax straddles can be for those with large incomes. In one case, a corporate ex-

ecutive who had salary and investment income in excess of \$500,000 deducted over \$500,000 as loss from a Treasury bill straddle. This taxpayer reported a net loss for the year and claimed a refund of \$38,000 for withheld taxes. In another case which the IRS examined, a taxpayer who recognized a substantial gain from a business liquidation tried to defer \$2 million of gain year after year through commodities straddles.

These examples, multiplied by the thousands of wealthy persons using similar methods, are a cause for tremendous concern for a variety of reasons. First, the rich are able to shift their tax burden on to the backs of middle-income taxpayers. The basic unfairness of this situation breeds contempt for the tax system. Second, the widespread proliferation of these straddles distorts the futures market and thus may disrupt its use by legitimate hedgers and speculators. Third, because tax avoidance straddles increase the volume of trading, I believe they are driving up the price of commodities and thus pushing up the cost to consumers of products made from these commodities. And fourth, I am concerned that the rapidly growing use of straddles involving Treasury bills and Treasury bill futures will create havoc in the Federal debt management process.

The bill that I am introducing today would address these concerns by specifically denying deductions for non-economic losses if the taxpayer continues to maintain a straddle position. The bill recognizes that taxpayers clearly are entitled to reflect real losses on their tax returns. Hedgers and legitimate investors must be allowed to reduce their income and gains by losses. However, phantom paper losses which do not reflect any genuine economic change cannot be fabricated to create enormous tax savings. A law to prohibit similar tax abuses in securities trading has been on the books since 1939. My bill would simply apply the same principle to commodities.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 21, 1980]

#### How It Works

(By Jerry Knight and James L. Rowe, Jr.)

How does a butterfly spread work? How can a butterfly or any other tax straddle cut your taxes?

Suppose you are one of the lucky ones. Last October, you bought 1,000 shares of the hot new gene-splicing stock Genentech at \$35 a share and sold it at \$80 on the first day it was offered to the public.

You made a killing: a \$45,000 profit in a matter of hours. But you have to share most of it with Uncle Sam. If you are in the top tax bracket, the government will claim 70 percent, and you'll get to keep only \$13,500.

You are the most common candidate for a tax straddle, someone who wants to avoid taxes on windfall income. If the Internal Revenue Service lets you get away with it,



you might be able to increase the amount left after taxes on your Genentech profits from \$13,500 to \$32,400. Or you may be able to postpone paying taxes on the profits until next year.

A commodity tax straddle can convert ordinary income that's taxed at 70 percent into a long-term capital gain taxed at 28 percent and also delay the tax liability for a year or more.

The basic technique is to create an artificial loss that can be deducted from this year's taxes, then recoup that loss with a profit that's taxed next year at a lower rate.

The silver butterfly is one of the most complex tax transactions yet devised. It is so arcane that only a handful of specialists are adept at it. Most Wall Street firms prohibit rank-and-file brokers from even attempting a butterfly and channel all the business through a specialist at headquarters.

A commodity specialist who arranged tax straddles at a major brokerage firm said there are myriad ways they can be constructed. The favorite is called a butterfly spread, because a diagram of the deal looks like a butterfly with bifurcated wings.

The butterfly is tailored to the specific needs of the customer. The butterfly specialist has to understand federal (and state) income tax laws well enough to know how to minimize the customer's tax liability and to be good enough at commodity trading to insure that the deal works in the market as well as on paper.

Some basics: First, ordinary income—wages, interest, etc.—is taxed at higher rates than capital gains. The maximum rate on "earned income" such as salaries or wages is 50 percent; on "unearned income" such as interest, the maximum is 70 percent; for long-term capital gains the limit is 28 percent. So if you can convert ordinary income to capital gains, you pay less taxes.

#### HOW TO NET A VALUABLE SILVER BUTTERFLY

Second, most investments have to be held for a full year to qualify for long-term capital gains treatment, but commodity investments qualify for capital gains rates after only 6 months. Finally, you can only deduct losses from the same kinds of profits; you can't use a capital loss to offset ordinary income.

In this case, the customer needs a \$45,000 short-term capital loss to deduct from 1980 taxes and offset the Genentech profit. The butterfly will create that loss and simultaneously create a \$45,000 profit next year that will be taxed at a maximum 28 percent rate.

The basic technique for using commodities to reduce your tax bill is called putting on a spread or a straddle. That means simultaneously buying and selling a commodity for delivery sometime in the future.

The commodity futures markets make that easier by establishing formal contracts that define the quantity and quality of the commodity and the time and place for delivery.

A simple spread could involve buying 5,000 ounces of silver to be delivered next June and at the same time selling 5,000 ounces of silver and promising to deliver it in July.

No matter whether the price of silver rises or falls by next summer, you'll make money on one deal and lose on the other.

If silver prices go up, you'll profit on the contract to buy, because the silver you get will be worth more than it was when you made the deal and set the price. But the silver you sell will be worth more than you'll collect for it, and you'll lose on that "leg" of the straddle.

If prices go down, the silver you sold will be worth more than you get paid for it, but you'll make money by getting the other batch of silver for less than its current price.

Over all, you break even, but it doesn't have to look that way on the income tax returns, where you can deduct the losses from other income and cut your tax bill.

What you want to do is arrange to lose money on one of the deals this year and wait to claim your profit on the other deal next year.

If prices are going up, that's easy enough to work out—just sell silver for December delivery at a loss and put it back at a profit in January.

But what if the prices go down? Then your trade is backward, you'll make money delivering silver in December, but that will produce more income and more taxes to pay. You'll qualify for a tax write-off next February, but that won't do any good on the first year's taxes.

When prices are going down, you'll want to arrange to buy silver for December delivery, so you'll lose on that deal. Then sell an identical amount for delivery in January, earning a profit to offset the December loss.

A "butterfly spread" works by covering both bets at once—simultaneously buying and selling four contracts for silver in a pattern that assures you'll get profits and losses at the desired time.

To set up a typical silver butterfly, you first buy 5,000 ounces of silver for delivery in March and simultaneously sell another 5,000 ounces, promising to deliver in July. Then sell another 5,000 ounces for July and balance it with an order to buy for delivery in December.

No matter how much the price of the metal rises or falls, the silver butterfly will float along, making money on two of its wings and losing an identical amount on the other two.

So you watch the market price move up or down, and wait. When you've lost as much as you want, you close out the unprofitable contracts and tell the tax man you've got a deduction.

To protect the profits made on the other wings, you have to set up a second butterfly and keep it alive until next year. If you hold the contracts more than six months, they qualify for long-term capital gains and the 28 percent maximum tax rate.

Even that tax can be avoided by repeating the butterfly process the second year and "rolling forward" the profits to 1982. In theory, at least, it can be kept up indefinitely, so you stall the taxes forever.

Generating a \$45,000 loss to offset the hypothetical Genentech profit probably will require setting up a multiple-contract butterfly, because the price of one 5,000-ounce contract usually won't move up or down by that much.

One specialist figures the maximum price change a butterfly trader can count on is \$3,500 a contract, so creating a \$45,000 loss will take 12 or 13 contracts.

A large number of butterflies may be needed if the price of the commodity is very stable or if there isn't time to wait. An investor who gets a windfall in December, for example, needs to lose money quickly. If the price of silver drops 10 cents an ounce, a 5,000 ounce contract will lose \$500. At that rate, it would take 90 butterfly straddles to lose \$45,000.

Commodity straddles were not invented to bedevil the Internal Revenue Service. They have many legitimate uses for professional

commodity traders, who can make money when there is a change in the difference between the prices of a commodity in two different months.

Last week there was a 10-cents-a-bushel difference between the price of soybeans for delivery in January and for delivery in March. If demand for soybeans in March suddenly increases, that differential could increase to 20 cents a bushel. On 5,000 bushels of beans, the widening spread could mean a profit or loss of \$500.

The two wings of the butterfly, however, tend to minimize the effect of changes in the spread prices. A study prepared for the Internal Revenue Service contends there's only one chance in 40 that a butterfly spread will make enough money to pay the commission a commodity broker charges for placing the buy and sell of orders.

The only way most people make money on a butterfly straddle is on the tax deduction it provides.

#### Technical Explanation

This bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code by providing new rules governing the taxation of straddles, "cash and carry" transactions, and related matters.

The bill would limit tax sheltering through straddle transactions by postponing the recognition of losses on certain straddle positions while the taxpayer continues to maintain offsetting positions in a straddle.

The bill would provide that if a taxpayer holds a straddle (i.e. offsetting positions), the portion of any loss which exceeds recognized gain from the positions may not be recognized for the period during which the taxpayer holds the offsetting positions plus the 30 days after the day in which the positions cease to be offsetting.

However, if the taxpayer disposes of all of the offsetting positions before the close of the 30-day period, the balanced period is treated as ending on the day of the last such disposition by taxpayer. Thus, taxpayers who close out their offsetting positions would be allowed to recognize, at that time, any otherwise allowable loss sustained on such positions. This rule would benefit hedgers, such as farmers or cereal processors, who establish offsetting positions in commodity future contracts in order to protect their selling price or costs until the actual sale of their crops or the purchase of their inventory requirements.

In addition, the running of holding periods for each of the straddle positions would be suspended for the balanced period, generally the period during which the positions are offsetting plus 30 days. However, in determining the taxpayer's holding period for any position, any period during which the position was held prior to the establishment of an offsetting position could be tacked to any period during which that position was held after the close of the balanced period.

The bill defines the term "straddle" as offsetting positions with respect to personal property. Under the bill, a taxpayer would hold offsetting positions if there is a substantial reduction of the taxpayer's risk of loss from holding any position with respect to personal property because the taxpayer also holds one or more other positions with respect to personal property (whether or not of the same kind).

The bill would create a rebuttable presumption that two or more positions are offsetting under specified circumstances. If two or more positions are customarily treated as

straddles or offsetting positions (whether or not called a straddle, butterfly, or similar name), or if the aggregate margin requirement for such positions is lower than the sum of the margin requirements for each such position (if held separately), the positions would be presumed to be offsetting unless the taxpayer establishes that they are not offsetting. The Secretary could prescribe by regulations other factors which indicate that two or more positions are offsetting and which would establish a rebuttable presumption that the positions are offsetting.

The bill would apply to positions in personal property which are interests, including futures contracts or options, in commodities, evidences of indebtedness, currency, and other types of personal property. If a taxpayer, within the period beginning 30 days before and ending 30 days after the date of the disposition of any position which is part of an offsetting position, acquires a successor position, such successor position shall be treated as the same position as the position to which it succeeds. In addition, a successor position shall be treated as held on each day which intervenes between the disposition of the interest which it succeeds and the day on which such successor position is acquired. Personal property acquired by a taxpayer pursuant to a futures contract, option, or other interest will be treated as a successor position to such interest.

The bill would provide that positions held by related persons are treated as held by the taxpayer for purposes of determining whether any positions are offsetting. Under the bill, a person is a related person to the taxpayer if the relationship between such person and the taxpayer would result in a disallowance of losses under section 267 or 707(b), or if such person and the taxpayer are under common control (within the meaning of subsection (b) or (c) of 414). However, an individual's family would consist only of the individual, his or her spouse, and the individual's children under 18 years of age. In addition, the bill provides attribution of positions to and from a partnership, trust, or other entity if any gain or loss with respect to a position held by such entity would properly be taken into account by a taxpayer with respect to whom the entity is not a related person.

The bill would limit tax sheltering in so-called "cash and carry" transactions by requiring taxpayers to capitalize interest and carrying charges properly allocable to personal property which is part of a straddle (as defined above). No deduction would be allowed for such charges, which would include interest on indebtedness incurred or continued to purchase or carry the property, and amounts paid or incurred for insurance, storage costs, and transportation costs.

In order to preclude manipulation of the character of gain or loss as ordinary income or loss, or capital gain or loss, the bill provides that obligations of the United States, of its possessions, of a State or political subdivision of a State, or of the District of Columbia, issued on a discount basis and payable without interest in less than one year, would be treated as capital assets in determining gain or loss. Thus, these obligations would be treated by the holder in the same manner as similar debt obligations. Any discount at issue would be treated as interest under generally applicable tax rules.

