

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 2, 1981

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Robert R. Robertson, pastor, First United Church of Christ, Everett, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Lord God, we pray to ask for Your continuing guidance and help in the affairs of this Nation, and the nations of the world. We especially pray for Your power and wisdom to be with these our leaders. Give them a growing sense of law and order. Temper their lives with a spirit of justice and righteousness as they strive to serve the will of the people.

Bring to them a spirit of gracefulness, grant them patience; provide them with a sense of courage; allow them the grace and freedom to make, and to admit to, mistakes; and help them to celebrate the joy of good and right choices.

We thank You for being our God and for granting the spirit of this prayer. 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 ROBERT ROBERTSON

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today's opening prayer was offered by the Reverend Robert Robertson, pastor of my home congregation, the First United Church of Christ in Everett, Pa. Reverend Robertson, his wife, Barbara, and their two children, Andy and Amy, have been wonderful additions to the community for 9 years since arriving in Everett in October 1972.

Reverend Robertson graduated from Meyersdale High School in Somerset County, Pa., received his undergraduate degree from Catawba College in Salisbury, N.C., and his masters of divinity from the Lancaster Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania.

Reverend Robertson has taken a strong spiritual faith, and utilized it to help his neighbors and congregation by being active in many areas including the area community housing board and as chairman of the area senior citizens center.

I am pleased that the House of Representatives has had the privilege of praying together with Reverend Robertson.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

BLANCA ROSA LUNA DE FREI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 661) for the relief of Blanca Rosa Luna de Frei.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 661

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Blanca Rosa Luna de Frei shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or, if applicable, from the total number of such visas and entries which are made available to such natives under section 202(e) of such Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5 delete the work "and", and all that follows through "entries".

Page 2, line 9 delete the words "and entries".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

JUNIOR EDMUND MONCRIEFFE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 688) for the relief of Junior Edmund Moncrieffe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 688

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of section 203(a)(2) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Junior Edmund Moncrieffe shall be held and considered to be the alien son of Rupert Edmund Moncrieffe, a lawful permanent

resident of the United States: *Provided, That the natural mother or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

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

ROLAND KARL HEINZ VOGEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 783) for the relief of Roland Karl Heinz Vogel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 783

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Roland Karl Heinz Vogel may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.**

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

MADELEINE MESNAGER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1469) for the relief of Madeleine Mesnager.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1469

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Madeleine Mesnager, the adoptive mother and aunt of Jeanne Petroff, a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) of such Act, and the provisions of section 204 of that Act shall not be applicable in this case: *Provided further, That any fee received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered relating to the introduction of this bill shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.**

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

□ 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.

OMAR MARACHI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1480) for the relief of Omar Marachi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1480

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, Omar Marachi shall be held and considered to have satisfied the requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to required periods of residence and physical presence within the United States and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 310(d) of that Act, may be naturalized at any time after the date of enactment of this Act if otherwise eligible for naturalization under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

AURORA ISIDRA RULLAN DIAZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1550) for the relief of Aurora Isidra Rullan Diaz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1550.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Aurora Isidra Rullan Diaz may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Peter Banez, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided*, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

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

HANIFE FRANTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2185) for the relief of Hanife Frantz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2185

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hanife Frantz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or, if applicable, from the total number of such visas which are made available to such natives under section 202(e) of such Act.

With the following committee amendment:

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

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hanife Frantz, the widow of a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) of such Act, and the provisions of section 204 of that Act shall not be applicable in this case.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3512, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSION ACT OF 1981

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tomorrow, Wednesday, June 3, 1981, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 3512) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, rescinding certain budget authority, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON THURSDAY, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER, CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT AND ANY AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT ON H.R. 3512, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSION ACT OF 1981

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, or any

day thereafter, to consider the conference report and any amendments in disagreement on the bill (H.R. 3512) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, rescinding certain budget authority, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CARDINAL WYSZYNSKI, CHAMPION OF FREEDOM

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, a great spiritual leader, a courageous fighter for liberty, a deep believer in human rights, is no longer with us. Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski, the late primate of Poland, died last week, and freedom-loving men and women throughout the world mourn his passing.

I have, Mr. Speaker, a particularly personal appreciation for what this great man believed in and for the courageous way in which he acted on his beliefs. During his distinguished career, he opposed both the totalitarianism of Nazi Germany and the imperialism of the Soviet Union with determination and wisdom.

A representative of the finest in the Roman Catholic tradition, he fought for all humankind. His memory will be honored and cherished by all who are committed to freedom.

CONSTITUENT RESPONSE ON ADMINISTRATION SOCIAL SECURITY PROPOSALS IS NEGATIVE

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

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming response I have received from my constituents to the administration proposals on social security has been negative. Person after person calls them unfair.

And I certainly agree, especially when one looks at the administration's proposal to drastically and immediately reduce early retirement benefits.

Thousands of Americans have planned for their retirement next year, counting on the Government to faithfully fulfill its obligations. Many must retire for health reasons, some are committed by contract to leave their regular employment.

Suddenly these citizens are being told they may lose up to \$160 a month they had every right to expect they would receive. That may not be a lot of money for those earning over \$100,000 a year, but it is a very stiff

tax for the bulk of those expecting to retire next January.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must, and I believe it will, reject such unfair proposals. We must seek alternatives that will be based on fairness to the generation receiving benefits and fairness to the generations now paying into the fund.

WHAT IS ADMINISTRATION'S MILITARY PAY POLICY?

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

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we all heard the speech by President Reagan to the graduating class at West Point. He talked about how we had come out of the Vietnam syndrome, and how we are rearming to be better prepared in the world. He promised the graduates increased pay and incentives to make the Army more attractive.

What the President did not tell those graduates and the military personnel around the world, of course, is that he has just deferred a planned 5.3-percent pay increase for the military which was to become effective on July 1, 1981, under current law. This increase was to be added to the one scheduled for October 1, 1981.

Mr. Speaker, the question is, What is the administration's position on military personnel? The Reagan budget increases investment in hardware by 34 percent, but the investment in operations and maintenance is increased only 4 percent. We are, therefore, laying the groundwork for a military with fancy equipment, but no way to repair it and no skilled hands to operate that equipment which works, and to fix the equipment which does not.

□ 1215

THE EFFECTS OF GRAMM-LATTA ON OLDER WOMEN

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

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, as Chair of the Task Force on Social Security and Women for the Aging Committee, I will be holding hearings on the effects of the social security cuts in the Gramm-Latta budget and other administration proposals on older women.

Mr. Speaker, 72 percent of all our elderly poor happen to be women. The average woman 65 or over lives on \$220 per month. If they take the early retirement benefit at age 62, their reduced benefit is an average of \$189 a month. The administration's proposal would decrease that check by 25 percent. The elimination of the minimum

benefit of \$122 a month, also affects older women adversely.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on and on. This is the so-called safety net related to our older Americans, especially older women. I believe personally it is a sham. Hopefully, our hearings will relay the truth about the administration's proposals related to social security and their effect on older Americans, in particular older women.

A 3-YEAR TAX CUT WITH SUNSET TRIGGERED PROVISIONS—A BIPARTISAN COMPROMISE

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

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in Washington and around the country recently about proposed tax reductions.

Some of us who would like to see a multiyear tax reduction such as the Kemp-Roth program are very concerned about the high deficits under which the budget is now operating. We want to see the tax burden relieved and productivity stimulated. But, we are concerned that the national debt will this year reach \$1 trillion, and that a multiyear tax reduction could add to the depth of the deficits and add to the raging fires of inflation.

Consequently, since President Reagan has asked for proposals for compromise, I now submit one which many of us who feel the way I do could support wholeheartedly. That proposal is to enact a 3-year, 30-percent tax cut, but for the second and third years trigger in a sunset provision for each of those years. The triggers would be whether or not the economy achieves the very same assumptions which the Reagan administration and OMB Director David Stockman have placed before us. If the inflation rate comes down, as it is predicted according to the President's program, if the interest rates are reduced, according to the President's program, if the deficits are brought under control, according to the President's program, then those tax reductions for the second and third out years are put in place; if not, we avoid the higher deficits and the inflation which would result from them by having an automatic sunset of the tax cut.

This proposal is fiscally prudent. It gives the President his Kemp-Roth tax cut intact. It uses the President's very own economic assumptions and gives Congress and the marketplace an incentive for reaching them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a compromise based on the President's own assumptions, and I think it would merit bipartisan support and become the bi-

partisan compromise which the President and the public want.

VETERANS' PROGRAMS UNDER FIRE BY ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, we will vote today on seven bills relating to veterans. I note that the Reagan administration opposes four of the seven bills.

That is understandable. The Gramm-Latta-Reagan budget has a \$38 billion deficit for fiscal year 1982. President Reagan must oppose all new spending programs and cut existing ones.

Mark this. The Reagan budget for fiscal year 1983 projects a deficit of \$23 billion if additional spending cuts of \$30 billion are made by Congress.

The question is which veterans' programs will be on the chopping block a year from now as part of that \$30 billion in new, unspecified cuts which must be made.

ARTS RESCISSIONS

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the unfairness and callousness of the Reagan administration seems to have no limits. I was shocked to learn of the further cuts in 1981 funding being proposed by the administration, all third quarter fiscal year 1981 funds for the national endowments for the arts and humanities have been frozen pending a rescission in these areas totaling \$58 million. That is this quarter we are in. These proposals are a breach of both contract and faith with arts and cultural groups. The freeze alone threatens irreparable damage to many arts and cultural organizations who have already budgeted these moneys for their activities. In light of the massive cuts under consideration for fiscal 1982, these rescissions would impose additional and unexpected hardship upon groups now fighting for their very survival.

For example, the Joffrey Ballet Co. of New York City depends on the revenues they receive from their national tour to cover over 50 percent of their annual operating expenses. The recent freeze on arts endowment funds jeopardizes most of the revenues they expected to earn on their 12-city tour, now in progress, if sponsoring agencies in the host cities fail to receive their third quarter payments from the NEA. The remainder of the tour could be canceled. It would be difficult, if possible at all, for the Joffrey to recover

from such a financial blow. In addition, the loss of funding would be needlessly destructive to the local economies that benefit enormously from these cultural activities and from the relatively modest Federal investment in the arts.