The bill would require a dealer in securities to identify a security as held for invest-

ment not later than the day after the date of the security's acquisition instead of before the expiration of the 30th day after its acquisition, as required under present law.

Except for the change in identification of dealer transactions in securities, the amendments made by the bill would apply to property acquired by the taxpayer after January 27, 1981, in taxable years ending after such date.

The amendment pertaining to dealer identification of securities held for investment would apply to property acquired by the taxpayer after the date of enactment in taxable years ending after that date.●

H.R. 1015

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1015 is intended to nullify Revenue Procedure 80-55, issued by the Internal Revenue Service on December 15, 1980.

Revenue Procedure 80-55 jeopardizes the deduction by commercial banks for interest paid on time deposits of State and local government funds where those deposits are secured by State and local obligations whose interest is exempt from Federal income tax. While Revenue Procedure 80-55 itself only applies to commercial banks, its principle could be extended to other financial institutions.

Revenue Procedure 80-55 involves the application of section 265(2) of the Internal Revenue Code. Section 265(2) denies an interest deduction to a taxpayer who uses borrowed funds to purchase or carry State or municipal tax-exempt obligations. Applying this general rule to the situation of banks which simultaneously hold governmental deposits and own governmental obligations marks a major departure from how this provision has been interpreted for many years.

Enforcement of this new position threatens the long-standing relationship between commercial banks and State and local governments. For example, banks in many States are required by law to pledge municipal bonds as collateral to secure municipal deposits. Accordingly it seems to place Federal tax law at cross purposes with State law to apply adverse tax consequences to the relationship between banks and States and local governments.

Besides the policy implications of Revenue Procedure 80-55, it also could have a very practical effect. That is, commercial banks might be influenced to pay lower interest rates on State and local deposits, if those interest payments were not deductible. This would result in reduced income for the States and local governments on their deposits.

Revenue Procedure 80-55 raises important policy questions; threatens to disrupt the long-standing relationship between commercial banks and State and local governments; and could result in lower interest payments on deposits of State and local governments. For these reasons I believe Revenue Procedure 80-55 should be nullified. H.R. 1015 accomplishes this result.●

## A FREE MARKET FOREIGN POLICY

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

## A FREE MARKET FOREIGN POLICY

Can there be a foreign policy based on the same principles as a free-market economy?

Some would say that economic and foreign policies are unrelated, and that the latter must be "bipartisan," unlike the former. How else could we get a Henry Jackson and a Barry Goldwater agreeing on foreign policy? In reality, foreign and economic policies are intertwined.

## LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE INTERVENTIONISTS

Economic interventionism allows some to support government action for the benefit of business, e.g., tariffs and subsidies; and others to support labor with monopoly wage settlements and compulsory unionism.

Variations can also be found among those who endorse international interventionism.

Most liberal economic interventionists want to intervene overseas to help left-leaning countries.

Most conservatives want to do the same for right-leaning ones.

Liberals want us to aid the Sandinistas. Conservatives say we should have helped Somoza.

Is it inconsistent that "free enterprises" should support intervention overseas? Not really, because very few follow a free-market policy consistently. Generally, they endorse special assistance to business with loans, subsidies, and protectionism.

Our foreign policy is like our prevailing economic policy. We accept economic interventionism of liberal and conservative varieties, and we also accept, with little questioning, international interventionism of both varieties as well.

All sorts of liberal/conservative combinations can be seen in economic and foreign policy, but most Members of Congress are interventionists of some sort.

If our foreign policy reflects a general philosophy of economic interventionism and political pragmatism, could we assume that our foreign policy would change if our economic order were based on consistent free-market principles?

## FREEDOM AND FOREIGN POLICY

The economic order of a nation reflects the prevailing attitude of its people towards individual liberty. If a strict definition of individual liberty, adequately protected by a Constitution, establishes the foundation on which a totally free economy operates, and



we adhere to it, it would not be surprising to see a foreign policy quite different from that which we now suffer.

Generally, most people see foreign policy as being completely separate from economic policy. For instance, my concerns have always been much more oriented toward economic policy, and yet, as I spend more time in government, I have come to realize that the two are interwoven.

When the people of a country insist on maximum liberty, a free market will result and a non-interventionist foreign policy (armed neutrality) will follow. In our own history, when we had our freest economy and soundest currency, we did not fight on foreign soil. As our freedoms eroded and our marketplace became dominated by special interests (labor and business), involvement in the internal affairs of other nations grew and foreign wars resulted. Although the Spanish-American War was late 19th century, the dramatic changes were in the 20th century, with World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and the pending conflict.

A free society is based on the fundamental premise of God-given, inalienable rights—rights that are individual, not collective, absolute, and not alterable by any state action. A nation so ordained will protect voluntary associations and free choices, demand that contracts be upheld, and insist that money be honest. Under these circumstances, no economic system other than a free-market economy can evolve.

Under these conditions, it follows that government is small with its power strictly limited, as ordained by the Founding Fathers.

#### THE RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

If—for moral and constitutional reasons—we cannot interfere with our citizens' lives and property, to control the economy or individuals' preferences, we also cannot control the internal affairs of any other nation. The responsibility of the government is then limited to protection of life and property.

Robert Taft said, "The purpose of American foreign policy is to maintain the freedom of the people of this country, and insofar as it is consistent with that purpose, to keep this country at peace."

"No entangling alliances" was the foreign policy watchword for every administration from George Washington's to Grover Cleveland's.

Washington said, "It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world."

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations in extending our commercial relations, is to have with them as little political connection as possible.

"Observe good faith and justice to all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies towards particular nations, and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them an amicable feeling toward all should be cultivated."

Cleveland reiterated by saying, "The genius of our institutions, the needs of our people in their home life, and the attention which is demanded for . . . our vast territory, dictate this scrupulous avoidance of any departure from that foreign policy commended by the history, the traditions and prosperity of our republic. It is the policy of independence favored by our position and defended by our known love of justice and by our power. It is the policy of peace suit-

able to our interest. It is the policy of neutrality, rejecting any share in foreign brawls, and ambitions upon other continents, and repelling their intrusion here. It is the policy of Monroe and of Washington and of Jefferson: peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none."

#### WHEN WE WENT WRONG

McKinley began the change in our foreign policy, leading us into the Spanish-American War. But it was Wilson who radically departed from the neutral, non-interventionist foreign policy which we had followed for more than 100 years.

Wilson's policy was "make the world safe for democracy." "America's duty," he said, "is to stand shoulder-to-shoulder, to lift the burdens of mankind in the future, and to show the path of freedom to all the world . . . The American flag is henceforth to stand for . . . the assertion of the right of one nation to serve other nations of the world . . . America is now rich enough and free enough to look abroad for great tasks to perform . . . Our duty is to serve the world."

The concept of individual rights requires that we reject, on a moral basis, any authority to use funds or lives to manipulate the affairs of other nations if we are not directly threatened. (But individuals should not be prohibited from volunteering for or contributing to any cause they support around the world. I would gladly contribute to buy arms for the Afghan rebels, for example, if the law allowed.)

Our Constitution follows this line of reasoning and gives no authority to the Congress to intervene illicitly around the world. We were not designated the policeman or savior of the world by the Founding Fathers. And all our attempts have failed. Our constitutional obligation is to protect our land and our people, and we cannot legally nor morally justify anything more.

Economically, intervention on the international level has turned out to be a disaster and it has not been endorsed by the people. The people have resisted more taxes, and have not been willing to loan the funds to the government to finance foreign aid. So it has been financed by inflation. The past 35 years of international intervention in particular have been a severe financial drain on us. Interventionism has destroyed the dollar, bankrupted our country, and has now caught up with us. Our policy has permitted Japan to spend essentially nothing on defense, and allowed them to subsidize the very industries that undersell competing American companies.

#### THE IMPRACTICALITY OF INTERVENTIONISM

Practical reasons alone mandate that we rethink our foreign policy. We are now militarily incapable of being the world's policeman. Our economy cannot stand further dollar weakness, and continual debt increase. Our foreign policy—financial aid to the entire world—is contributing significantly to the downfall of our economic system. We can show no good results from all this spending and intervention. We essentially have no friends in the world, we are seen as a paper tiger, and we continue to sign bad treaties. We are misled by administrations, both Republican and Democrat; by compromises; and by wishful thinking.

Leftists in our government have led us to subsidize our enemies. Arguing that we should only subsidize our "friends" is of no value, since the conservatives have argued this for 40 years, and it not only hasn't

helped, it has made things worse. We have financed both sides of many major conflicts since 1945. It's time to look after ourselves.

#### WHAT A FREE-MARKET FOREIGN POLICY MEANS

A free-market foreign policy would emphasize international free trade for both its economic benefits to our people, and its value in creating an atmosphere of friendly relations with all nations, and guiding us away from militant isolationism.

Free trade recognizes that the consumer is sovereign, and that it is his right to buy any goods or receive any service at the best price. Free trade also precludes favors to special interests. No foreign aid and no corporate welfare of any sort: no subsidies; no export assistance; no insurance help; no licensing restriction; and no tariffs.

When people and goods flow freely over borders, armies will not. Limitation of trade can only be justified for the direct security of the nation in an armed conflict. If there is any doubt about restraining trade, we should always lean towards permitting trade.

Under these conditions, businessmen would make better economic decisions. Without subsidies for his insurance, overseas investments, and exports, the businessman would anticipate world events, and would voluntarily curtail trade with nations unable to guarantee property protection and honest payment. Now we encourage bad investments and subsidies to the enemy at the innocent taxpayers' expense.

Instead of businessmen selling to Russia or China at American taxpayers' expense, they would demand gold rather than accept rubles or yuans. Public opinion would also restrain trade with perceived enemies.

#### THE THIRD CHOICE

In our foreign policy debate, we have had only two choices: be weak, or be international policemen. A third choice is available to us: neutrality, with a policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations, plus all the armed strength necessary to protect America.

With such a foreign policy of strength and confidence, our system would prosper, our international respect would be heightened, and our example to the rest of the world would be much brighter. The complex messes, like the one involving Iran, would not occur, and we would not invite such anti-American resentment.

A liberal—known to follow the weak-America policy—said that he was delighted that our troops are in Europe, since they keep Western Europe from developing a stronger defense capability that might threaten the U.S.S.R.

European nations have never invited our nuclear missiles into their territory. The West Germans now are showing a great reluctance in setting themselves up as a target. They are delighted to let the U.S. be the potential target of Russia, if Russia chooses to wipe out the West's retaliatory capability.

Nations like West Germany must assume the responsibility of their own defense. We cannot afford it economically, nor is it militarily wise for us to continue to provide it for them. For instance, it certainly is in the best interests of the Germans and the French to develop the neutron bomb. The American taxpayer shouldn't do so. Encouraging dependency on the U.S. has neither helped the nations receiving aid, nor us who have provided it. Foreign assistance cannot create a "will to win." Vietnam proved that.

More than half our defense budget now goes to the defense of other nations. These funds would go a long way in providing adequate military pay and building the best weapons, with many dollars left over to use in budget-cutting.

A non-interventionist foreign policy would shift the lines of strategic confrontation. To do nothing about Soviet troops in Cuba and give away the Panama Canal, at taxpayers' expense, while allowing 50,000 men to die in a no-win war in Vietnam, is inconceivably inconsistent. Even though our opinions may vary on just when armed conflict is necessary, it's unforgivable to commit lives to a war with no intention of winning, without even a specific goal. This reflects a sick foreign policy. The Koreans and the Vietnamese are preventable. Even our involvement in World War I and World War II can be seriously questioned. Overinvolvement, no matter how promoted by the government, will eventually fail if the will and the spirit of the people reject its intended goals. The draft, the lives, the bombs, and the dollars did not compensate for the bad policy that got us involved in Vietnam.

Non-intervention would also negate bad treaties. SALT I would be repealed, with due notice, and an antiballistic missile built, and SALT II would be scrapped. The Panama Canal would not have been handed over to the Marxists at the American taxpayers' expense. No twisted reasoning could trap us into trusting the communists by signing agreements with them, whether they be Russian, Chinese, Cuban, or Nicaraguan. Neither would we subsidize them.

#### NO ISOLATIONISM

A free-market, non-interventionist foreign policy is frequently attacked as "isolationist." Nothing could be further from the truth. The image of a nation walling itself off from the rest of the world is impossible in a free society, and is instead exactly what happens under interventionism. With an "internationalist" foreign policy, which includes goals of government and international banking with a fiat currency, economic isolationism always results, with nations becoming more militarily nationalistic. Trade wars ensue, and protectionism follows. Today we hear the preparations for this.

A society with a free-market foreign policy protects absolutely the rights of its citizens to travel and trade across the borders, without tariffs or licenses, and rejects all special-interest subsidies. Emigration is always permissible, and no attempts to curtail the movement of currency or people is made. The ultimate right of the free society is to be able to vote with your feet—to leave freely with your assets.

This freedom of movement, of people and goods, encourages the intermingling of people and a natural balance in trade, assuming nations do not participate in the fraud of inflation. Freedom would not create a Fortress America, or a country isolated. Only the opposite could result.

#### NO CONSCRIPTION

A crucial aspect of the free-market foreign policy is a volunteer military. The best vote on the advisability of war and the commitment needed to win comes from those who are forced to risk their lives. In America, a fight to defend our freedoms will bring out the volunteers by the millions. But another halfhearted fight to "contain" communism, or prop up a "Western-leaning" dictator, will not wash.

The best way to find out if a war is needed for our survival and security is to ask the

people who are to risk their lives to volunteer.

Also, can the war be fought with open taxation or borrowing, and without resorting to the inflation machine? Remember, the American Revolution was fought without a draft, and it was won against great odds. With all our firepower, and with a conscripted army, we couldn't even defeat North Vietnam.

As our children are forced to pay for the effects of borrowing on tomorrow through inflation, and suffer the erosion of the free market system, so too will they suffer the consequences of unwise treaty commitments. Why should a youngster born in 1960, pay with his life for a war fought to police the world, pursuant to a treaty signed in 1945? This is hardly fair. All of our international commitments need reassessment.

Some say we will need to fight for Middle Eastern oil. But these are the same economic interventionists who won't deregulate our energy industry, who compel the use of coal, and who prohibit nuclear power. Economic policy and foreign policy cannot be separated. And, despite the scare talk, only 5% of total U.S. energy comes through the Straits of Hormuz.

#### THE NEED FOR CHANGE

In spite of the dollars spent, the rhetoric heard, draft preparations, CIA activities, and troops around the world, we are weaker than ever before. Our policies need change, for even if it is still claimed that we need international commitments, it is precisely the policy of the past 40 years that has made us so weak. America now is desperately close to being undefended from Russian attack. This must be changed, but it won't be without a new policy. We can tolerate no more Koreans or Vietnamese, economically, militarily, or psychologically.

The evidence is clear: the more intervention economically, the more intervention internationally, and the greater the chance of poverty and war. The less economic intervention, the less international intervention, and the greater the chance of prosperity and peace.

My vote is for non-intervention.●

#### CONDOMINIUM CONVERSION

#### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Commerce, Consumer, and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee is conducting an investigation into the public policy implications of the dramatic increase across the country in the number of conversions of rental units to condominium and cooperative ownership. As chairman of the subcommittee I am concerned with how governmental programs and activities impact the conversion trend.

In the course of the subcommittee's investigation, I have become aware of the often traumatic experience endured by people, particularly the elderly whose homes are converted. In this connection, I recently visited a building in Jenkintown, Pa., which is being converted from rental housing

to condominiums by the Chicago-based American Invsco Corp.

The January 8, 1981, Times Chronicle of Jenkintown reported on my visit. I want to share that article with my colleagues because it deals with some very poignant examples of elderly people faced with an awful dilemma.

I also visited, with our colleague, WILLIAM H. GRAY III, of the Second District of Pennsylvania, a building at 3600 Conshohocken Avenue in Philadelphia which is being converted by another Chicago developer. The Philadelphia Inquirer reported on January 3, 1981, on the large and enthusiastic meeting of the tenants.

The articles follow:

#### CONGRESSMAN LISTENS TO BEAVER HILL TENANTS

(By Andy Kraus)

Beaver Hill tenants met last week with the chairman of a congressional subcommittee investigating American Invsco Corp., the Chicago-based developer which is selling condominiums at Beaver Hill.

About 12 tenants were selected to meet with U.S. Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal, D-N.Y., chairman of the House Commerce, Consumer and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, to describe their experiences regarding the conversion of their apartments to condominiums and the marketing practices of the Beaver Hill Limited Partnership.

During November, Rosenthal's subcommittee released the details of a staff investigation into American Invsco, the parent company for the Beaver Hill group. In it, American Invsco, which has been called the largest and most successful converter in the country, was accused of allowing widespread speculation in its units, and of possible violations of federal law in selling condominiums.

American Invsco has denied the allegations, calling the committee staff biased and saying its report was based on "bizarre economic theories."

Rosenthal called Friday's informal meeting in Jenkintown a "fact finding mission" aimed at preparing for congressional and regional hearings on condominium conversion in the spring.

As part of a one-day visit to the Philadelphia area, Rosenthal, who was joined by the chief counsel for the subcommittee, Theodore Jacobs, met with tenants at two other apartment complexes, one of which had recently been converted by American Invsco.

The congressman told the Beaver Hill tenants that he had heard "Bizarre stories of tenants being pushed out of their homes" by converters in other areas of the country.

He said that some of the answers to ending the problems caused by conversions are to restrict the amount of mortgage money available for condominium sales; to declare a moratorium on conversions until the government "learns how to deal with and respond to conversions" in terms of laws and regulations, and to pass a national condominium conversion law which among other things might require that 35 percent of the tenants in a building agree to conversion before the owner is allowed to do so.

In fact, Rosenthal has introduced such a law in the House. It would provide for a three-year moratorium on conversions. The bill would use the federal government's con-



trols over lenders to prohibit loans to converters and to people who want to buy a converted unit for that period.

Commenting on Rosenthal's efforts to limit conversions, Ed Woolery, vice president of American InvSCO and its top representative at Beaver Hill, said that "His attention should be on stimulating more housing rather than on trying to limit it."

"People should be able to dispose of their personal property in the manner in which they see fit. This is part of the free enterprise system," he said, adding that in Rosenthal's home state of New York, there is a housing shortage partly because of the thinking of people like Rosenthal.

"With the limitation imposed by rent control, maintaining a rental property in a place like New York is a losing proposition" he said. Woolery said that his statements were his own opinion and didn't necessarily reflect the views of American InvSCO.

One of the tenants who spoke at the meeting, Morton Schwann, 82, discussed the personal and financial hardship that buying at Beaver Hill or moving from it would create for him and his wife.

"With the pension that we have, we have just been able to keep our heads above water, although the rise in the cost of living has made it much more difficult," he said. Schwann said that his wife, who is 80, is a "very sick woman" and that moving would be a strain on her.

The couple's monthly rent of \$538 for their one-bedroom apartment is slightly more than one-quarter of their pension income of \$21,000. To stay in the same apartment, which Schwann says has been offered to him for \$87,000, he would have to spend more than 60 percent of his income on mortgage payments and associated costs.

Schwann said he doesn't want to make such an investment considering the couple's future medical bills.

Schwann said that he was asked by one of the Beaver Hill salesmen if he had any children who might be interested in investing in the property for the couple. He told them of his son in California, who soon received an envelope of material about the units for sale.

The next day, Schwann continued, his son received a call from the salesman, who urged him to buy quickly because half the units had already been sold and said that he "had to make up his mind fast."

"This is one of their (the salesmen's) threats," said Allen Beckman, a lawyer who is representing the tenants of Beaver Hill. "They tell them that time is running out," giving tenants the impression that they are going to lose their homes if they don't buy right away.

Asked to respond, Beaver Hill's Woolery said later that he doesn't have a sales force large enough to contact the tenants frequently and that what the tenants objected to was having "any" time limit within which they had to decide whether to buy or move.

He said that "No matter how long you gave some of these people, they would be mad."

According to Beckman, the salesmen have said that the person who buys the apartment will be happy to rent it back to the people who now live in it. He said the people who don't know a lot about real estate investments or transactions are the people that the salesmen are really looking to sell to.

Melba Klein, 80, who said she can afford to buy her apartment said that she won't do so because she "doesn't want to be around

these people, (the staff of the Beaver Hill partnership). She said that instead, she and her husband who is 83, will move into a retirement village.

Her husband said that his experience had been "high pressure straight through" and that the Beaver Hill owners were "only after the almighty dollar."

Annette Eisenberg, who has lived in the complex since it opened 16 years ago, said that while she would like to stay, she could not take the chance that her medical problems would not get worse leading to medical bills she would not be able to afford. She said she has looked for other places to live but thus far had been unsuccessful. The process of moving already was causing "a serious emotional reaction," she said.

"When the Government feels that people aren't as important as garbage," she said, referring to environmental laws, "then there is something wrong with government."

"They have written laws to protect forests and parks but not the elderly who are not asking for money but only for decency and protection for the few years they have left on earth," she said.

Another tenant, Irving Harburger, said that the move-or-buy choice that he has been faced with is "the biggest shock that we have suffered since we were forced out of Germany in the 1930s."

Reacting to Harburger's statement, Jacobs said the "The most valuable thing about this meeting is to hear from people like that man—it takes away the abstractness of the situation and makes it more real."

Rosenthal was unsure as to what could be done to help the tenants at Beaver Hill and implied that any legislation might not be passed in time to help them.

"It took 20 years to pass Medicare," Rosenthal said, "but where the need is acute, attention must be focused."

"If the need is as serious as I think," he continued, "I think there will be a response, but the impact (of the conversions) must be proved to be nationwide."

The Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development has said that by 1990, half the population of the United States will be living in condominiums.

Rosenthal said that because of his jurisdiction over the banking industry, he might be able to do something on a short-term basis to control the avenues of funding for those who want to buy and convert buildings the way American InvSCO does.

Beckman, however, said that the battle being waged by the tenants at Beaver Hill is "one of the strongest in the country."

Realistic about the effect of any future legislation on the Beaver Hill tenants, tenant Schwann said that "Maybe through our efforts, we can help other people who later find themselves in our position."

#### FRIGHTENED RESIDENTS BAND IN YET ANOTHER CONDOMINIUM BATTLE

(By Jan Schaffer)

Abe Abramson is not sure where his home will be when he celebrates his upcoming 75th birthday. But if he wants to continue living in the River Park Apartments, his home for the last nine years, he may well have to buy his two-bedroom apartment.

"Believe me, I don't want to buy, and I'm not going to," Abramson said yesterday at a meeting where he and about 150 fellow residents vowed to fight plans to convert the 360-unit building at 3600 Conshohocken Avenue into condominium apartments.

The conversion is a particularly worrisome prospect for River Park tenants because 74

percent of them are senior citizens living on fixed incomes.

They estimate that buying the units that they are now renting would mean paying two or three times what they now are paying in monthly rent.

The meeting yesterday was called by the apartment complex's tenants association to organize against the conversion. Encouraging the residents in their stand against conversion were U.S. Reps. William H. Gray 3d (D-Pa.) and Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D-N.Y.), who have been leading the fight in Congress to develop a national policy to slow the so-called "condomania."

The congressmen have sponsored a bill that calls for a three-year moratorium on condominium and cooperative conversions so that the impact of the process can be studied further.

"The impact of conversions is enormous and the trauma is very, very deep," said Rosenthal, who chairs the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer and Monetary Affairs. The committee is studying the mode of operations of some of the largest conversion firms, and the involvement of government sponsored mortgage financing in effecting the conversions.

Rosenthal said yesterday that the committee plans to hold hearings on the problem in Philadelphia in early spring.

In the meantime, Rosenthal advised the residents of River Park to ask the state legislature to amend state law to allow Philadelphia City Council the local option to pass laws dealing with condominium conversions in the city.

The council has passed such an ordinance, restricting condominium converters, in October 1979. But Gov. Thornburgh, in the middle of last year, signed a statute that effectively pulled the teeth out of the city ordinance.