The Joffrey Ballet is not alone in this situation. Many other organizations in New York and around the country would face similar disasters. I cannot urge my colleagues strongly enough to oppose any cuts in 1981 funding for the arts and humanities.

THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AMENDMENT WOULD HOLD UP MX MISSILE SYSTEM

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

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS), in his concern over the drastic cuts in arts and humanities, and I will have more to say about that within a few days.

My immediate reason for taking time at this point is to point out that when we get to the Military Construction Authorization Act, I will have an amendment which would hold up any further funding of the racetrack MX missile system until the President's committee makes its recommendation. I will be joined in support of this amendment by my colleagues, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MARRIOTT), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. SANTINI).

IN OPPOSITION TO THE ADMINISTRATION'S MODIFICATIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

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

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to President Reagan's recommended alterations of our Nation's social security system. I share the concern of my outraged constituency that these drastic changes will unfairly penalize current social security beneficiaries and those hard-working Americans approaching retirement.

The principal flaw of President Reagan's proposal is the immediacy of its harsh effect. Conscientious citizens have no opportunity to prepare for these severe cutbacks in fundamental retirement benefits. The President has pulled out the safety net without a warning.

While I fully support the need to assure the fiscal viability of the social security system, I believe far more equitable solutions are possible. For instance, the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security has rec-

ommended in H.R. 3207 a phase-in formula approach to commence in 1990. In contrast to the President's suggestion, this formula would not disrupt pending retirement plans of working Americans.

As the Congress addresses this difficult task, it must exercise caution and due regard for the interest of social security beneficiaries. It must be remembered that the social security system is the primary means by which retired Americans have guaranteed their financial security.

This security must not be sacrificed in the interest of fleeting political expediency. The conscience and compassion of the Nation cannot allow this to occur.

WHAT IS FAIR IN SOCIAL SECURITY?

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

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, remarks about the unfairness of the Reagan program do not just upset me; they turn my stomach. Let us talk about what is really fair.

When the program was developed by President Roosevelt years ago, we were living to be about 63 years of age, and every hard-working laborer willingly contributed \$30 a year to the program. Now we are living to be about 76, and the laborers, most of them, are contributing about \$2,000 a year, and many of them think they want to opt out because if they do not, they feel they will never get anything.

Let me point out one other thing with respect to the 62-year retirement age. Look at it from the standpoint of life expectancy. Two people are arriving at the age of 61 and deciding what to do. One takes early retirement, and one elects to work 3 more years. If they both live to the age of 76, the early retiree gets more retirement dollars than the 65-year retiree. Meanwhile the 65-year-old is continuing to contribute into the system and risking himself in the stress he has in his regular employment.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to fair play, I think the arguments against the President's program simply lack foundation in fact.

COORDINATION OF SEVERE STORMS RESEARCH NEEDED

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

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill entitled the Severe Storms Advisory Committee Act of 1981. The purpose of the advisory committee would be to review, on an annual basis, the severe storms re-

search and operations activities of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is badly needed. For example, several weeks ago eight tornadoes splintered houses and barns across Oklahoma and Kansas and violent thunderstorms caused considerable damage in the Mississippi Valley. Unfortunately, this is not an infrequent occurrence. Much of the Nation is plagued by such storms for large portions of each year.

The advisory committee established by this bill would assess current objectives and milestones of the severe storms forecasting program, recommend initiation of any needed new programs, and recommend incorporation of new technological developments into the operational forecasting system. The committee would thus tie together the Federal effort in this area. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) would take the lead, in cooperation with DOD, NASA, FAA, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The committee would not exceed 12 members and its life would be limited to 5 years. No new authorization is provided by the bill. The personnel, facilities, and needed services are to be provided by the agencies involved.

I urge the Committee on Science and Technology to take prompt action on this necessary legislation.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE SAFETY NET

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

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that over the last couple of weeks we have had many Members take the well and talk about social security. I have done that. I have requested that we turn the rhetoric down and prepare to talk and come up with some alternatives. But as I return to the well, I constantly hear from the other side of the aisle criticisms of this President, some Members accusing him of destroying the safety net because of his recommendations on social security.

Let us make one thing very clear. Those who have destroyed the safety net on social security for the people of this country are those in this Congress who, through their spending and their taxing policies, have allowed inflation to take more and more from our retirement bases than the people were able to put into their savings accounts and into the social security system over the years.

Last week I was in my district and attended a classroom attended by social security recipients or at least people of that age group. When I discussed the issue with them, they were

not berating the President. They wanted to know what we were going to do to make that system solvent; they were giving the President credit for at least having the guts to talk about the problem.

Some have said that we have had committees in this House working on the program. That is fine. Everybody has worked on it, but where have their answers been? Four years ago we in this House promised the American people we would solve the problem of social security from now until the 21st century. Four years does not make a century, but it does make a great deal of mischief.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to have the guts to follow the President, give him some advice, and help him come up with a solution to the problem so we can indeed save the social security program for the people.

CUBAN BROADCAST INTERFERENCE HEARINGS ANNOUNCED

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I would like to draw your attention to a series of hearings planned by the subcommittee to discuss an issue which will touch the everyday lives of many Americans. The subject of the hearings is the upcoming Region II Administrative Radio Conference where the nations of the Western Hemisphere will renegotiate international agreements governing AM broadcasting. The results of this conference will affect the ability of AM radio stations to broadcast without interference and to maintain the quality of radio services received by the American public.

Within the range of conference issues is the problem of Cuban interference with U.S. broadcasting activities. At present, Cuban broadcasting practices interfere with U.S. radio stations in Florida, the Gulf Coast States, and a number of other States throughout the Nation as far north as Maine and as far west as Washington. New proposals for more high-powered stations, which are being discussed by the Cuban Government and which will be aired at the November conference in Rio de Janeiro, could further aggravate this problem and cause increased levels of interference in radio broadcasts as far away as Alaska and Hawaii.

Testifying at the subcommittee hearings on June 4 and 10 will be representatives of the Department of State, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration—Department of Commerce—the FCC, and experts from the private

sector who will discuss the effects on U.S. broadcasters of conference issues which include channel spacing, transmitter power, and frequency allocation.

A CALL FOR A BIPARTISAN TAX BILL

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think we are seeing more and more every day now why we on this side of the aisle were so concerned about the ratio being put in place earlier this year on the Ways and Means Committee. They have the majority that refuses to even make an effort to work out a bipartisan compromise tax bill.

It is time for that bill. We have got to work on it. The Speaker has indicated as recently as yesterday that there would be a tax bill on the President's desk by August 1.

Must we fight about this? The President has again and again said, "I want to work with the Congress."

Mr. Speaker, let us work together in a bipartisan effort. The President has gone the extra mile. It is time now to get together on a reasonable tax bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to, under clause 4 of rule XV.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION AND CUSTOMS SERVICE AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2540) to authorize appropriations for the U.S. International Trade Commission, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative for fiscal year 1982, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2540

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

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SECTION 101. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.

Paragraph (2) of section 330(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1330(e)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission for necessary expenses for fiscal year 1982 not to exceed \$18,501,000. No part of any sum that is ap-

propriated under the authority of this paragraph may be used by the Commission for the making of any special study, investigation, or report that is requested by any agency of the executive branch unless that agency reimburses the Commission for the cost thereof."

SEC. 102. UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Section 301 of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 301."; and

(2) by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Treasury not to exceed \$480,001,000 for the salaries and expenses of the United States Customs Service for fiscal year 1982.

"(c)(1) No part of any sum that is appropriated under the authority of subsection (b) may be used—

"(A) for administrative expenses to pay any employee of the United States Customs Service overtime pay in an amount exceeding \$25,000; or

"(B) to implement any procedure relating to the time of collection of estimated duties that shortens the maximum 10-day deferment procedure in effect on January 1, 1981.

"(d) For the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1981, and for each fiscal year thereafter, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Treasury for salaries of the United States Customs Service such additional sums as may be provided by law to reflect pay rate changes made in accordance with the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970."

SEC. 103. OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.

Section 141(f) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"(f)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office for the purpose of carrying out its functions \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1982; of which not to exceed \$40,000 may be used for entertainment and representation expenses.

"(2) For the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1981, and for each fiscal year thereafter, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Office for the salaries of its officers and employees such additional sums as may be provided by law to reflect pay rate changes made in accordance with the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970."

TITLE II—FUNCTIONS AND POWERS OF THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

SEC. 201. FUNCTIONS AND POWERS.

(a) BASIC AMENDMENTS TO THE TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 141 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (c) is amended by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and by inserting immediately after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

"(2) The United States Trade Representative may—

"(A) delegate any of his functions, powers, and duties to such officers and employees of the Office as he may designate; and

"(B) authorize such successive redelegations of such functions, powers, and duties to such officers and employees of the Office as he may deem appropriate."

(2) Subsection (d) is amended—

(A) by inserting “, powers and duties” immediately after “functions” in paragraph (3);

(B) by striking out “and” after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (6);

(C) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(D) by adding immediately after such paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) pay for expenses approved by him for official travel without regard to the Federal Travel Regulations or to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code (relating to rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses);

“(9) accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts, devises, and bequests of property, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Office; and

“(10) acquire, by purchase or exchange, not more than two passenger motor vehicles for use abroad, except that no vehicle may be acquired at a cost exceeding \$9,500.”

(3) Subsections (b)(3), (g), and (h) are repealed.

(4) Such section (including the section sideheading) is further amended—

(A) by striking out “Special Representative for Trade Negotiations” each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof “United States Trade Representative”;

(B) by striking out “Deputy Special Representatives for Trade Negotiations” in subsection (b)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof “Deputy United States Trade Representatives”; and

(C) by striking out “Deputy Special Representative” and “Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations” each place it appears in subsections (b)(2) and (c)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof “Deputy United States Trade Representative”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TRADE ACT OF 1974.—(1) The chapter heading for chapter 4 of title I of the Trade Act of 1974 is amended to read as follows:

“Chapter 4—OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE”.

(2) The table of contents of such Act relating to such chapter 4 is amended to read as follows:

“Chapter 4—OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

“Sec. 141. Office of the United States Trade Representative.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 5.—(1) Section 5312 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out:

“Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.” and inserting in lieu thereof “United States Trade Representative.”.

(2) Section 5314 of such title is amended by striking out:

“Deputy Special Representatives for Trade Negotiations (2).”

and inserting in lieu thereof

“Deputy United States Trade Representative (2).”.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS CUSTOMS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall take such action as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) the United States Customs Service is administered by the close of fiscal year 1983 through not more than 6 regional offices and 35 district offices; and

(2) by the close of fiscal year 1982 the aircraft fleet of the United States Customs

Service consists of not more than 45 aircraft.

SEC. 302. INCREASE IN VALUE LIMITATIONS FOR CERTAIN CUSTOMS PURPOSES.

(a) INCREASE IN VALUE LIMITATIONS ON ARTICLES ADMINISTRATIVELY EXEMPTED FROM DUTY.—Section 321(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1321(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out “\$10” in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$20”;

(2) by striking out “\$25” and “\$40” in paragraph (2)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$50” and “\$100”, respectively;

(3) by striking out “\$25” in paragraph (2)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$50”; and

(4) by striking out “\$5” in paragraph (2)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof “\$10”.

(b) INCREASE IN LIMITATION ON VALUE OF ARTICLES SUBJECT TO SUMMARY FORFEITURE.—(1) Section 607 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1607) is amended—

(A) by striking out “VALUE \$10,000 OR LESS” in the heading thereto and inserting in lieu thereof “ADMINISTRATIVE FORFEITURE”; and

(B) by striking out “\$10,000” each place it appears in the text thereto and inserting in lieu thereof “\$15,000”.

(2) Section 610 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1610) is amended—

(A) by striking out “VALUE MORE THAN \$10,000” in the heading thereto and inserting in lieu thereof “JUDICIAL FORFEITURE”; and

(B) by striking out “\$10,000” in the text thereto and inserting in lieu thereof “the maximum value specified in section 607 of this title.”.

(3) Section 612 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1612) is amended by striking out “\$10,000” and inserting in lieu thereof “the maximum value specified in section 607 of this title.”.

(c) INCREASE IN FAIR RETAIL VALUE LIMITATION ON IMPORTS UNDER PERSONAL EXEMPTION.—Subpart A of part 2 of schedule 8 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended—

(1) by striking out “\$300” in item 813.30 and inserting in lieu thereof “\$400”; and

(2) by striking out “\$600” and “\$300” in item 813.31 and inserting in lieu thereof “\$800” and “\$400”, respectively.

(d) INCREASE IN FAIR RETAIL VALUE LIMITATION ON CERTAIN NONCOMMERCIAL IMPORTATIONS.—Part 6 of schedule 8 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out “\$600” in the article description immediately preceding item 869.00 and inserting in lieu thereof “\$800”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (c), and (d) shall apply with respect to importations made after September 30, 1981.

(2) The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to seizures made after September 30, 1981.

SEC. 303. AMENDMENTS REGARDING CUSTOMS SERVICES FOR PRIVATE AIRCRAFT AND VESSELS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 53(a) of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 (49 U.S.C. 1741(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out “on or after July 1, 1970”; and

(2) by striking out “\$25” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$50”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to services performed after September 30, 1981.

SEC. 304. JOINT UNITED STATES-CANADIAN CUSTOMS OPERATIONS.

The President is urged to enter into negotiations for purposes of reaching an agreement with the Government of Canada under which customs facilities can be constructed, maintained, and operated by the United States and Canada on a joint basis at those border crossings where the volume of traffic does not warrant the provision of separate customs facilities by each Government.

SEC. 305. TEST AND EVALUATION OF CERTAIN CUSTOMS PROCESSING.

During fiscal year 1982, the United States Customs Service, Department of Agriculture, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall conduct 6-month tests in at least two major international airports of new Federal inspection systems that would result in the facilitation of passenger entry into the United States. The Commissioner of Customs, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, and the Secretary of Agriculture (or his designee) shall submit to the Congress a joint report containing the results and an evaluation of such tests, including, but not limited to (1) data on the differences, if any, between the new systems of processing and traditional processing with respect to revenue collections, seizures in the enforcement of both agricultural and customs laws, and processing times; and (2) an assessment regarding whether any of the new systems have potential for manpower savings.

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

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first say that trade policy and the carrying out of trade policy has never been a partisan issue in the years I have been in Congress. The Republicans and Democrats have worked together to carry out a common purpose. We are here today to discuss the mechanics by which we implement the policy that we have set here.

The bill before the House, H.R. 2540, provides an authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1982 for three international trade agencies under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee.

The authorization levels provided in this bill are fully consistent with and fully support President Reagan's budget. We adopted the numbers requested by the President for the Customs Service and the Office of the Trade Representative, thus achieving a \$30,258,000 reduction over the original budget requests of January. For Customs, we are providing an authorization of \$480,001,000. This is a reduction from the January budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 of \$495.6

million. In other words, Customs is taking an absolute cut; its budget numbers will be lower in fiscal year 1982 than in fiscal year 1981—despite inflation and a growing Customs workload. Customs manpower will be reduced from 13,280 in fiscal year 1980 to 12,703 in fiscal year 1982. For the Office of the Trade Representative, we are providing \$10 million. This figure is \$633,000 above the fiscal year 1981 estimated budget—an increase of 6 percent.

For the International Trade Commission, we adopted the figure requested by that agency—\$18,501,000. The ITC, which is a quasi-judicial, independent agency designed to provide special services to the Congress, submits its budget directly to the Congress and does not clear its budget through OMB. Therefore, over the years, the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee has been careful to provide especially severe oversight of the Commission's operations. The Commission's budget is only \$790,000 or 4.4 percent more than its total fiscal year 1981 budget, assuming the enactment of the pay increase supplemental. There will be no increase in the Commission's staff. Therefore, we believe that the ITC's budget is a very tight one and should be supported as submitted.

There are several items of particular interest in title III of the bill relating to the Customs Service.

Because of the cut in the Customs budget, the continued inflation, and Customs growing workload, we desperately need to find ways to make the operations of Customs more efficient, to eliminate unnecessary tasks and low priority programs. Therefore, we have proposed several changes in the laws affecting Customs operations, which we estimate may save about \$14 million per year beginning in fiscal year 1983 and thereafter.

Several of these proposals have evoked questions.

In one case, the bill requires that by the end of fiscal year 1983, Customs be operated out of no more than 6 regional offices and 35 district offices. This is a reduction of at least 3 regions and 11 districts. We have not spelled out in the bill which offices are to be closed and I have no idea which offices Customs management and analysts may eventually select for closing. But let me say, that over the past 17 years there have been 12 studies on Customs' field organization and all of those studies have found a need for fewer offices. Closing some of these headquarters offices will result in cost savings, reduced overhead, and increased efficiency. It is a time to end the studying and to act. By mandating the closings, we intend to give Customs the political backbone to make the hard choices of which offices to close. There are some who are ques-

tioning this provision. We can no longer play pork barrel politics with the budget. The present Customs field structure is a product of 200 years of gross pork barreling and the Nation's taxpayers demand an end to it. Some may argue that this proposal and the \$7-plus million it will save are not in the President's budget. That is a strange argument. Of course, the Congress can make additional savings and efficiencies above and beyond the President's budget. This is what our oversight function is for.

Second, because of the extraordinary budget tightness facing Customs, we must find new more efficient ways to inspect arriving passengers and cargo. This is particularly important, because at some of our Nation's airports, it already takes up to 2 hours or more to clear Customs—and this is before the planned budget cuts.

The General Accounting Office has recommended several new ways of processing passengers. Primarily, these new methods center on one-stop inspection and the preliminary interviewing of passengers before they receive their luggage or pit baggage from the aircraft. GAO believes that these new methods, variations of which are used in many foreign nations, can be tried without impairing law enforcement. Therefore, the committee's bill provides for 6 month tests at at least two major international airports of new ways of processing passengers. We have taken great care to work with USDA to insure that such tests are jointly developed and administered and evaluated by Customs, Agriculture, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service so that the concerns of each of these agencies are addressed. In particular, we are concerned that the current systems of protecting the country against the importation of infected or diseased animals and plants be continued without change. We believe that the committee's amendment providing for joint agency development of tests—which will not—I repeat, not—be the so-called red door/green door type of system—satisfies the concerns of the American agricultural community about the dangers of the entry of exotic plant and animal diseases.

Finally, I would just like to say that I wish we could provide a larger budget for Customs. It is a well-run agency of dedicated public servants. It is a revenue raising agency. I hope that in fiscal year 1983, the administration will support a significant growth in its budget. This year, however, the demands for less Government spending require this budget reduction. It will mean some hardships and some delays in the processing of goods and merchandise. We hope that with the creative management which has been demonstrated by Customs in recent years, that they will use this

budgetary crisis to find new and better ways of doing the really essential tasks.

Mr. Speaker, I have covered the main points of the bill and the principal controversial sections. I urge the Members to support this bill as one which meets the Nation's immediate budget needs while also including some long-range improvements in the operation of the Customs Service.

□ 1230

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade has explained the content of H.R. 2540, which I rise to support. Under his very distinguished bipartisan leadership, through extensive hearings and markups, he has worked together with the minority and the administration to fashion a bill which now has the unanimous support of the committee. I commend him for his leadership and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2540, a bill authorizing appropriations for the U.S. International Trade Commission, the U.S. Customs Service, and the U.S. Trade Representative for fiscal year 1982. It is heartening to be considering this bill so early in the session since last year it failed to be scheduled at all and often the appropriations bill comes to us first in spite of House rules that require prior passage of authorization legislation.