Until then, Arnold Goldman, president of the River Park Tenants Association, advised the apartment complex's residents, "Don't move and don't buy."

Goldman said the group was planning to picket the apartment building, and also the bank that provided financing to the Chicago converter, Wayne Kubicki. They also plan to distribute bumper stickers and to put advertisements opposing the conversion in the Jewish Exponent newspaper.

Most of the residents intended River Park to be their last apartment, Goldman said. Now they are faced with carrying a heavy mortgage and paying monthly maintenance fees for their apartments, or searching for a new apartment that may also turn condominium.

"One week you're paying \$400 and the next week you're paying \$900 for the same place," griped resident Joseph Goldman, who is retired.

River Park residents will learn the details of the converter's plans next week, although Goldman said yesterday that the apartments were expected to cost between \$60,000 and more than \$100,000. "The whole thing is cockeyed," said auctioneer Louis Prince, a long-time resident of the building. "Morally, it's wrong." ●

# TOMORROW'S LEADERS— SERVICE ACADEMY NOMINEES

## HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rewarding annual events which I enjoy is nominating students from my congressional district to our Nation's armed service academies.

I make it a practice not to nominate en masse, but rather to make the selection process as deserving as possible for the nominee. The criterion set down by my reviewing committee is rigid and demanding. This insures that the best and brightest will represent my district and its schools and communities at the service academies.

This year I have nominated 22 outstanding young men and women from my district for appointments to the service academies. I am sure that my constituents join their families and me in wishing them well. Whether they attend a service academy or not, these young people are a credit to their community and their country.

My nominees to the Military Academy at West Point are: Richard LeBlanc, Western High School; Mike Simmons, Rancho Alamitos High School; Timothy Rushing, Orange High School; Randy Pagan, Kennedy High School; Christopher Rocha, Saddleback High School; Jay Wigboldy, Savanna High School; Gregg McPherson, Servite High School; David Nyberg, Bolsa Grande High School.

My nominees to the Naval Academy at Annapolis are: Scott Henderson, Cypress High School; Richard LeBlanc, Western High School; Anne Pendlebury, University of California, Irvine; Joseph Thelander, Westminster High School; Mike Simmons, Rancho Alamitos High School; Emily Salanio, Rancho Alamitos High School; Timothy Rushing, Orange High School; Randy Pagan, Kennedy High School; David Huddleston, Westminster High School; Reginald Bennett, Westminster High School; Joseph Luntz, Los Alamitos High School; Derrith Young, Cypress High School; Helen Garner, Garden Grove High School; David Nyberg, Bolsa Grande High School.

My nominees to the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs are Scott Henderson, Cypress High School; Mary Shogren, Rancho Alamitos High School; Mario Farneti, Garden Grove High School; Richard LeBlanc, Western High School; Anne Pendlebury, University of California, Irvine; Michael Howard, Bolsa Grande High School; Joseph Thelander, Westminster High School; Mike Simmons, Rancho Alamitos High School; Emily Salanio, Rancho Alamitos High School; Timothy Rushing, Orange

High School; Randy Pagan, Kennedy High School; David Huddleston, Westminster High School; David Harris, Westminster High School.

My nominee to the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y. is: Edward Mendieta, Valley High School.●

# PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL BESET BY LACK OF MINORITY OPPORTUNITIES

## HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, with the euphoric Mardi Gras atmosphere of the Super Bowl game still freshly in mind, it is appropriate to draw attention to a nagging problem which besets professional football, and which has significant implications for the society which follows the game religiously, and whose values and ideals the sport purports to represent. As Weldon Young points out in the most recent issue of Equal Opportunity Forum, the National Football League continues to exclude minorities from top managerial positions. Even though roughly 50 percent of NFL players are black, there are no black general managers, no black head coaches, and of the last 261 openings for assistant coaches over the last 20 years, only 20 were filled by blacks.

Mr. Young's insightful analysis of this continuing problem, and the NFL's apparent insensitivity to it, raises a number of thoughtful questions about the relation of sports and society, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

# BLACK AND BLUE: PLAYING GAMES IN THE NFL

Professional football is a pervasive force on the American scene. It generates a tremendous amount of interest, debate, and revenue each year. Broadcast rights in 1980 alone were bought by the major networks at a price in excess of \$201 million. The 28 franchises in the NFL draw more than 14 million fans annually. Countless others follow the game religiously on TV and radio, in newspapers and magazines. Ex-ball players become product symbols (like O. J. Simpson), politicians (Jack Kemp), and sports announcers (Don Meredith). Whole cities are galvanized by championship games. But behind the roar of the crowd and endless hype there is a troubling reality.

The National Football League is an American institution. Like many institutions, it has an established hierarchy from which minorities and women are excluded. And like all American institutions, it cannot be extracted from its societal context. But why is it that the U.S. Army has black generals when the NFL has no black coaches? Why is the influential and wealthy Ford Foundation headed by a black professional while the NFL power structure remains lily

white? In terms of equal opportunity, professional football fails the test.

Roughly 50 percent of the players in the National Football League are black. Of the 261 assistant coaching positions and 68 head coaching positions to become vacant in the last 20 years, 20 assistant coach positions have been filled by blacks. The NFL has yet to have a team directed by a black head coach. There are no black general managers; the Commissioner and both the conference presidents are white. If a similar situation existed in the industrial sector and such a large talent pool were similarly available, the federal government and civil rights groups would be all over the offending industry or group of companies. Apparently there is something sacrosanct about our great national pastime.

In 1978, the National Football League Players Association (NFLPA) presented the above statistics and their implications to Commissioner Pete Rozelle. While he said that he recognized the disparity between the percentage of black players and that of blacks in field management (coaching), Rozelle's only tangible action was to urge the League's owners to hire "qualified" blacks. In addition, Rozelle pointed out that the NFL is no more serious an offender than the news media which cover the weekly football contest. He concluded on a strong note by saying, "Things are changing."

Emilen Tunnel was the first black assistant coach in the NFL with the New York Giants. Willie Wood is now a head coach in the Canadian Football League. Deacon Jones, ex-Rams star, sought unsuccessfully to become a coach at the end of his career. Kermit Alexander was likewise not allowed to make the transition from player to coach at the end of his playing days. Chicago Bears great Gale Sayers found that accepting an athletic director job at a small college was the only way he could retain his affiliation with football. But the two names most often mentioned as head coach potentials are Lionel Taylor, Assistant Coach for the L.A. Rams, and Eddie Robinson, Head Coach at Grambling College.

Lionel Taylor began his career with the NFL in 1959 as a wide receiver for the Chicago Bears. He played in the American Football League for the Denver Broncos from 1960-66 and ended his playing career with the Houston Oilers. During this time, Taylor made 567 pass receptions, which places him fifth on the all-time receptions list. His career as an assistant coach in the NFL has been impressive. He became the receiver coach for the Pittsburgh Steelers in 1970 and remained there until 1976, coaching the Steelers to three Super Bowl victories. When lured away by the Rams in 1977, Taylor became the senior member of former Head Coach Chuck Knox' coaching staff. Since 1977, Taylor has been offensive coordinator of the Rams and has helped coach them to three Western Division Championships.

Eddie Robinson has been the man most often touted as the possible first black head coach in the NFL. He is a veritable institution at Grambling College where he has been head coach for 35 years, sending 160 players to the ranks of the NFL—something no one else in college football has achieved. Robinson reportedly was the number one candidate to replace George Allen at the helm of the Ram organization two years ago when Allen was fired. The deal never went through.

While these two men are currently "in the running," the list is too small. They are



typical of the many fine black prospects available to the NFL as head coaches. While no racist motives are imputed to the NFL, it seems apparent that a mechanism which produces the effects of racism is an important part of its organizational structure.

The National Football League Players Association (NFLPA) recently urged the implementation of an affirmative action policy to recruit blacks into NFL management positions. Commissioner Rozelle refused. Consequently, the NFLPA commissioned a social scientist from Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Jomills Braddock, to conduct a study to examine race discrimination in NFL managerial recruitment.

The Braddock study was released late last year. It concludes that race is a significant factor in filling coaching and front office positions. Dr. Braddock statistically determined that such characteristics as education and personal career success were strong determinants in the probability of landing a coaching job in the NFL. Upon examining the available data covering the last 20 years (i.e., education and player performance statistics), Dr. Braddock determined that race is a very strong predictor of accession to coaching positions. If black and white players had been promoted from the players' ranks equally, NFL clubs should have hired 10 blacks as head coaches rather than none and 92 blacks as assistants rather than the meagre 20 hired in the last two decades. The study also indicates that the NFL organizational structure has a built-in propensity to discriminate by race in filling coaching positions. Many coaching positions are filled through social contacts between coaching prospects and their potential employers; there is an apparent disregard for the objective qualifications of the person being considered.

Jim Hill, a TV sportscaster for CBS in Los Angeles and former NFL player, thinks that it is "strange to have so many black players and no black coaches," adding that it makes one "suspicious." When asked about possible explanations, Hill simply said, "General managers usually hire people they can control." Perhaps Hill was implying that black coaches might bring an unwanted air of independence to the NFL field management.

Lionel Taylor told Forum there is a myth in the NFL "that a person must have had some previous affiliation with the NFL to be an effective NFL coach." Taylor believes that there is an informal network of coaches, general managers, and ex-coaches who hire personnel "on the basis of recommendations" among themselves. This is a concrete reference to the "old boy" network referred to in the NFLPA study and a parallel to similar practices in other fields.

Traditionally, three main arguments are used to justify the NFL status quo:

(1) The NFL is improving in terms of bringing blacks into decision-making positions.

(2) There aren't enough "qualified" blacks to step in and take over coaching positions, since most coaches are recruited from the college ranks and there are currently no black head coaches at major universities.

(3) Most superstar NFL players would not be inclined to forego the lucrative earnings in other arenas after their playing days are over to opt for a lower paying coaching job.

The first argument falls flat under critical examination. The Braddock study has determined that "roughly 1 out of every 20 [former] football players can expect to become . . . a coach." When the same data

is utilized with race as a variable, the figure decreases to "1 out of 100." In terms of any improved ratio outside of the statistical realm, we only have to consider official NFL comments. For example, Jack Donlin, Executive Director of the NFL Management Council, indicated in a recent interview that the NFL has no short-range plans to recruit blacks from the playing ranks.

Moving on to the second argument about the lack of "qualified" blacks, we find that it is equally suspect. Research indicates that 40 percent of all black players come from black colleges with presumably a large percentage of black head coaches and assistants. These black colleges are apparently not considered by the NFL to be "qualified" talent pools from which to select coaches for the NFL. Jack Donlin points out that most field managers are recruited from colleges. It seems absurd that the NFL can recruit players from black colleges but will not recruit coaches. In other words, blacks are acceptable as field fodder but not as management material.

The third and final argument, that black superstars would not be willing to sacrifice million-dollar contracts to become coaches, appears on the surface to have a certain ring of truth. The facts, however, prove otherwise. First of all, when you speak of "superstar" football players, you are speaking of a small minority. About 2 percent make more than \$100,000 annually. Football pays its players on the average less than other major league sports (\$61,000 as compared to \$120,000 for basketball and \$77,000 for baseball). While the data is hard to obtain, there have been numerous newspaper reports about million-dollar coaching contracts (Don Shula, Dick Vermeil, and John McKay, to name just a few). Again, this is only a small percentage of the total coaching population; the rank and file player and coach salary levels are probably about the same. If a person is willing to play for the going rate, he would certainly be willing to coach for the going rate.

The future of the race factor is still an uncertain issue in the NFL. Due to the efforts of the NFLPA and increased media attention, there is some hope. Brigg Owens, Assistant to the Executive Director of the NFLPA, feels that the facts and figures involved clearly point to the need for an immediate change. Owens compared the situation to the U.S. Constitution, pointing out that to insure equality, "amendments were added and pressure applied by influential organizations." The NFLPA has commissioned a new study to be conducted by the Civil Rights Division of the AFL-CIO and a panel of player representatives. The study is to be headed by NAACP Director Benjamin Hooks and would include, it is hoped, some representatives from the NFL management.