As described by my colleague, H.R. 2540 authorizes for fiscal year 1982 \$18.5 million for the International Trade Commission (ITC), \$480 million for the Customs Service, and \$10 million for the USTR. All of these amounts represent austere budgets consistent with our overall efforts to control Government spending and reduce the Federal budget deficit. In the case of the Customs Service, the authorization reflects a 3.1-percent reduction over fiscal year 1981 levels.

In addition to the amounts authorized, H.R. 2540 contains statutory language and important report language that address congressional concerns regarding the operations of these agencies. For example, the bill contains a provision which increases from \$20,000 to \$25,000 the cap on the amount of overtime pay which may go to any Customs employee and urges Customs management to continue to monitor the allocation of overtime.

The increase in the cap will alleviate the administrative burden and additional cost of complying with the more restrictive cap which should be helpful at a time when the hiring freeze will mean fewer inspectors to share the

overtime workload. Yet the cap helps to curtail escalating costs in general as well as ease the problems which have arisen among Customs personnel.

Because the reduced budget for the Customs Service will necessarily put pressure on services provided to the traveling public, H.R. 2540 provides for 6-month tests of new systems of facilitating passenger processing at at least two major international airports. These tests would be determined and carried out by three agencies: Customs, Agriculture's Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). There has been some concern that speeded-up processing would mean the entrance of plant or animal pests and diseases. The bill provides for the active participation of the Department of Agriculture in the processing tests and in any resulting new systems.

The bill also prohibits the use of appropriated funds to implement any mechanism for the collection of estimated customs duties that provide for less than a 10-day deferment in the collection of such duties. Congressional intent in this regard has been firmly expressed on three previous occasions in the report language of both the Customs Procedural Reform Act (Public Law 95-410) and the fiscal year 1980 and 1981 authorization bills for the U.S. Customs Service.

Although the present administration has announced no plans to change the present deferment period, the committee wants a definitive statement that finally will put this matter to rest. Thus, H.R. 2540 provides a statutory prohibition against any shortened deferment period.

I would like also to mention the concern of the Ways and Means Committee with respect to the reorganization of the structure of the Customs Service which is addressed in this bill. The committee has pressed Customs for several years to reduce the number of its regional offices and to otherwise streamline its operations so that resources are concentrated at the district and port locations where the important direct services are delivered. Although Customs has taken significant steps to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the agency, it has not moved to reduce the number of regional offices. The bill mandates reducing the number of regional offices from 9 to 6 and the number of district offices from 46 to 35 by the end of fiscal year 1982 to help the need for Government cost savings and efficiency.

Finally, the bill makes changes in the personal exemptions and simplified duties applied to merchandise brought back into the United States by the traveling public. We have also made changes in the reimbursements required for certain special customs

services. These changes are an effort to set realistic value levels that take into account inflation—a trend that began with the Customs Procedural Reform Act.

Therefore, the personal exemption for returning residents would be increased from \$300 to \$600 and from \$600 to \$800 in those cases where an individual is returning from the insular possessions. Also, above the personal exemption, the flat 10-percent rate of duty—5 percent in case of the insular possessions—would be applied to the next \$800 worth of noncommercial entries rather than \$600 as in current law.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2540 is an important authorization bill that addresses a broad range of issues that are of ongoing concern for the Congress. I urge my colleagues to give this bill their unqualified support.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee. I have found that it is a pleasure to work with him and to work with all the members of our committee. I pledge that we will continue that kind of cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. IRELAND), who has a question.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, while the committee has attempted to insure that any new methods of speeding the processing of passengers as the gentleman from Florida alluded to, through Customs protects the American agricultural community against the introduction of foreign animal and plant pests and diseases, I continue to have serious concerns.

I would like to ask my colleague from Florida whether it is the intention that in these tests, there will be no reduction in the level of inspection designed to insure the enforcement of the Nation's plant and animal health laws?

Mr. GIBBONS. The committee is very clear on that point. There will be no reduction of the level of inspection. The Subcommittee on Trade and the General Accounting Office will be monitoring the development and conduct of these tests very closely. The USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service will be an equal participant in the design and implementation of the studies. As a fellow Member from the State of Florida, I certainly share the concern of the entire State delegation on this matter.

Mr. IRELAND. I thank the gentleman. I am further concerned that in fact, the current level of enforcement of the Nation's agricultural health laws is already inadequate. It is a miracle that there have not been more, costly outbreaks of animal and plant epidemics.

I think part of the problem is that the traveling public and the customs officers themselves do not place a high priority on the enforcement of these agricultural laws. Under Customs laws, the penalty for bringing in a possibly diseased agricultural product is simply the forfeiture of that item. A failure to report the item to a Customs officer under questioning means a penalty equal to the value of the item. In the case of infested fruit or meat products carried by the general public, this is a miniscule amount. It is no deterrent at all.

Also, under the agricultural laws, there is a criminal penalty for a violation of the animal and plant quarantine laws. But that is never used; it is too laborious. The U.S. attorneys simply will not touch it. Therefore, it is no deterrent.

For that reason, the gentleman and I have introduced today legislation which we feel will provide a practical deterrent. I have explained it in detail in my floor statement, but for the present, I would suggest that we should think of it as analogous to a costly traffic ticket which would be assessed, rather than an impressive sounding potential penalty which would never be assessed.

The point here is to stop people, not to have a law engraved in granite which stops nothing.

Can the gentleman, the cosponsor of this bill comment on when the committee may be able to consider this legislation?

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman makes a number of excellent points. I am very pleased to be a cosponsor of this penalty-for-failure-to-declare legislation. This type of measure is essential for insuring the better enforcement of our Nation's laws relating to animal and plant health. My Subcommittee on Trade will schedule this bill for consideration during our upcoming round of hearings on small tariff bills. While I cannot speak for the entire membership of the subcommittee, I believe it has an excellent chance of passage.

Let me make several other points.

In the conduct of these tests, I expect that Customs will develop some new, informative literature, in various languages, for the traveling public explaining the travelers obligation to meet national laws. In these pamphlets, I hope that more can be done to stress the importance of complying fully with the agricultural health laws.

Last, as you know, the Carter administration proposed legislation which would establish a system of civil penalties for the violation of these health laws. That proposal was introduced in 1980 in the Senate as S. 2956. It was not introduced in the House. I understand that this year OMB is reviewing

the situation to determine whether USDA can again request this legislation. This legislation is a matter which would be under the jurisdiction of the House Agriculture Committee, and I hope concerned members will explore the possibility of that legislation.

Mr. IRELAND. I thank the gentleman for his kind words of support for my legislation, and for his hard work and support to protect the agricultural interests of our State and our Nation.

As I have often said, no one who has ever stood in line in Miami, or Tampa, or any of our major international airports can be insensitive to the need to facilitate our traveling public—and our guests—more expeditiously.

But at the same time we cannot let an airport traffic management problem override the health and welfare of our agricultural industry. That is self-evident, and I welcome the support of the gentleman and the committee as we work in the future with Customs, Agriculture, and all appropriate officials and agencies to make sure that our Nation's agricultural interests are fully protected.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As one Member of Congress who has observed the terrible damage that these imported diseases can do to our plants and animals and to the economy of this Nation, I assure the gentleman that I do not intend to stand by and watch these very helpful protective measures be sacrificed just for passenger convenience.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. AuCOIN).

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the need for cost savings in the Customs Service, and though I understand that, I am concerned that in closing some regional or district offices, there may be a reduction in services to the local trading community and that this might, in turn, lead to a diversion of trade away from certain ports and to areas which still retain a Customs headquarters.

I am wondering if the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida, would comment on this concern?

□ 1245

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

Mr. AuCOIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I know that this is a fear among importers and exporters in a number of cities. But I want to stress, as strongly as I possibly can, that the committee does not intend for there to be any reduction in service to the trading community—merely a reduction in overhead and layers of bureaucracy. Indeed, we

expect that service to the public will be improved by these closings, since they will free up personnel to work with the public directly, rather than maintain unneeded headquarters staffing.

We stress this point in our committee report on page 10, where we say:

The Committee does not expect most personnel from these closed headquarters operations to be transferred to other headquarters; rather, they are to be moved into line operations.

I would also like to quote from a 1978 GAO study on the need for Customs to close some of these headquarters. The GAO said, and I quote:

The negative effects of retaining the existing (organizational) structure are felt by all those served by Customs because fewer resources are available to meet day-to-day operating requirements. Having fewer regions and districts would allow Customs to reduce overhead and reassign personnel to day-to-day operations.

Mr. AuCOIN. I thank the gentleman. Is it also your understanding that Customs has not yet decided on what facilities to close and that decisions on closures will be based on up-to-date information on workloads and trade trends.

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman is correct. That is our understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. GLICKMAN).

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and would ask two questions of the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS). The first question concerns the same issue the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. AuCOIN) raised, the closing of three regional offices and nine district offices.

The committee report notes that the personnel which will be freed up by closing those offices will be transferred to ports of entry to provide direct service. Has the committee given any consideration at this point to just where those personnel might be reassigned? I ask this because of a problem I am trying to work out with the Customs Service. At the point of entry at Mid-Continent Airport in Wichita, there are only 3 Customs Service personnel who handled 5,250 entries last year while at another point of entry in an adjacent State, the Customs Service had 9 staff members to handle 5,837. Would the committee agree that as personnel are freed up, they should be shifted to facilities like that in Wichita which are short staffed?

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct; the purpose of

closing headquarters offices is to free up personnel to serve the public.

I must advise the gentleman that with the cut in Customs budget and its decline in manpower, even closing headquarters staffs will not substantially reduce the demands on Customs manpower. Further, I would expect most of the staff at closed headquarters offices to switch to "port-of-entry" type work in the same area. Nevertheless, the only hope for increased manpower in the type of case you describe is through cutting some of these headquarters staffs. In the example you cite at Mid-Continent Airport, it certainly sounds as if staffing should be adjusted upward, and with your permission, I would like to inquire with Customs as to why immediate staffing adjustments could not be made so as to help at Wichita Airport.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I thank my colleague. I would ask one additional question.