Individual members of an institution need not personally hold racist attitudes for the institution to have a racist effect. If equality is as widely a shared goal as suggested by some NFL officials, it seems clear that something should change to achieve parity in management. If past struggles are any indication, however, parity will only come after a prolonged period of pressure, compromise, and more pressure.

As an institution and as a business, the NFL is displaying a marked lethargy in approaching change. But it really can't afford to continue this way. Given the impact of football on so many of our lives, the demands for energetic correction will only become louder and more powerful. The future is not so far off when we'll be seeing

a head coach on our TV screens because of his field management skills and not because of his winning baby blues. ●

## THE BREMER FOUNDATION

### HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which is designed to correct an oversight in the Tax Reform Act of 1969 that could have the undesirable consequence of forcing the dissolution of one of the largest and most generous foundations in Minnesota, the Otto Bremer Foundation.

The Otto Bremer Foundation is a private foundation, and it is also a bank holding company. It is the only private foundation in the country to have this dual status. Due to its unique status, the foundation has been required to enter into complex negotiations with the IRS in order to insure that it is in compliance with all of the provisions of the 1969 act. For the most part, these negotiations have gone smoothly, and the foundation has gone to great lengths to keep the negotiations on the right track. Unfortunately, the foundation and the IRS have thus far been unable to determine the value of the foundation's assets for the purposes of section 4942 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as the code did not make any provisions for a foundation with the Bremer Foundation's unique dual status.

Under section 4942, a private foundation is required to distribute the greater of its adjusted net income, or 5 percent of the fair market value of its assets. As the foundation's adjusted net income has been less than the 5-percent figure, the foundation has been paying out the latter amount. In this case, the value of the foundation's assets, the banks which make up the bank holding company, was determined by capitalizing the net income derived from such assets at a 6-percent-capitalization rate.

However, the IRS has inexplicably opposed this method, and wants to value the foundation's assets by computing their market value were the banks to be sold off individually. This is an unrealistic demand, as it incorrectly treats all of the banks as separate entities, when they are in fact not. They are a part of a complete banking system, and should be treated as such.

In addition, the IRS's method of valuation would place the bank holding company in direct conflict with the various bank regulators, who require that all banks maintain a sound capital position. The foundation currently

maintains a very sound dividend policy, a policy which would be jeopardized if the banks were forced to significantly increase their dividends in order to meet the IRS's unreasonable demand for an increased payout.

My bill would correct this flaw in the current statute by permitting a foundation—which is also a bankholding company—to capitalize its assets at 6 percent. This would permit the Bremer Foundation to continue to meet all of its generous charitable commitments, and to maintain sound banking policies, while at the same time meeting all of the requirements set forth by the minimum payout provisions of section 4942 of the Internal Revenue Code. A copy of the bill follows:

## H.R. 139

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the valuation of bank holding company assets for the purpose of determining the amount certain private foundations are required to distribute

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

## SECTION 1. SPECIAL VALUATION FOR BANK HOLDING COMPANY ASSETS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subsection (e) of section 4942 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining minimum investment return) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

## “(3) SPECIAL VALUATION.

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), in the case of a private foundation which is a bank holding company and which has a substantial portion of its assets consisting of securities in—

“(i) banks,

“(ii) bank related companies, or

“(iii) a bank holding company,

the private foundation shall have the option of valuing the banks and bank related companies which are owned in whole or in part by the private foundation (or by any bank holding company in which the private foundation owns securities) by capitalizing the dividends paid by the banks and bank related companies at a capitalization rate of 6 percent.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) BANK RELATED COMPANY.—The term ‘bank related company’ means any corporation or company which may be acquired by a bank holding company under the provisions of paragraph (1) or (8) section 4(c) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 as amended.

“(ii) BANK HOLDING COMPANY.—The term ‘bank holding company’ has the same meaning as when used in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1971.●

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.:  
BUFFALO, N.Y.'S TRIBUTE

## HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 1981, my hometown of Buffalo, N.Y., like so many other communities in our Nation, paid its special tribute to the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

One of the highlights of the event in Buffalo's Lafayette Square was the tribute offered to Dr. King by two schoolchildren, one black, the other white.

Reflecting the display of racial unity among the 5,000 persons gathered in the square, Derrick Houstin, 14, a black student at School 80, and Anna Lynn Furst, a 17-year-old white student from the City Honors School, gave their insights into the achievements and vision of the slain civil rights leader.

These students and their teachers are to be commended for the inspirational and meaningful role their comments played in Buffalo's commemoration this year of Dr. King's birthday.

Also to be commended are the many public officials and private citizens who helped make Buffalo's observance a stunning success, despite the adverse publicity associated with a new-Nazi rally scheduled the same day. The community owes particular thanks to so many individuals and organizations but especially to the following members of the Black Leadership Forum, who spearheaded the Lafayette Square observance:

BUFFALO, N.Y.: BLACK LEADERSHIP FORUM

Daniel Acker, NAACP.

Bishop Leroy Anderson, Prince of Peace Temple.

George K. Arthur, City Councilman at Large.

Rev. R. E. Baines, Zion Missionary Baptist Church.

Theodore Banks, Ted Banks Auto Services.

Robert Barksdale, SETU Local 200, AFL-CIO.

Herbert L. Bellamy, City Councilman at Large.

Rev. L. T. Boyce, Calvary Baptist Church.

Rev. Will J. Brown, New Covenant Church of God.

Father Walter L. Bryan, St. Philip's Episcopal Church.

David Collins, City Councilman.

Leroy Coles, Jr., Buffalo Urban League.

Charles Davis, Attorney.

Rev. Elroy Day, Tabernacle Baptist Church.

Rev. Elijah J. Echols, First Shiloh Baptist Church.

Arthur O. Eve, New York State Assemblyman.

Rev. Maceo Freeman, Centennial AME Zion Church.

Minnie Gillette, County Legislator.

Dorothy Grey, Community Action.

Rev. James Hemphill, Hemphill Baptist Church.

Octavia Hudson, Adm. Assistant to Mr. Eve.

James A. W. McLeod, Attorney.

Sheila Nickson, Black Faculty and Staff, Assoc., Buff. State.

Eugene L. Pierce, AFL-CIO.

James Pitts, City Councilman.

Charles L. Price, United Auto Workers.

Rev. Herbert V. Reid, Gethsemane Baptist Church.

Rev. Bennett W. Smith, St. John Baptist Church.

Tex Smith, Local 210.

Rev. Andrew B. Whitted, St. Luke's AME Zion Church.

Rev. S. W. Williams, New Zion Baptist Church.

Following are the complete texts of the tributes offered by Derrick Houstin of School 80 and Anna Lynn Furst of the City Honors School respectively:

## TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Derrick Houstin)

When we think of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. we think of those who came before him who symbolized his leadership and spirit—Sojourner Truth, Frederick Douglass, Abraham Lincoln, Mary McLeod Bethune, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, and William DuBois.

We are reminded of his contemporaries such as Mohandas Gandhi, Andrew Young, John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young.

Today we see his dreams of universal brotherhood and his belief in God's wish that each man reach his full potential being carried on by people such as Rev. Jesse Jackson, Benjamin Hooks, Rev. Ralph Loew of the Chautauqua Institute and our own Rev. Bennett Smith as well as many educators, public spirited citizens, and community leaders. Many of these people including you in the audience are here today.

When I think of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. I think of the March from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, the March to the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., the moral wrongs of the Viet Nam War, Operation Bread Basket, The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, nonviolent demonstrations, the philosophy of nonviolence and the winning of the Nobel Peace Prize.

When I as an eighth grade student think of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. I think of him as a man of honor, trustworthiness and vision, a friend of mankind and a model to look up to.

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was an author and educator who stood for universal excellence and for being responsible as a citizenship of the world.

When we think of the achievements of Dr. Martin Luther King we are reminded of the quote from former President John F. Kennedy who said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

I and my friends at School 80 took a pledge to excel which was written by the Rev. Jesse Jackson. This pledge exemplifies Dr. King's philosophy of the achievement of excellence that students must aspire to so that they can be responsible citizens. The pledge to excel reads:

We will take the opportunity to learn all that we can about life. We will help our school and community by exercising discipline and by becoming a positive thinker.



We will sacrifice some of our wants of today, so that we may satisfy most of our needs of tomorrow. We will learn the secrets of success and practice them daily. We must be motivated to accept responsibility because nobody will save us from us but us.

We all have the "Force" to achieve as Obi-Wan-Ken-Obi said in the movie Star Wars, to achieve and develop to our full potential. Let all of us adults and children pledge to do our best, to leave this world a better place because we were here and to do this in the name of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King.

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Anna Lynn Furst)

Members of the clergy, distinguished citizens, and fellow students of this city:

We are here to celebrate the birth of Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King was a man who devoted his adult life to the principles of brotherhood and equality. Not just brotherhood within the black population and not just brotherhood within the white population, but brotherhood within America. Equality for all Americans.

Dr. King played an essential role in helping blacks to achieve the equality promised them almost one-hundred years before the civil rights movement even started. Before the 1950's and 60's, the United States had been extremely slow in removing the glaring racial injustices thrown upon one group of our American Population.

Our country needed a man like Dr. King to revive the hopes of blacks. He went about this in a very brave and noble way. He said that blacks must not drink from the cup of bitterness and hate, but must conduct themselves with dignity and discipline.

Though the end to his struggle may never have been in his sight, he persevered. He was sentenced to jail and he was deluged with criticism. He saw blacks being killed for no reason and he saw blacks being denied equal education. For an ordinary man, that could only hinder his cause, but it made Dr. King's stronger and revived even more hope within his followers.

Though a great deal was still to be achieved after his death, without him, America would not have received the rude awakening it needed.

And that is why we are here today, to commemorate a man whose unselfish motives were only for good, only for the benefit of all human beings.

It is indeed a great honor for me to have been chosen to represent the high school students in the city of Buffalo in paying tribute to a truly great American and an even greater human being. ●

#### COAL LEGISLATION

#### HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I remain very concerned about our Nation's energy problems and how we can best get a grip on them. Undoubtedly, inflation—including the cost of living and the cost of doing business—will continue to soar until we as a nation get serious about reducing our dependence upon imported, OPEC oil and until we take effective action to develop and substitute alternative energy

resources. Our dependence upon imported, OPEC oil also is a critical element in our foreign policy; an element which has helped erode our country's once preeminent international position.

There is no one solution to "The Energy Problem." The only hope consists of developing diverse alternative sources, to conserve energy and to utilize it in a more efficient and environmentally sound manner.

One of the alternatives which must be used in our energy mix is coal. The world coal study (Wocol) entitled "Coal: Bridge to the Future," released last May estimated that world coal production two and one-half to three times its present level will be required to meet between one-half and two-thirds of the world's additional energy needs through the year 2000 primarily because of dwindling supplies of oil at acceptable prices.

The Wocol carried out by researchers from 16 countries under the direction of Dr. Carrol L. Wilson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology states:

A tripling of coal use and a tenfold to fifteenfold increase in world steam coal trade would allow the energy problems of the next two decades to be faced with confidence. Without such a coal expansion the outlook is bleak.

For 7 years our national leaders have been calling for greater reliance on coal to meet our energy needs, yet little progress has been realized. We know that increased use of coal can decrease our reliance upon imported fuels; however, coal is not a panacea. Often its use can lead to environmentally harmful effects which subsequently lead to bitter protracted battles between coal producers and users, and the environmentalists both in the courts and before regulatory agencies. A unique and novel undertaking, the national coal policy project (NCP), under the auspices of the Center for Strategic and International Studies of the Georgetown University, has brought together leaders from these traditional adversarial groups to resolve the issues involved in using coal in an economically and environmentally acceptable manner.

The NCP, initiated in 1977, brought together over 100 corporate executives and environmentalists to discuss and debate policy issues related to coal use. The participants agreed to abide by the "Rule of Reason," seeking to find solutions rather than to resume their traditional adversarial roles. In nearly 4 years of the project's existence, its participants have been able to agree upon over 200 recommendations and policy guidelines; in several major areas these findings and conclusions have been published under the name, "Where We Agree," highlighting the very positive nature of the agreements developed by these long-warring interests.

The project has been the subject of much national interest and publicity, including the cover story of *Fortune* magazine. In the past year, it has been described in "Energy Future," the report of the energy project at the Harvard Business School, and "Energy in America's Future: The Choices Before Us," and the "Resources for Future" study, as a very hopeful methodology for the future. These reports agreed that a reasoned approach to the Nation's energy problems is more likely to achieve meaningful results than constant bickering and legal battles.

I became interested in the NCP more than 2 years ago because I felt it held promise for identifying meaningful ground for compromise between competing environmental and industrial views on key public policy decisions that will facilitate prudent use of more of America's vast coal resources. For more than a year I have been working closely with participants in the NCP with an eye toward incorporating some of their mutually agreed upon recommendations into legislation to be considered by the Congress. Today, I am reintroducing two bills in the House I offered last year which address the critical issues of coal use in relation to air pollution policy and the extraordinary delays associated with powerplant siting. These bills draw their inspiration from the NCP deliberations and they draw heavily upon NCP recommendations.

It is important to remember these bills take into account hundreds of hours of negotiations, research, debate, and discussion among NCP participants drawn from boardrooms of corporations such as the Union Carbide Co. and major environmental organization like the Sierra Club. I am sure that environmental groups and industrialists reading these bills for the first time will find many features that will please them. On the other hand, they are almost certain to find elements that they will disagree with. This is to be expected since these bills include compromise positions agreed to by key leaders from both sides.

My first bill amends the Clean Air Act to provide incentives to develop new technology capable of minimizing air pollution and decreasing costs associated with increased coal production and use.

Under current law, industry does not have sufficient incentives to attempt the implementation of new pollution control technologies which may be more effective or less costly than proven technologies. Yet, it is important to note that industry's interest in achieving required pollution control at lower costs and the environmentalists' interest in achieving improved pollution control coincide in a desire to en-

courage the development of new technology.

To promote the development of such technology, the Environmental Protection Agency under this bill would be given the authority to allow a limited number of exceptions from the new source performance standards (NSPS) and the best available control technology (BACT) requirements of the Clean Air Act. Variances, however, would not be allowed from compliance with the national ambient air quality standards (NAAGS). Only technologies with a reasonable chance of success would qualify for an exception.

A charge would be imposed if the new technology failed to comply with NSPS or BACT, but in no instance would the cost of the new technology, plus the charge imposed, exceed the cost of achieving NSPS or BACT with proven technology. The charge would be structured to encourage the development of technology to provide the most pollution control possible.

Let me stress, once again, that this bill is designed to minimize the effects of sulfur dioxide, particulate, nitrogen oxide emissions and other forms of air pollution. It would provide industry with a goal to shoot for in an effort to cut costs and improve the quality of the air we all breathe.

My first bill also attempts to harness economic incentives to improve ambient air quality, specifically in those regions where national or secondary ambient air quality standards are not now being achieved, through the imposition of an emission charges and rebate plan.

Under the plan suggested in this bill, provisions would be added to the Clean Air Act to authorize the Administrator of the EPA to develop and implement, in air quality control regions which are not now in attainment of national or secondary standards, a system of charges to be paid per unit of emissions of any particular pollutant in a given control region. The funds collected would be redistributed annually to those paying the per unit charges in proportion to each emitter's total useful output in the industry for which the system was in place. Year-to-year emission reduction schedules for each pollutant and each industry subject to the charge plan would be specified. If in any given year, actual emission exceeded scheduled emissions, the fee for the next year would automatically increase.

Under this plan, revenues produced would not be just another form of tax, but rather would act as an incentive to achieve cost-efficient abatement through economic competition. I must point out that these are not noncompliance penalties.

The emission charge and rebate is most appropriate or use in nonattainment areas because current nonattainment provisions severely restrict the

opportunities for placement of new industries in such areas, even for proposed new facilities which would have very low emissions. The plan is an effort to deal with problems and constraints associated with the present air pollution control system in an innovative way instead of building upon the ambiguities and uncertainties of the current system.

Mr. Speaker, my second bill deals with the siting of coal-fired powerplants. It is well known that many Government agencies possess various powers with respect to the issuance of the various permits and licenses which are necessary for the construction and operation of coal-fired powerplants. These duties are often overlapping and duplicative, and frequently result in unreasonable and unnecessary delays and expense for those who would seek to construct such new plants. The unpredictability which results jeopardize our Nation's ability to meet future energy demands through more use of coal and less reliance on imported oil.

This bill would remedy that situation by requiring coordination of the activities of the various governmental agencies which have responsibility for various aspects of permitting and licensing of new coal-fired powerplants. The Secretary of Energy would be authorized to require Federal agencies to conduct consolidated proceedings, and to establish a reasonable period of time within which the Federal agencies must render their decisions. The Secretary would also be authorized to consult with State agencies concerning the consolidation of State proceedings, and to establish a reasonable period of time within which the Federal agencies must render their decisions. The Secretary would also be authorized to consult with State agencies concerning the consolidation of State proceedings with necessary Federal proceedings. With these provisions I expect that the Secretary of Energy will plan a leading role in coordinating all levels of Government decisionmaking in the powerplant siting process.

In order to provide for effective participation of all interested parties in the expedited siting process, this bill provides for the compensation of all reasonable attorney fees, expert witness fees, and other costs of participating in proceedings before a Federal agency. Such compensation would be provided for those who have a point of view or interest not otherwise represented and who would be unable to participate in the proceedings because they are unable to afford the costs. Federal financial assistance would be made available to States for the implementation of streamlined plant siting programs subject to certain requirements, including the existence of a citizen-funding mechanism similar to

that available in proceedings before Federal agencies.

New coal-fired powerplants are often sited in areas which are remote from the areas where the energy produced is to be used. Such siting effectively removes the social and environmental burdens of these facilities from those persons who will benefit most from their operation. Consequently, efforts to improve pollution control and to further energy conservation are not encouraged as they might be if the powerplants were not sited with this "out of sight, and out of mind" mentality. This bill recognizes this tendency and tries, in part, to counteract it.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, under this bill the decisions with respect to such new facilities would be reached in a much more timely manner, at a significantly reduced cost, and in a more socially responsible manner. In these times, our Nation simply cannot afford to wait for 10 or 15 years before it becomes clear if a proposed facility will be allowed to operate. We must speed up the decisionmaking process and at the same time provide for meaningful participation in the siting decisionmaking process. Similarly, we cannot continue to hide our air pollution in someone else's backyard. We must have a way of expeditiously determining our energy needs and taking appropriate actions to meet these needs. The coal-fired powerplant siting policy contained in this bill would do much to alleviate these problems.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Members of this body that both of the bills I am offering address the interests of many environmentalists and industrialists. They are the product of a reasoned attempt to accommodation based upon an understanding of the interests of various parties. As we are pulled farther apart by the conflicting demands of our Nation for energy, and our desire to protect the environment, we should listen closely to those who have already done much to eliminate their own differences. By following their counsel, we too may be spared many of the unnecessary delays which we have experienced in the past.

In closing, I call to the attention of my colleagues the principal finding of the world coal study:

Coal can provide the principal part of the additional energy needs of the next two decades . . . But the public and private enterprises concerned must act cooperatively and promptly if this is to be achieved.

Governments can help in particular by providing the confidence and stability required for investment decisions, by eliminating delays in licensing and planning permissions, by establishing clear and stable environmental standards, and by facilitating the growth of free and competitive international trade.



The two bills I am introducing today serve each of these purposes. I commend them to my peers for thoughtful study and careful consideration.●

### THE HOSTAGES: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

**HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a very happy time in Washington, D.C., right now—as it is all over the country. Yellow ribbons everywhere, on buildings, on car antennas, on clothing, a welcoming parade down Pennsylvania Avenue, with flags waving—all part of the reunion of 52 American hostages with their families and the American people.

Everybody is happy and proud—but over what? There certainly was no victory in battle that we now herald. It is not as though the hostages' release was secured in a surprisingly short time. The only role the United States finally played was that of a parent who paid part of a demanded ransom and had a child returned without any serious harm—we hope. Obviously the Iranian crisis is not resolved—we still are faced with an extremely hostile government where for 30 years we had a friend, and our access to the Mideast remains threatened. The President and his advisers in the Department of State must turn quickly and determinedly to this ongoing, and very serious problem.

No, our eyes did not water last Tuesday as we heard the now famous phrase "Wheels up" because of pride in some action taken by the United States; rather it was because of something each of us felt inside.

We are joyous now—January 1981—because the resolution of this 14½-month experience has crystallized in American hearts and minds what living in America really means, what is embodied in the phrase—the land of the free.

Not since the dark days of World War II have Americans as a nation focused so intently on what it would be like not to be free. Something we have been told we have taken for granted, is something we have taken for granted—until last Tuesday. But, since then it has sunk in, at least to me and I think to many Americans. My heart swelled with pride as the band played "My Country 'Tis of Thee \* \* \*" while the freed hostages boarded the plane in Germany for the final flight home to the United States, and as a marine firmly saluted as he reached the top of the stairs " \* \* \* sweet land of liberty \* \* \*."

We often admit that we forget our prayers until we are in trouble; that a

dying man quickly finds God. Likewise, as Americans we seem to have forgotten what liberty—freedom—and being an American means. Not only what it means, but why we must fight to protect that liberty, that freedom, and that right to be an American.

Somehow the words "liberty" and "freedom" became out of style, something popular and necessary in the 1700's, part of our history books, but not something for the 1970's and 1980's when the important things became objects—cars, televisions, or a weekend at the beach.

One young college student even said to me several months ago, during day whatever of the hostage crisis—"Well, I feel sorry for the 52 hostages, but I don't want to go fight a war for the oil companies."

How misguided that young man was—and yet, I dare say, if I was in his home as he watched the televised return of the hostages, I am sure I would have seen the same pride and happiness in his eyes that I see everywhere.

We do not fight wars for oil companies. We do not fight wars for multinational corporations. It does not matter what foreign nation it might be—or what products that country exports—or how different the people look from us—freedom in America is threatened whenever we witness—and do nothing about—someone else's liberty being taken.

So, while the crowds and media, families and friends emerge from this episode, let us benefit from the experience, let us not forget why we fight or more importantly why we need the equipment—both machinery and intelligence—to possess the strength to prevent unwarranted aggression.

Let us not forget the look on these 52 American faces—and the glimpse of several who even kissed American soil when they first landed.

That is what it means to be an American—knowing the difference between living in freedom—and surviving in captivity.●

### THE IMPORTANCE OF ENCOURAGING PERSONAL SAVING

**HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the United States has the lowest personal saving rate of any major industrial nation—4.7 percent in the third quarter of 1980. The current U.S. rate has dropped by half over the past 10 years to a level that is one-fourth the Japanese rate and one-third the German rate.

This lack of saving has significant consequences. Saving is the source of

funds for financing Government deficits, for investment, and for personal borrowing for consumption. When saving is inadequate, something has to give. In the United States, in recent years, that give has consisted of: First, the inflationary practice of printing money to cover Government deficits, second, inadequate investment which results in declining productivity in our economy—in fact, U.S. productivity growth has been generally slowing down since 1974 and in 1979 productivity actually fell 0.8 percent. This negative trend continued into 1980—and third, personal borrowing became so inflationary in early 1980 that credit controls were instituted to restrict further expansion.

Recently, some limited steps have been taken to stimulate saving. The Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act of 1980 will gradually decontrol interest rates, allowing regular savings accounts belonging to individual savers to earn interest at market rates. A rider to the windfall profit tax bill expanded the existing dividend exclusion—a maximum of \$100 for a single individual or \$200 for a couple filing a joint return—to include an exclusion of \$200 of earned interest and dividends or \$400 for a couple filing a joint return. And the Keogh plan and individual retirement accounts (IRA's) have allowed certain saving programs to operate tax free.

But only the first of these approaches, the deregulation of pass-book savings account interest rates, means much to low- and moderate-income households in terms of the net return they may receive on their savings. The interest exclusion and the tax deferral on income invested in retirement plans, however, are of small value to these income groups and will not encourage a significant increase in saving behavior.