I note the support the committee has given in its report to the one-stop inspections where one staff person handles both Customs Service and Immigration and Naturalization Service matters. That approach makes imminent sense in terms of maximizing service provided at the least cost. In the case of Wichita, we have those three Customs Service personnel, but no INS office. That has created some real problems most notably for the sizable aviation industry located in Wichita. It has meant that when a plane is flown into Wichita for business purposes or for repairs or modifications, any passengers other than crew can be diverted to the nearest INS office in Kansas City to be cleared for entry. A number of us in the Kansas congressional delegation have been working to get an INS office in Wichita for a number of reasons, but, short of that, it would certainly be a help if this one-stop service could be instituted there. Can you tell me, is it the view of the committee that one-stop service should be instituted in situations like this where there is a Customs Service point of entry but no INS staff to provide complementary services?

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentleman for bringing this example to my attention. It is a classic example of unnecessary bureaucracy. The one-stop system and cross training of Customs inspectors is ideally designed for the type of situation you describe at Wichita. Again, with your permission, I would like to begin some discussions with Customs on a creative, nonexpensive way to handle the case you describe. In this time of budget austerity, it is absolutely essential that our border inspection services cooperate and coordinate to cut down on manpower needs and redtape.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I thank my colleague for his generous responses and urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Mrs. Boggs).

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned by the fact that title III of the bill before us includes a provision directing the U.S. Customs Service to reduce the number of regional offices from nine to six by the end of fiscal year 1983.

There is a strong suspicion on the part of those in the trade and maritime communities that this reorganization will result in the closure of regional office 5 which is located in New Orleans. This would make no sense whatsoever by any rational standard.

New Orleans is the Nation's leading port in tonnage for waterborne traffic. According to Corps of Engineers statistics, New Orleans surpassed the Port of New York in 1979 and became the Nation's premiere port.

New Orleans is the No. 6 port in the Nation in customs collections, which easily surpasses both Houston and Miami.

Ports in the State of Louisiana are rapidly growing and expanding; 35 percent of the Nation's waterborne commerce moves through Louisiana and some 13 percent of the Nation's total foreign waterborne trade is handled within the State.

Just last month, operations began at the Louisiana offshore oil port, which we call the Louisiana superport. This is the first true deep-draft port in the continental United States. It will handle a significant volume of the Nation's imported petroleum needs in the future.

Just 2 weeks ago I participated in hearings in New Orleans on the development of coal-handling facilities in our region. By all reports, New Orleans will likely experience a significant increase in coal and grain movement once the channel is dredged to a depth of 55 feet.

It therefore concerns me, Mr. Speaker, that at a time when there is the very definite potential for growth in trade activities in the New Orleans area that this House is considering legislation that could result in the closure of one of the key facilities that makes New Orleans a great port and that contributes to the orderly processing of customs revenues.

Could the gentleman from Florida please explain to me what criteria he expects the Treasury Department to use in determining the reduction in the number of customs regional offices?

Does the gentleman feel that growth trends in import activities should be an important factor in the develop-

ment of plans for reorganizing the Customs Service?

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

Mrs. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentlewoman for bringing these observations. I will try to answer her questions.

Before I do, let me say I had the privilege of visiting New Orleans about 2 years ago. As I recall, when I was there, the gentlewoman informed me about the great growth of the Port of New Orleans and, of course, it is one of the historically great ports of the world. I would hope that the Customs Service would use criteria that are designed to achieve the greatest amount of good for every American and that they would be completely objective and use objective criteria in measuring the workload, the work demands on these various headquarters.

As the gentlewoman knows, the Customs Service is perhaps the oldest service rendered by our Government. It really was in existence before this Government came into existence, and it is a continuation of that. During that time conditions have vastly changed; communication is much more rapid and decisions can be made more centrally than they could in those days.

So I would hope that in developing this objective criterion by which to measure offices, that thorough consideration would be given to what are the needs of the community and how do the needs of that community stack up with the needs of other areas.

From what the gentlewoman has described to me about the activity of the Port of New Orleans, it would seem to me that headquarters as important as that would probably be maintained.

Mrs. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of a letter the Louisiana congressional delegation received last year from the executive director of the Port of New Orleans on this proposal to reorganize and reduce the regional office structure of the customs service:

PORT OF NEW ORLEANS,
March 5, 1980.

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senator,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
U.S. Senator,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. LINDY (Mrs. HALE) BOGGS,
U.S. Representative,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. W. HENSON MOORE,
U.S. Representative,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. ROBERT L. LIVINGSTON,
U.S. Representative,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. BOGGS AND GENTLEMEN: We are writing to bring to your attention the proposed closing of several Customs regions, with the strong possibility that New Orleans may be one of those to be closed. We are indebted to Mrs. Boggs for her enclosed letter of January 25, 1980, which alerted us to the proposed closings.

As background, the U.S. Customs Service nationally was last reorganized in 1966 based on the "Stover Report," which brought about the regionalization of Customs. That report, the only one of the many conducted over the past fifteen years in which the opinions of brokers, freight forwarders, steamship companies and importers were considered, recommended that the then existing 113 principal field offices and nearly 400 subordinate installations be reorganized into six regions. The result was a four tier structure, Headquarters, Region, District and Port designed to achieve uniformity and unity of command, permit increased delegation of authority, permit centralization of certain functions, and improve field administrative programs. The six regions were established using the following criteria: (1) grouping geographical areas having similar Customs activities and problems; (2) achieving a balance of workload among regions; and (3) maintaining a reasonable number of ports to be supervised. Using those criteria, the Boston, New York, Baltimore, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Chicago Regions were created. Intense Congressional and public interest resulted in the subsequent addition of three more regions in the cities of Miami, Houston, and Los Angeles for a total of nine.

While the Regional office performs the many functions mentioned above, one of its most important is coordinating the research efforts and on-going liaison involved in developing, implementing, and operating new trade and other programs such as the construction of the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port (LOOP). Regional representatives of Customs meet frequently with company officials and others to assure that the equipment at the LOOP conforms to government standards and this will reduce the paperwork and other problems for everyone involved. They then coordinate the flow of information to the rest of the staff and Customs Headquarters.

The recent report of the General Accounting Office reiterates, as it has in previous reports, the desirability of a six regional configuration for Customs. It states that "six regions would provide for:

More balanced workload and personnel among regions.

Better groupings of regions into areas having similar activities and problems.

Greater uniformity of management over activities along the Mexican border."

In putting forth its recommendation, GAO repeats the assertions of the studies conducted since the Stover Report. Many of

those studies called for the abolishment of the New Orleans Region (among others) on irrelevant grounds—smaller workload, less personnel, fewer districts, and smaller collections. Having been tremendously reduced from its original size after large sections were carved out to create two additional regions, New Orleans was left with only two districts. Consequently, fewer personnel and reduced collections and workload are conditions which would naturally follow such an act.

The GAO study, like its predecessors, presents no original research, or new interpretation of events, no study of commercial conditions, but instead proposed reducing regions where it appears convenient. Instead of simply following the path of least resistance, Customs should apply a more imaginative and responsible approach to reorganization. It should conduct some new research into the number and location of firms engaged in international commerce, the trade routes of various lines, programs in progress which will affect Customs and the community, and the existing and potential workload.

With those facts in hand, a more thoughtful decision may be reached.

A very significant set of statistics that dramatically illustrates the greater business volume carried out by the New Orleans Customs District as compared to Houston and Miami is shown by the enclosed collections comparison for Calendar Year 1979 as compared to Calendar Year 1978. This enclosure shows that New Orleans ranked No. 6 in the nation, with total collections of almost \$374 million, as compared to Houston with \$270 million, and Miami not even ranking within the top 15 in the nation. Of corresponding interest and importance is the enclosed summary of waterborne statistics for Louisiana ports. This shows that 35 percent of the nation's total waterborne commerce moves through Louisiana ports and waterways. Louisiana handles 13 percent of the nation's total foreign waterborne trade value.

Also of interest is the enclosed Executive Summary of the Mid-America Ports Study. This report shows on page 17 that Louisiana's share of projected new port facilities required in the 17-state region is almost 44 percent of the total, or \$4.1 billion out of \$9.4 billion for the next 20 years.

In conclusion, we believe strongly that the tremendous concentration of waterborne commerce, related industries and maritime entities certainly demonstrate that New Orleans is undoubtedly the greatest maritime, foreign trade action center in the Southeastern part of the nation. In view of the foregoing, we solicit your assistance in using your good offices with the Secretary of the Treasury to insure that the New Orleans Customs Region will not be abolished.

Sincerely,

EDWARD S. REED,

Executive Port Director-General Manager.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUCOIN). The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) has expired.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON).

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would not want to take much of the gentleman's time except to reempha-

size what the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Mrs. Boggs) has just pointed out, that the Port of New Orleans is now recognized to be, if not the largest port in the world, certainly among the largest, and it certainly would be ill-advised if the Customs Office were to be closed in that area.

I frankly would move to strike section 301 of this particular bill if I possibly could. I cannot do that, but I want to make my objection known for the record.

While I support this bill as a whole, I am compelled to speak out against one particular section of it. I refer to section 301, which provides that the Customs Service must eliminate three of the current nine regional offices that it operates. In addition, this section mandates the closing of 11 district offices, a reduction from 46 to 35.

Section 301 is not a part of President Reagan's program for economic recovery, was not requested by this administration. By the same token, the hypothetical savings from the closings of these offices were not specifically figured into the Reagan budget. In fact, I understand that the administration intends to work with the Senate to delete section 301 from the bill. I would support such an effort.

Given current circumstances, I cannot believe that the House really means to mandate that the Secretary of Treasury close these facilities. This would be the wrong move at the wrong time.

The Port of New Orleans, for example, has recently moved into a position as the premier port facility in the United States. New trends in coal and grain exports indicated that cargo volumes in the New Orleans/Baton Rouge corridor will increase dramatically over the next decade. In addition, the coast of south Louisiana is fast becoming the most active drug-smuggling area in the country.