If we want to stimulate personal saving, we should focus on these low- and moderate-income households, since it is elementary economics that the well-to-do families already tend to save a larger proportion of their income. A number of countries have saving incentive programs designed to encourage lower income households to save. One of the most successful was instituted by the West Germans in 1959. Until recently, the West Germans have been able to receive interest bonuses on certain contractual amounts deposited in banks and life insurance companies or invested in employers' firms if the saver's income did not exceed certain limits. In addition to the regular return the investment received, the German Government paid a bonus of 14 percent at the end of 6 or 7 years for a limited amount of investment. Indeed, that program was so successful that the

program was recently suspended. The program induced 15,000,000 households to save and has apparently changed the West Germans' attitudes toward saving. Most households continue to save even after receiving the bonus.

The ingredients of my program for this country include the following:

Participants would have to commit to save or invest for 7 years.

The savings could be held at banks or invested in mutual funds or other vehicles similar to those allowed under Keogh and IRA programs.

The United States would commit to pay a substantial interest bonus of 14 percent of the value of the initial investment depending on household status at the end of the investment period of 7 years.

The program would have an income limit of \$15,000 adjusted gross income for an individual or \$30,000 for a married couple.

The program would have an investment limit per year of \$500 per individual and \$1,000 for a married couple.

The benefits of the significant transfer of funds from consumption to saving that this program would promote are twofold:

First. Inflationary consumption expenditure would be reduced.

Second. Funds would be available to modernize our productive capacity and to cover Government deficits.

Instituting a saving incentive program that is targeted to modest income savers would be even more urgent if the Kemp-Roth tax cut is enacted. The reason for this is the comparative timing of the impact of the two programs. In the case of the Kemp-Roth program, few but the most ardent believers in the Laffer curve think that the stimulative effects of an across-the-board tax cut will be instantaneous. That is particularly true because a 10-percent cut in tax rates in 1981—the first stage of Kemp-Roth—will be more than offset by higher social security taxes and the fact that inflation will push wages up thus pushing individuals into higher tax brackets. The lag between the enactment of Kemp-Roth and its actual economic stimulus will thus, in the short run, increase the budget deficit. Absent an increase in personal saving, the Government will either print more money to cover the deficit, thus increasing inflation or, if the money supply is not increased, private investment will be crowded out, thus eliminating the stimulation Kemp-Roth was supposed to induce.

The timing of a saving program works in just the opposite way. If one assumes a program where savers must save 7 years before the Government pays the bonus they have earned, we get 7 years of saving before the Government outlay starts. That gives us 7 years worth of savings to cover Gov-

ernment deficits—including the start-up of Kemp-Roth—and 7 years of investment in private sector productivity improvement. Basically, the saving program buys 7 years time to get a handle on inflation.

A second benefit of a saving subsidy program is political and ethical. A Kemp-Roth tax cut benefits primarily upper income households—whose taxes rose the fastest as tax rates were increased over the past 40 years. A low and moderate income saving program rounds out Kemp-Roth by offering something to those further down the economic ladder.

In short, I believe a savings subsidy program for low and Moderate income families is a key part of our fight on inflation and should rank high on our economic agenda for 1981. Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation which would establish the program I have outlined above. I urge my colleagues to give prompt and favorable consideration to this program.●

#### THE NONPROFIT TAX REFORM ACT OF 1981

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, on January 20 I reintroduced H.R. 990, a bill entitled the Nonprofit Tax Reform Act of 1981. This is a comprehensive measure with a number of separable provisions, and I introduced it for study purposes so that interested parties can consider its impact on their organizations and their tax relationships.

Tax problems in the nonprofit area are frequently complicated, although they often do not involve large amounts of revenue. Due to complexities, uncertainties, and ambiguities, and the evolution of increasingly diverse functions, considerable man-hours can be invested by both the Internal Revenue Service and the nonprofit groups themselves in assuring compliance with the law. H.R. 990 is designed to try to reduce the problems inherent in nonprofit status and to make the overseeing of such organizations by the IRS more definite and certain so that activities and programs can be planned with confidence. The law must change through redefinition and increasingly precise provision for changing institutions, including those in the nonprofit sector.

I am hopeful that interested parties will suggest changes and additions to the provisions of this legislation. Although I have reservations about some of the matters included in the bill, I reintroduced it in the hope that Congress will benefit from the public discussion, definition, and efforts to re-

solve the many different issues involved.●

#### PRICE CONTROL ON PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, earlier today President Ronald Reagan issued an Executive order eliminating price controls on domestic oil, gasoline and other petroleum products. It is estimated that this action will result in an almost immediate price increase of from 3 to 12 cents per gallon of gasoline and home heating oil.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot state too strongly what a disastrous effect this action will have on the average American consumer, and I feel that those of us who oppose price decontrol must rise in protest.

First let me point out that I have opposed petroleum price decontrol from the moment President Carter first proposed it. The cost to the consumer is too much to bear. In addition, I told President Carter personally at the White House that his proposal to place a 10-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline would also be a disaster. Petroleum prices were and are too high.

And, of course, the burden of higher prices falls hardest on those people who can afford it least, the beleaguered middle and lower income groups.

Mr. Speaker, the decision to decontrol these products is particularly unfair to consumers, since it affects only old oil. I would like to know how this action will encourage new oil development when almost all newly discovered oil already can be sold at world market prices. The action of President Reagan today is nothing more than a bonanza for the oil companies which continue to rake in tremendous profits.

I am seriously concerned about the effect of this action on the families and individuals who are straining to live within their means. While they may have some leeway in the amount of gasoline they use, there is very little room to cutback in the use of heating oil. The consumers are stretched to the limits of their resources and it is not fair to place this unnecessary and inflationary obstacle in their paths.●



ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IN THE  
WESTERN UNITED STATES

## HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which speaks to one of the most serious, yet often overlooked, problems that exists in the West today. We have all heard about the great possibilities for energy development in the Western United States. We have all heard time and again that the coal reserves in our country, if properly developed, can provide us with energy independence. We have all heard, more times than I can count, that the development of those resources must be one of this Nation's top priorities.

I would certainly never underemphasize the importance of that energy development. It is, after all, one of our greatest natural resources. But I am concerned today with another of our great natural resources, one whose fate is tied inextricably to that development. I am speaking, of course, of the water resources of this country, without which no meaningful energy industry can exist. It is my fear that, in our headlong rush to make our energy resources a realized national asset, rather than simply a potential one, we are in danger of destroying the delicate balance that provides the agricultural, industrial, and domestic stability of an entire region.

There is a significant body of Federal law which deals with the allocation of surface water: the rivers, lakes, and streams that we are all familiar with. But there is, as yet, no protection offered to our underground water supplies, about which we know much less. These underground water formations, known as aquifers, provide much of the usable water for cities, towns, farms, and ranches all over the country. Their geographical extent is often difficult to determine with great exactitude. Many lie underneath multi-state areas. They have served the needs of those States well in the past, but they will continue to do so in the future only if some attention is paid to their protection.

At this very moment there are proposals to use much of that underground water as a transportation vehicle in coal slurry pipelines. I will not, at this time, speak to the merits of coal slurry pipelines themselves, although I do feel the entire concept is somewhat questionable. What I am concerned with is that such a proposed use of groundwater, while perhaps legitimate and defensible in some instances is, in others, nothing less than a disaster. Water rights for such underground formations may be granted by one State which complete-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ly ignore the effect that such use may have on a neighboring State. That neighboring State, to protect itself, and its citizens, has no other recourse except litigation, a time-consuming and expensive process.

The bill that I am proposing today seeks to remedy that situation, not through any Federal interference, but simply by providing a mechanism whereby States which share in common underground water formations may have a voice in protecting their own interests. It leaves the decision on the beneficial use of those waters precisely where it belongs; namely, to the affected States. It avoids the interminable, often divisive legal battles over underground water rights which are now beginning.

The bill simply states that any coal slurry pipeline using any groundwater as a vehicle for transmission must, before it can receive a Federal right-of-way, receive the consent of the States affected by the use of such groundwater. The thrust of the bill is to insure that the rights of the individual States to their most precious commodity, water, are not destroyed in a hasty, ill-conceived rush to cash in on our present energy problems.

With perseverance and care, we can develop our energy potential. But we must make sure that, in doing so, we do not destroy the most single important asset that our country has: Its plentiful supply of clean, available water. ●

## RECOGNITION DAY

## HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, I had the pleasure of participating in the Recognition Day ceremonies held by Tidewater Post 4809 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in Norfolk, Va.

One of those honored was the district winner of the Voice of Democracy competition, a young man named Samuel White, who is in the 11th grade at Norview High School in Norfolk. Indeed, Samuel was the runner-up in the State VOD competition.

I was deeply moved by his words, and I am delighted to take this opportunity to share them with my colleagues at this point in the RECORD. It is heartening to me to know that we have young citizens like Samuel who appreciate our great country and understand the need for commitment to its historic principles.

## MY COMMITMENT TO MY COUNTRY

All my life I have taken for granted that I live in the best country in the world. I have believed this without really thinking about

it—until lately. Not long ago I met a man from Russia, who had recently emigrated to this country, and what he had to say suddenly made me see everything in a different light. I was so used to my country that I think I was blind to all it has to offer.

"You Americans just don't realize what you have!" he said. Only then did it come to me that not everyone enjoys the rights and liberties that Americans do. Because of this we must do all in our power to protect and preserve the liberties and rights we have been blessed with.

As Americans, we can speak out freely and without fear on any subject; we can choose our own kind of work and if we are competent we can expect to advance in our chosen field; we can vote as we wish in any election; . . . the list is endless it seems. We Americans are the envy and wonder of the World.

But too often we forget that we enjoy such freedoms not because we deserve them but simply because we had the good fortune to be born as Americans. We forget that even liberties such as ours may be weakened or even lost through apathy and neglect. Each of us has the obligation to preserve our priceless heritage and where it is still imperfect—to improve it. I acknowledge my obligations and freely make my commitment to my country and will do everything in my power to help it live up to its promise and become all that it can be.

What exactly is a commitment? The letters in the word commitment form words which stand for the ideas and concepts which every person as a citizen of the U.S. should be aware and strive their best to fulfill.

C Covenant. Each time we pledge to our flag or sing The Star Spangled Banner, a bond, an agreement, a covenant between us and our country is renewed.

O Obligations. As children we are taught to accept our responsibilities and to fulfill our obligations. As a citizen of the U.S. I am obligated by birth to foster and nurture our Democratic way of life.

M Morality. Our country was founded on a moral code of what is right and wrong. It is my responsibility as a citizen to distinguish between the two and by doing so to do what is morally right for my country.

M Might. In order for our country to retain the highest level of respect throughout the world it is necessary that we remain the mightiest nation also, not only in military power but in the strength of compassion as well.

I Individuals. This country is the home of many millions of individuals. As one of them I have the responsibility to do what I can for the benefit of my country.

T Togetherness. Our country is not run by one person alone but by the combined efforts of many. In our government, our schools and our families, people are working together to make our country stronger.

M Mindful. I must at all times be mindful of what takes place around me and realize when my commitments be and how I can fulfill them.

E Environment. My environment is another important aspect of my commitment. I will strive to "Keep America Beautiful" without strangling its industry.

N Necessary. I have these responsibilities to my country because I believe them to be necessary and vital for the continuance of our American way of life.

T Total. My commitment to my country must be a total commitment. It cannot be something which is expressed only now and

then, but a continual, steadfast bond between me and my country.

In the months and years to come the pride and love I feel for my country will be tested to its fullest. Despite those critics who claim that America can never be what it once was, my belief and trust in this country will not be swayed. Despite the misinformed who preach indifference, my faith in our "government for the people, by the people" will not be dimmed. I believe in her completely and totally. I am committed.●

#### TRIBUTE TO THELMA STEWART

#### HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, being selected Stocktonian of the Year in Stockton, Calif., is an honor of the highest order. It indicates that the individual in question is a caring, contributing, and humanitarian person, one who gives of himself or herself to enhance the lives of others. Thelma Stewart is just such a person, and I am delighted that she has received the Stocktonian of the Year Award this year.