These situations demand a regional-level Customs Service response, not a congressionally mandated reduction of regional offices.

Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, I cannot offer an amendment today to strike out section 301, as I would like to do. But I can make clear that I hope the administration and my colleagues in the Senate will be more successful, and that the Members of the House—once given the chance—will join in rejecting these ill-advised closings of Customs Service regional and district offices.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to indicate my support today for H.R. 2540, the bill that authorizes appropriations for the U.S. International Trade Commission, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative for fiscal year 1982.

This bill is of extreme importance to the U.S. Virgin Islands, which relies

very heavily on the tourism industry, since it increases the current ceiling on duty-free gifts that tourists can mail to the mainland from \$40 to \$100. It also increases the ceiling on duty-free hand carried purchases from \$600 to \$800. Meanwhile, gifts sent from persons in foreign countries would be duty-free up to \$50 and hand carried purchases up to \$400, therefore the Virgin Islands would maintain its two to one advantage in both categories.

Tourism, our economic mainstay, has been hard hit by inflation. The increases in the duty-free ceiling that this bill would provide, particularly in the ceiling on gift purchases made from the territory, would be an economic shot in the arm for us. Each year hundreds of thousands of vacationers come to partake of our impeccable weather, clear tropical waters and beautiful white sand beaches. Aside from our esthetic attractions, however, there is also our reputation as a shopping area, where liquors, perfumes, watches, and gifts can be purchased at a savings over mainland prices.

However, tariff considerations given to neighboring developing areas have severely reduced our once famous price advantage. Increasing our duty-free ceiling will ameliorate this situation and enhance the attractiveness of this American flag territory to today's sophisticated, bargain-conscious tourists. A thriving tourist industry will in turn contribute significantly in providing aid to private enterprise, help the local government increase its severely strained operating revenues, and create much needed additional employment in the Virgin Islands.

The importance of this legislation to the economy of the U.S. Virgin Islands cannot be overstated and I am pleased to voice my support for its passage.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, as chairwoman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over Federal personnel ceilings, I have been investigating the effects of reduced Federal personnel on the ability of certain agencies to perform their mandated functions. The Customs Service is one of the agencies in question.

The committee report on H.R. 2540 points out that the U.S. Customs Service is "an exceptionally well-run agency" which has little fat to cut and, therefore, reduced budget and personnel will result in "slowed and reduced service for the traveling public and the trading community."

This administration has instituted an arbitrary hiring freeze and personnel ceiling cutbacks which bear no relationship to affected agencies' workload or to the fact that it may be counterproductive in budget terms to cut personnel at a revenue producing agency. The effects of this grand-

standing, public relations ploy are evident in the Customs Service.

I am particularly concerned because 347 Customs employees will be separated through reductions in force during this fiscal year. Two hundred and five of them—59 percent—will be in the New York region. There are also major cutbacks scheduled for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and again, the eastern region, which includes New York, will inexplicably take disproportionately high share of the cuts.

The peak international tourist season is almost here. My subcommittee will be holding a hearing at JFK on June 15 to try to determine the magnitude of these problems and to find long-term solutions.

But today we must face the immediate problem. I do not believe that lax enforcement of our customs and immigration laws is an acceptable alternative to hours long waits at our Nation's airports of entry. While I would prefer not to see experiments with expedited passenger processing undertaken in an atmosphere of impending crisis, I recognize that we must act now.

Let me record strong agreement with the committee report language on the enforcement question, which states:

It is important that the tests be carefully constructed to ensure that movement to this system will not result in illegal immigration or increased drug, weapons or other contraband smuggling or danger to the agricultural community.

Having stated my doubts about the wisdom of personnel cuts in agencies like Customs, and the resulting need to devise emergency means of dealing with staff shortages that follow, I want to express my support for the demonstration projects authorized by the committee.

As I have said, we need to develop innovative new methods of improving passenger processing. At JFK International Airport in New York, the coming peak tourist months of summer will mean even longer than average delays for incoming passengers at INS and Customs checkpoints.

The tourist trade is very important to New York's economy. The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, which operates JFK, has conducted a major promotional campaign this spring to encourage Western Europeans to travel to the United States. This effort has included a series of seminars with European travel agents. In these seminars, the single biggest complaint heard, over and over, was that the Federal inspection process, meaning Customs and INS, caused great delay and inconvenience to arriving passengers.

JFK is by far the leading U.S. airport of entry. In 1980, 6.3 million international passengers arrived at Kennedy. That is 31 percent of total U.S.

arrivals by air, and 75 percent more than the second largest gateway airport.

In the past weeks I have been involved in discussions with officials of major U.S. international airlines about the need for prompt, strong measures to deal with the delay problems at JFK. I commend the committee for recognizing the severity of the problem and for establishing the two 6-month demonstration projects. I would hope that JFK International Airport, as this country's leading gateway, would be selected as one of the two demonstration sites.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2540, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF FUNDS FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT OF STATE MEDICAL SCHOOLS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2156) to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend by 12 months the period during which funds appropriated for grants by the Veterans' Administration for the establishment and support of new State medical schools may be expended as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2156

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5073(a)(2)(G) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "seventh such period" and inserting in lieu thereof "seventh and eighth such periods".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOTT), the very able chairman of our Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care. I want to compliment him for the work he has done since assuming the position of chairman of the subcommittee when we organized earlier this year. I am very pleased with the time and attention he has devoted to the medical issues that relate to our Nation's veterans and, of course, part of the backbone of the veterans' programs are the medical care in the hospitals.

It is my privilege at this time to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOTT) and request that he would handle this bill.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 2156 is a very simple yet very important measure. Public Law 92-541, the Veterans' Administration Medical School Assistance and Health Manpower Training Act of 1972, established a program through which the VA could provide grant assistance for the establishment of not more than eight new State medical schools, on a pilot basis, to be located in proximity to and operated in affiliation with a VA medical facility. As a result of this authority, five new State medical schools were established with the assistance of the VA grant. Each of these new medical schools has received grants to assist in the alteration or repair of buildings in order to make them suitable for use as medical school facilities and to help pay faculty salaries.

Although new medical schools are no longer authorized to be established under the program, funds previously appropriated remain available for 6 years after the year for which they were appropriated. Under section 5073(a)(2) of title 38, a grant made to a new medical school under the program for a payment of faculty salaries may be used for that purpose only during the first 7 years of the school's operation, and only up to a statutorily specified percentage of total faculty salary costs—declining from 90 percent during the first 3 years of a school's operation to 50 percent in the seventh year.

Wright State University, in affiliation with the VA Medical Center in Dayton, Ohio, was the first of the five new medical schools established under this program, and it is now well into its seventh year of operation. According to information received by the committee, Wright State, because of unanticipated delays in completing its faculty roster in the first year, was unable to expend fully the first year's VA grant for faculty salaries. Thus, at the end of that year, approximately one-third of the VA grant funds were

unexpended and remained in Wright State's account. It should be noted that the University of South Carolina Medical School, Columbia, S.C., and possibly one other, could also experience similar problems.

In an attempt to resolve this problem, the bill, as reported, would extend the availability of the appropriations authorized for purposes of this grant program from a period of 6 years to a period of 7 years following the year in which such appropriations are made. However, some question was raised that the bill, as reported, could be interpreted as an amendment proposing an appropriation; and, if so, would not be in order. Therefore, the bill has been amended to eliminate a possible conflict with the Appropriations Committee. As amended, the bill would simply provide an additional 12-month period in which these schools could obligate the funds already committed to them under the program. This provision would limit the amount of remaining funds that could be used to pay faculty salaries during the 12-month period to 50 percent of the total cost of such salaries during that year—the same limit that currently applies in the seventh year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will not authorize any additional funds beyond those already appropriated. I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman SONNY MONTGOMERY, the ranking minority member of the full committee and the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care, the Honorable JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, and the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN of Ohio for their support on this most important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to favorably consider this measure.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2156, a bill to extend for 1 additional year the authority to disburse funds already appropriated to new State medical schools. I commend the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. MOTTLE, for expediting this important and needed legislation.

During the 92d Congress, legislation was enacted that would authorize grants to States to assist them in establishing new State medical schools. The law provided that the grants would be disbursed in increments as required over a 7-year period.

Funds were appropriated and five States qualified for the grant. Because it was a new program, and medical schools were being created from "square 1," delays were experienced and facilities were not readily available. As a result, some of these schools will have unexpended funds remaining in their accounts when the authoriza-

tion to expend such funds expires. Simply stated another way—they will run out of time before they run out of money.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the five new schools speaks for itself. They are all affiliated with Veterans' Administration hospitals and are assisting in serving the health needs of the Nation's veterans while providing a modern health care delivery system in the States in which they are located.

The funds have been appropriated. They are programed for expenditure by the schools and need only the 1-year extension authorized by this measure to spend them.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the past weeks, we have heard a great deal about making Government funding more efficient so that moneys are expended in such a way as to bring maximum benefits to the institution receiving the grants. Within this context of the current emphasis being placed on the effective allocation of Federal resources, I would like to make the case for the medical schools that receive funding through the Veterans' Administration Medical School Assistance and Health Manpower Training Act of 1972. These centers will be forced to make hasty decisions in order to spend appropriated Federal funds before their 7-year grant authorization expires on June 30 of this year, and because one of the schools involved, Wright State, is in my district, I have chosen to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 2156—a bill that would extend the authorization for the program for an additional 12 months.

The Medical School Assistance and Manpower Training Act provides funds for the establishment and support of new State medical schools in affiliation with nearby veterans' facilities. In the case of Wright State University Medical School—which is affiliated with Dayton VA Medical Center—the grant runs for a period of 7 years as specified by the regulations of the Veterans' Administration. Wright State's authority ends June 30, 1981; however, because the university has budgeted the use of the money for faculty support salaries, some of it will not have been spent by the end of the grant period. Wright State, therefore, needs the authorization period to be extended by the 12 months so that remaining grant money can be used in an effective and rational manner. Extension of the grant period would cost no extra money and require no new VA regulations. At the same time, it would preclude the four other schools from facing the same technical problem in the near future. I feel it is only in the best interest of the Federal Government and the American taxpayer for the Congress to reward the

prudent use of funds rather than forcing grantees to spend all their moneys in a short period that may not provide for the most efficient use of funds.

At a time when both the VA hospital appropriations and health funds are being reduced, I feel we are justified in helping ease the termination of these grants to a program that has answered many of our most pressing medical problems. Not only has the affiliation between teaching schools and veterans' hospitals upgraded the care available for those who have served their country in times of need, it has provided a training ground for future health care professionals and introduced them to the special needs of our veterans. Most importantly, these facilities have been particularly sensitive to the maldistribution of primary health care.

The VA hospital and medical school partnership has served us well since its beginnings in 1946. I urge my colleagues to consider this measure favorably, so as not to disrupt a longstanding partnership that has brought mutual benefit to veterans, students, and the communities they serve.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MOTTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2156, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOTTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed, H.R. 2156.

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

There was no objection.

VETERANS' HEALTH CARE ACT OF 1981

Mr. MOTTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3499) to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the Vietnam-era veterans' readjustment counseling program, to provide medical care for Vietnam veterans exposed to herbicide defoliants, including agent orange, to recover the cost of certain health care

provided by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3499

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

SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 38,
UNITED STATES CODE

SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Health Care Act of 1981".

(b) Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

AUTHORITY FOR CONTRACT HOSPITAL CARE IN
PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 2. Section 601(4)(C)(v) is amended by striking out "December 31, 1981" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1982".

MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS EXPOSED TO AGENT
ORANGE

SEC. 3. Section 610(a) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (3);

(2) by redesignating clause (4) as clause (5); and

(3) by inserting after clause (3) the following new clause (4):

"(4) any veteran who served in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era if a physician employed by the Veterans' Administration (or, in areas where no such physician is available, by a physician carrying out such function under a contract or fee arrangement) determines that such hospital care is necessary for the treatment of a condition that may be associated with exposure while serving in the Republic of Vietnam to phenoxy herbicides and chemicals used as defoliants (including the defoliant commonly known as 'Agent Orange'); and".

EXTENSION OF VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS'
READJUSTMENT COUNSELING PROGRAM

SEC. 4. Section 612A(a) is amended by striking out "or two years after the effective date of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "or by September 30, 1984".

MEDICAL CARE FOR SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS
OF CERTAIN VETERANS

SEC. 5. The second sentence of section 613(b) is amended by striking out "particularly" and "most effective".

MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS IN THE REPUBLIC
OF THE PHILIPPINES

SEC. 6 (a) Section 624(d) is amended by striking out "and at the same rate as specified in section 632(a)(4) of this title".

(b) Section 631 is amended by inserting "in fulfilling its responsibility" after "the Republic of the Philippines".

(c)(1) Section 632 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 632. Contracts and grants to assure the effective care and treatment of United States veterans in the Veterans Memorial Medical Center

"(a) The President, with the concurrence of the Republic of the Philippines, may authorize the Administrator to enter into contracts with the Veterans Memorial Medical Center, with the approval of the appropriate department of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, covering the period beginning on October 1, 1981, and ending on September 30, 1986, under which the United States—

"(1) will provide for payments for hospital care and medical services (including nursing home care) in the Veterans Memorial Medical Center, as authorized by section 624 of this title and on the terms and conditions set forth in such section, to eligible United States veterans at a per diem rate to be jointly determined for each fiscal year by the two Governments to be fair and reasonable; and

"(2) may provide that payments for such hospital care and medical services provided to eligible United States veterans may consist in whole or in part of available medicines, medical supplies, and equipment furnished by the Administrator to the Veterans Memorial Medical Center at valuations therefor as determined by the Administrator, who may furnish through the revolving supply fund, pursuant to section 5021 of this title and subject to reimbursement, such medicines, medical supplies, and equipment as necessary for this purpose.

"(b)(1) To further assure the effective care and treatment of United States veterans in the Veterans Memorial Medical Center, there is authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year occurring during the period beginning on October 1, 1981, and ending on September 30, 1986, the sum of \$500,000 to be used by the Administrator for making grants to the Veterans Memorial Medical Center for the purpose of assisting the Republic of the Philippines in the replacement and upgrading of equipment and in rehabilitating the physical plant and facilities of such hospital.

"(2) Grants under this subsection shall be made on such terms and conditions as prescribed by the Administrator. Such terms and conditions may include a requirement of prior approval by the Administrator of all purchases of equipment and of all plans for rehabilitating and upgrading the physical plant and facilities of the Veterans Memorial Medical Center.

"(3) Funds for such grants may be provided only from appropriations of the Veterans' Administration available for medical care.

"(c)(1) The Administrator may stop payments under any contract or grant under this section upon reasonable notice as stipulated by the contract or grant if the Republic of the Philippines and the Veterans Memorial Medical Center fail to maintain such hospital in a well-equipped and effective operating condition as determined by the Administrator.

"(2) The authority of the Administrator to enter into contracts and to make grants under this section is effective for any fiscal year only to the extent that appropriations are available for that purpose."

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 is amended to read as follows:

"632. Contracts and grants to assure the effective care and treatment of United States veterans in the Veterans Memorial Medical Center."

RECOVERY OF THE COST OF CERTAIN HEALTH
CARE PROVIDED BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 7. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 17 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 629. Recovery by the United States of the cost of certain care and services

"(a) In any case in which a veteran is furnished care and services under this chapter for a non-service-connected disability which was incurred—

"(1) incident to the veteran's employment and the disability is covered under a workers' compensation law or plan which provides reimbursement for or indemnification of the cost of health care and services provided to the veteran by reason of the disability,

"(2) as the result of a motor vehicle accident covered under the law of a State which requires that owners or operators of motor vehicles registered in such State have in force automobile accident reparations insurance, or

"(3) as the result of a crime of personal violence that occurred in a State or political subdivision of a State in which a person injured as the result of such a crime is entitled to receive health care and services at such State's or subdivision's expense for personal injuries suffered as the result of such crime, the United States shall have the right to recover the reasonable costs of such care and services from the State (or political subdivision thereof), employer, employer's insurance carrier, or automobile accident reparations insurance carrier, as appropriate, to the extent that such veteran, or the provider of care and services to such veteran, would be eligible to receive reimbursement or indemnifications for such care and services if such care and services had not been furnished by a department or agency of the United States.

"(b) The amount that may be recovered by the United States under subsection (a) of this section may not exceed the lesser of (1) an amount equal to the reasonable cost of the care and services furnished such veteran under this chapter, as determined by the Administrator, or (2) the maximum amount specified by the law of the State or political subdivision thereof concerned or by any relevant contractual provision to which such veteran was a party or was subject. The Administrator shall prescribe regulations for the determination of the reasonable cost of care and services under clause (1) of the preceding sentence, and any determination of such reasonable value by the Administrator under such clause shall be made in accordance with such regulations. Regulations under the preceding sentence shall be prescribed only after notice and opportunity for public comment.

"(c)(1) The United States shall, as to the right provided in subsection (a) of this section, be subrogated to any right or claim that such veteran or such veteran's personal representative, successor, dependents, or survivors may have against a State or political subdivision of a State, an employer, an employer's insurance carrier, or an automobile accident reparations insurance carrier.

"(2) In order to enforce any such right or claim to which it is subrogated under paragraph (1) of this subsection—

"(A) the United States may intervene or join in any action or proceeding brought by the veteran or such veteran's personal representative, successor, dependents, or survivors against a State or political subdivision of a State, an employer, an employer's insurance carrier, or an automobile accident reparations insurance carrier, or

"(B) if—

"(i) no such action or proceeding has been commenced within one hundred and eighty days after the first day on which care and services for which recovery is sought were furnished to such veteran by the Veterans' Administration under this chapter, and

"(ii) the United States has sent written notice by certified mail to such veteran at

such veteran's last-known address, or to such veteran's personal representative or successor, of the United States intention to institute legal proceedings,

the United States may, sixty days after the mailing of such notice, institute and prosecute legal proceedings against such State or political subdivision, employer, employer's insurance carrier, or automobile accident reparations carrier.

"(d) A veteran eligible for care and services under this chapter may not be denied such care and services by reason of this section.

"(e) No law of any State or of any subdivision of a State, and no provision of any contract or agreement entered into, renewed, or modified pursuant to any State law shall operate to prevent recovery by the United States (1) under subsection (a) of this section for care and services furnished under this chapter to any veteran for a non-service-connected disability, or (2) under subsection (b) of section 611 of this title for care and services furnished as a humanitarian service in emergency cases under such subsection to any individual."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 628 the following new item:

"629. Recovery by the United States of the cost of certain care and services."

MINIMUM NUMBER OF HOSPITAL AND NURSING HOME BEDS IN MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 8. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 5010(a) is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Administrator shall establish the number of hospital and nursing home beds in medical facilities over which the Administrator has direct jurisdiction for the care and treatment of veterans at not more than one hundred twenty-five thousand and not less than one hundred thousand. The Administrator shall establish such number so as to maintain a contingency capacity to assist the Department of Defense in time of war or national emergency. Of the number of beds authorized, the Administrator shall operate and maintain not less than eighty-two thousand five hundred hospital beds and not less than nine thousand nursing home beds and shall have available such additional beds and facilities above the operating bed level as the Administrator considers necessary for contingency purposes. The President shall include in the budget transmitted to the Congress for each fiscal year pursuant to section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 11(a)), an amount for medical care and amounts for construction sufficient to enable the Veterans' Administration to operate and maintain not less than eighty-two thousand five hundred hospital beds and not less than nine thousand nursing home beds in accordance with this paragraph."

(b) Paragraph (3) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(3)(A) The Chief Medical Director shall annually (i) analyze agencywide admission policies and the records of those eligible veterans who apply for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care, but are rejected or not immediately admitted or provided such care or services, and (ii) review the adequacy of the established operating bed levels, the geographic distribution of operating beds, and the demographic characteristics of the veteran population and the associated need for medical care and nurs-

ing home facilities and services in each State.