For 17 years, Thelma Stewart has devoted herself to charitable work. She has done extensive fundraising for such groups as the Stockton Police Youth Activities, the Children's Home of Stockton, and for Special Olympics. Her concern for the lifestyle of retarded people is further demonstrated by the fact that she formed a group called Lady Bugs to supplement the Harrison School for the retarded's budget. She was also a founding member of the Ladies Aid for Retarded Citizens and Women Active for Charitable Services.

Thelma is the first and only woman ever to serve as president of the Stockton Boys Club. She also served as a member of the boys club board for 11 years.

She also gave 11 years in service as a member of the board of United Way, and headed the United Way's kickoff luncheon for several years. Thelma is a member of the Dameron Hospital board and the Dameron Auxiliary.

Very few spheres of interest have been untouched by Mrs. Thelma Stewart's competence and concern. She is a person able to translate noble ideas into realistic action, and to generate enthusiasm and assistance in those around her. Thelma is an enormous asset to our community, and I am delighted to consider her my friend. To her, and to her husband, Don, I extend congratulations on a job well done, and every best wish for continued success.●

#### THE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT COST ESTIMATE ACT OF 1981

#### HON. STANLEY N. LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my distinguished colleagues from New York (Mr. ZEFERETTI) and California (Mr. MINETA) in introducing the State and Local Cost Estimate Act of 1981. This legislation requires the Congressional Budget Office to provide estimates of the costs to State and local governments of significant bills or resolutions reported by House and Senate committees.

I am offering this legislation because I believe congress has failed to fully assess the consequences of its actions on State and local governments. In our increasingly complex economy, even minor changes in Federal programs and policies can impose significant fiscal burdens on local governments, burdens which are often unexpected and usually unintended.

It is important that Congress have both the opportunity and the means to assess all potential costs and consequences of Federal actions. The legislation we are introducing provides the means for such assessments by requiring the submission of estimates of the costs incurred by State and local governments in carrying out or complying with bills or resolutions which, in the judgment of the Director of CBO, are likely to have a significant fiscal impact on State and local governments. These cost estimates would permit Congress to identify all potential costs to taxpayers before a legislative proposal is enacted into law.

I believe there is a very clear need for such a procedure. During the past decade we have witnessed an unprecedented expansion in Federal assistance and a corresponding growth in Federal controls. Power has shifted from local elected officials to Federal bureaucrats. State and local governments have had their traditional policy and funding priorities disrupted. Their operations have become so encumbered with the details of responding to Federal agencies that many have lost their capacity to respond to the concerns of local citizens.

During the 1970's Congress enacted some 150 new categorical aid programs, bringing the total number of such programs to nearly 500. Federal assistance programs for State and local governments alone increased to 442 by the end of the decade. Today there is virtually no function of local government, from police protection to community arts promotion, which does not have its counterpart Federal aid program.

Each new Federal program has come with its own set of requirements, regulations, and overhead costs. Burdened by declining revenues and rising demand for services, local governments have had little choice but to accept these requirements as the price of needed Federal assistance. The result has been an increase in Federal control over the budgets and policies of local governments, requiring that an ever increasing amount of local effort be diverted to the task of responding to Federal requests and mandates.

This expansion of Federal programs has not had the intended effect of making local government more responsive to social needs and public concerns. In fact, the opposite has occurred. The uncentralized and uncoordinated administration of hundreds of Federal programs has increased the overall cost of government, has made it less efficient and, most importantly, has made it less responsive than ever before.

Most of the local costs associated with Federal programs result from program requirements which appear beneficial on paper, but prove extremely costly to implement. During my years as mayor of Jamestown, N.Y., I found numerous instances in which Federal programs, initially design to help local government, actually resulted in new and unexpected burdens for local officials and taxpayers.

Hundreds of examples of costs imposed on localities by Federal legislation can be cited by State and local officials throughout the Nation. As I noted earlier, most of these costs were unintended, since Congress has had little capacity to assess the cost of legislation on anything other than the Federal budget.

It has become clear that Federal legislation can no longer be considered in isolation. Federal objectives cannot be achieved, nor current programs simplified by merely shifting a greater burden of the cost to State and local government. The public's growing resistance to higher taxes and new public expenditures should serve to remind us that the cost of government, whether at the Federal, State or local level, ultimately falls on the same taxpayers.

The cost estimate procedure we are proposing would permit Congress to identify, early in its deliberative process, all the significant costs associated with proposed programs and policies. This can result, I believe, in the drafting of more responsible, less costly legislation and the rejection of proposals that impose excessive and unreasonable fiscal burdens on State and local governments.

We are reintroducing this proposal at a critical time for State and local



governments. Congress continues to impose requirements on local jurisdictions while simultaneously reducing funding for State and local assistance programs. The new administration has proposed an even greater shift in responsibility for Federal programs to the State and local level. It would be irresponsible for Congress to continue imposing fiscal burdens on State and local governments without even attempting to assess the magnitude of these burdens.

Mr. Speaker, I know that some Members will question this proposal because of the additional expense these cost estimates will add to the legislative process. I am certainly no advocate for a needless complication of the legislative process or for the creation of additional bureaucracy. I am convinced, however, that the expenditures required to prepare these cost estimates will be more than offset by the savings that will result from less costly, more responsible legislation.

Thirty-five States currently employ some system for preparing "fiscal notes" estimating the cost of legislative proposals on local jurisdictions. In States where these systems have operated for many years, local officials are convinced the process has provided substantial savings to local governments and to taxpayers.

I think it is time for Congress to adopt some cost-saving measures that have been developed by State and local officials in response to changing economic conditions. This legislation offers a first step toward achieving the kind of fiscal responsibility the American people are now demanding of government. ●

#### TRIBUTE TO CANADIAN EMBASSY IN TEHRAN

#### HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, we are, as a nation of free men and women, witness to and participants in the return of our fellow Americans from 444 long and painful days in captivity. Their return, their passage to these shores, has been a profound and moving celebration of freedom. There is a very understandable sense of pride that we are a nation blessed with dignity, humility, unity, and with knowledge that we as a people have prevailed in this long, dark night of trial.

In this time of joy for our brothers and sisters who have returned to us—in this time of profound gratitude to the memory of the eight Americans who gave their lives in the Iranian desert—let us also reflect at this very special time in our history on the singular courage of a group of Canadians.

It was they, these heroic men and women, who at enormous risk to their own lives, undertook to rescue and shelter six Americans on November 4, 1979, as they escaped from the beleaguered U.S. Embassy compound into the nightmare of Tehran.

Words seem inadequate in conveying the selflessness and valor of these brave Canadians. Let it be said simply, then: We love you and we shall never forget that you stood by six desperate Americans in a wonderful display of fellowship, sacrifice, and heroism in the face of such danger. You have the right stuff. ●

#### CALL FOR MEDIA COMPASSION

#### HON. LARRY J. HOPKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I made a suggestion to the heads of several leading news organizations regarding the coverage of the former hostages upon their return to the United States.

It is not my intention to become habitually involved in the everyday policy decisions of national news services; however, because I do feel this is an extraordinary situation that merits the attention of all Americans, I have offered a suggestion on news coverage—hoping it will be taken as the one-time-only proposal I intend.

The following is a sample letter I mailed to Mr. Ben Bradlee, executive editor, the Washington Post; Mr. A. M. Rosenthal, executive editor, the New York Times; Mr. Murray Galt, editor, the Washington Star; Mr. Larry Grossman, president, PBS; Mr. Fred Silverman, president, NBC; Mr. Thomas Wymas, president, CBS; Mr. Boone Arledge, president, ABC; Mr. H. L. Stevenson, editor in chief, UPI; and, Mr. Louis Boccia, executive news editor, AP:

JANUARY 23, 1981.

Mr. BEN BRADLEE,  
Executive Editor,  
The Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADLEE: I have been reading in The Washington Post the enlightening and informative stories of our "returnees" since their release from Iran. As an interested, disbelieving, outraged and curious viewer, I have hung on every word, gleaning as many details as possible.

However, today, I realized my hunger for this news is—as some of your reporters again informed me—at the expense of the former hostages and their families. And, having listened to the radio this morning and hearing physicians in West Germany explain that some hostages already show potential signs of psychiatric stress, and that they run the risk of further emotional strain by the intensive media exposure they're certain to get upon their arrival in the United States, I have decided to offer a proposal for your consideration:

I feel the American media—print and broadcast—should restrain itself, voluntarily, for a short period of time to allow for the personal readjustment of the former hostages by limiting coverage to public events or returnee-initiated interviews. If a newspaper of your caliber and influence announced such a policy, many other news organizations would follow your lead.

This, I believe, would enhance your prestige among readers all over the country because, as you realize, the press is getting bad press over this media dilemma.

Let there be no mistake, I am a firm believer in the First Amendment rights of the press; still, I am also a believer in the individual's right of privacy and peace of mind. This delicate situation appears to be an extraordinary case when the lives of our former hostages should be considered over and above those people—myself included—whose voracious appetites for details deny the well-being of others.

Again, my suggestion does not preclude coverage of the returnees and their families. It does limit coverage to public appearances and interviews that are instigated by the former hostages and/or their families for a designated period of time—a month or six weeks, for example. Thereafter, it would be "business as usual" in your reporting coverage of these men and women.

I hope you will consider this proposal as soon as possible. It is, I feel, in the best interest of the 52 American diplomats, their families, and, perhaps equally importantly, the media and the image it portrays to its clientele and the world.

Yours very truly,

LARRY J. HOPKINS,  
Member of Congress. ●

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 29, 1981, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

## MEETINGS SCHEDULED

## JANUARY 30

8:45 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
Organizational business meeting, to consider committee budget for 1981, adopt committee rules of procedure for the 97th Congress, and announce committee agenda.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.  
Appropriations  
To continue hearings to review the proposed budget for fiscal year 1982 and the state of the U.S. economy.

1114 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting, to consider committee budget for 1981.

3110 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 2

10:00 a.m.  
Foreign Relations  
To hold hearings on the nomination of William P. Clark, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

4221 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 3

10:00 a.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the employment and training administration programs of the Department of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building

Judiciary  
To hold a business meeting on general committee business.

2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.  
Select on Intelligence  
To hold hearings on the nomination of E. R. Inman, of California, to be Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

6202 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 4

10:00 a.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Labor-Management Services Administration, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and the Employment Standards Administration of the Department of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.  
Special on Aging  
To hold hearings on the estate tax impact on older women.

1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the Mine Safety and Health Administration of the Department of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 5

10:00 a.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, departmental management programs, and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped of the Department of Labor.

1223 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 17

10:00 a.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Health Services Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration  
To hold hearings on committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1981.

301 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Center for Disease Control of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 18

10:00 a.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institutes of Health of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration  
To continue hearings on committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1981.

301 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institutes of Health of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 19

10:00 a.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institutes of Health of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration  
To continue hearings on committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1981.

301 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 20

10:00 a.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Health Resources Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1223 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 23

2:00 p.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, scientific activities overseas, and retirement pay program for commissioned officers of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1223 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 24

10:00 a.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Health Care Financing Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration  
Business meeting, to consider committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1981, and other legislative and administrative committee business.

301 Russell Building

11:00 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1981 from the Disabled American Veterans.

318 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Human Development Services of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 25

10:00 a.m.  
Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Social Security Administration of the



Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Inspector General, Office for Civil Rights, policy research programs, and departmental management programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

## FEBRUARY 26

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain departmental management programs and the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 2

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for elementary and secondary educational programs of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 3

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for impact aid programs, and emergency school aid programs of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for library and learning resource programs and vocational and adult education programs of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 4

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for educational, rehabilitation, and research programs for the handicapped of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain

student financial assistance programs of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 5

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain school improvement programs, special institutions, and Howard University of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institute of Education, fund for the improvement of postsecondary education, educational statistics, educational research and training activities overseas of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 10

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Community Services Administration.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, and the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 11

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Railroad Retirement Board, domestic operations programs of ACTION, and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the President's Commission on Ethical Problems in Medicine.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 16

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 17

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 18

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 19

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

## MARCH 20

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building