"(B) After considering the analyses and recommendations of the Chief Medical Director pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the Administrator shall annually report, on or before December 31, to the committees regarding the number of operating beds required to meet the health care mission of the Veterans' Administration and, as appropriate, shall recommend the number of operating beds required for the health care of veterans."

(c) Section 5010 is further amended by striking out subsection (b) and redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

EXPANSION OF SCOPE OF AGENT ORANGE STUDY

SEC. 9. Paragraph (1) of section 307(a) of the Veterans Health Programs Extension and Improvement Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-151; 93 Stat. 1097) is amended to read as follows:

"(1)(A) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall design a protocol for and conduct an epidemiological study of the long-term adverse health effects in humans of service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Republic of Vietnam during the period of the Vietnam conflict as such health effects may result from exposure to phenoxy herbicides (including the herbicide known as Agent Orange) and the class of chemicals known as the dioxins produced during the manufacture of such herbicides. In conducting such study, the Administrator may include an evaluation of the adverse health effects in humans of such service as such health effects may result from other factors involved in such service, including exposure to other herbicides, chemicals, medications, or environmental hazards or conditions.

"(B) The Administrator shall also conduct a comprehensive review and scientific analysis of the literature covering other studies relating to whether there may be long-term adverse health effects in humans from exposure to phenoxy herbicides (including the herbicide known as Agent Orange) and the class of chemicals known as the dioxins produced during the manufacture of such herbicides. In conducting such review and analysis, the Administrator may include a review and analysis of the literature covering other studies relating to whether there may be long-term adverse health effects in humans from other factors involved in service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam conflict or in other comparable situations involving one or more of the factors described in the second sentence of subparagraph (A)."

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 10. (a) The amendments made by sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 shall take effect on October 1, 1981.

(b) The amendment made by section 7(a) shall apply with respect to care and services furnished under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOTTLE) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOTTLE).

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 3499, the Veterans' Health Care Act of 1981, is the result of five oversight and legislative hearings by the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care. The need for all of the provisions of H.R. 3499 was clearly demonstrated during the hearings.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would:

Extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for hospital care, or medical services to obviate the need for hospital admission, for veterans in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to September 30, 1982.

It would also provide authority for hospital care for Vietnam veterans who served in the Republic of Vietnam if a physician employed by the Veterans' Administration, or a physician carrying out such functions on a contract or fee basis arrangement in areas where a VA physician is not available, determines that such care is necessary for the treatment of a condition that may be associated with exposure to phenoxy herbicides and chemicals used as defoliants, including the herbicide commonly known as agent orange.

H.R. 3499 would extend the Vietnam-era veterans readjustment counseling program, the so-called vet centers, by 3 additional years or until September 30, 1984.

This program would cost an estimated \$27.4 million in budget authority and \$24 million in outlays to operate in fiscal year 1982, which is a small amount to pay to alleviate the psychological and emotional problems of Vietnam veterans. By comparison, the proposed military construction budget for 1982 is \$6.8 billion. Taxpayers spent some \$30 billion a year in the midsixties to support the American military machine in Vietnam. In view of the special sacrifices that Vietnam veterans have made for their country, which have gone largely unheralded, it is fitting that the Congress remedy this gross injustice and continue to provide Vietnam veterans with the services of the vet centers. In the past 1½ years, these vet centers have had more than 130,000 visits and have provided services to over 52,000 Vietnam-era veterans. There are many more out there we still must reach, and that is why we must keep this program going.

One provision would make technical changes in the language of the CHAMPVA program in section 613(b) of title 38, United States Code, to facilitate the treatment of certain beneficiaries within VA facilities.

Further, the bill would extend the Administrator's authority to contract for the hospital care and medical services of U.S. veterans in the Veterans'

Memorial Medical Center in the Republic of the Philippines and provides for a grant program of \$500,000 per year for 5 years for the replacement and upgrading of equipment and rehabilitation of the physical plant of this medical center. This grant authority expires on September 30, 1986. It also clarifies the position of the United States that the Republic of the Philippines has the primary responsibility for providing hospital care and medical services for Commonwealth Army veterans and new Philippine scouts, and is an expression of the long-standing position of the United States that the operation and maintenance of the Veterans Memorial Medical Center should eventually be assumed by the Philippine Government.

H.R. 3499 would also provide authority to the Veterans' Administration to recover the reasonable cost of care and services from a State, employer, employer's health insurance carrier, automobile accident reparations insurance carrier, or in situations arising under a State's "victims of crimes" provisions in those cases where a VA health care facility provides the hospital care or medical service for non-service-connected conditions of a veteran.

The bill would require that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs establish not more than 125,000 or not less than 100,000 hospital and nursing care beds in VA facilities and operate and maintain not less than 82,500 hospital beds and not less than 9,000 nursing care beds. It further provides that the budget transmitted to the Congress for each fiscal year will include an amount for medical care and for medical construction sufficient to enable the VA to operate and maintain this minimum number of hospital and nursing care beds.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to expand the epidemiological study on the long-term adverse health effects, if any, in veterans serving in the Republic of Vietnam who were exposed to phenoxy herbicides, including agent orange, and the chemicals known as dioxins. The study was originally authorized by Public Law 96-151, and authorizes an expanded review and analysis of other studies which relate to the long-term adverse health effects in humans from other factors involved in service in the Armed Forces in the Republic of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, all of the provisions of H.R. 3499 are sorely needed and justified. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated the budget authority in fiscal year 1982 to be \$30.8 million and outlays of \$27.2 million. Some of the provisions are cost-savings measures. The principal cost is for the extension of the readjustment counseling program. The testimony on this subject clearly demonstrated the urgent need for the extension of the program.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the chairman of our committee, the Honorable SONNY MONTGOMERY of Mississippi; to Congressman TOM DASCHLE of South Dakota, the chairman of the Vietnam Veterans Caucus; the Honorable DON EDWARDS of California; the Honorable BOB EDGAR of Pennsylvania; the Honorable MARVIN LEATH of Texas; the Honorable RICHARD SHELBY of Alabama; the Honorable CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey; as well as a special thanks to the Honorable JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, the ranking minority member of the committee, and the Honorable MARGARET HECKLER for their support in bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor today. Without their help, it would have been most difficult to act on this legislation at this point in time.

I urge my colleagues to favorably consider the Veterans' Health Care Act of 1981, H.R. 3499.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3499. This bill incorporates the provisions of seven measures that were the subject of extensive hearings by the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care. All of the major veterans' organizations and spokesmen for the Veterans' Administration expressed their views on this legislation.

This measure, Mr. Speaker, which I was privileged to cosponsor, truly can be termed an omnibus measure because it contains seven unrelated matters, though all are in the general area of veterans' health care.

The first provision will extend the authority of the Veterans' Administration to contract for hospital care in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands through the 1982 fiscal year. Our failure to enact this provision will result in the denial after December 31, 1981, of medical care to eligible veterans residing in these U.S. possessions.

The provision authorizing grants to the Republic of the Philippines to assist in providing care and treatment in the Veterans' Memorial Medical Center to certain veterans must also be considered at this time in view of the impending termination of the existing grant authority.

Initiated in 1948, the grant program has recognized the close special relationship between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines. Yet, it has been the long-standing policy of the United States that the full responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the Veterans' Memorial Medical Center should eventually be assumed by the Republic of the Philippines.

This measure, authorizing a total of \$2.5 million over a 5-year period for

the replacement and upgrading of equipment and rehabilitation of the physical plant and facilities of the hospital presents a reasonable alternative to the abrupt cutoff of grant funds. I strongly support it.

Another provision of this measure will require the Veterans' Administration to operate not less than 100,000 hospital and nursing home beds. Having witnessed the continuing erosion of the Veterans' Administration Hospital system—a health care system once described as second to none—I am pleased to support this provision.

Mr. Speaker, three provisions of this bill relate directly to the needs of Vietnam veterans. One provision will extend a priority in medical care for treatment of conditions that may be associated with the use of defoliants. Another provision will extend the readjustment counseling program for an additional 3 years, while another provision will expand the scope of the previously authorized agent orange study in order to include the effects of all environmental hazards.

Mr. Speaker, all of the provisions of this measure have been carefully thought out. They are needed and I urge that the bill be passed.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I am very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished whip.

□ 1315

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and, of course, our distinguished chairman of the full committee from my own State of Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) for the job that they have done on veterans' legislation. I think my record speaks for itself in support of these efforts.

I do want to ask this question, though, if I could: This particular bill, H.R. 3499, the Veterans' Health Care Act of 1981, does in fact have some provisions in it that are controversial; is that correct?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. It does have some provisions that some with administrative authority feel are controversial; that is correct. And obviously that makes them controversial.

Mr. LOTT. I think it would certainly go beyond the administration.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Yes; I agree that could be so.

Mr. LOTT. There are others that raise some questions. While in the final analysis they may go along, approve of them, the reason I ask is this: I wonder if this bill should be on suspension or should it have been on the regular calendar so it could have a full

and thorough discussion with amendments being in order?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. It had, of course, thorough and full review within the subcommittee and the full committee of jurisdiction. I did not feel there was that much controversy, at the time from the testimony that we heard. That is a subjective judgment, of course; but I really believe that this bill has overwhelming support in the House.

Mr. LOTT. In the House, most veterans' bills do pass overwhelmingly, as they should, because this committee is a very responsible committee and does a good job. I do think sometimes that perhaps we put too much legislation on suspension here in the House, and I just wanted to raise that question.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Might I say further to the gentleman, some of the controversy may be caused by a misunderstanding on what the issues are. When I suggest that the administration opposes this, I am not entirely sure that is so, because as the gentleman knows, it has taken time to put the new administration in place. We do not yet have a Veterans Administration confirmed. We get mixed signals out of those people that are down at the Veterans' Administration right now. We have had conflicting testimony.

I would not want to, certainly, indict the administration as opposing certain provisions of this bill when I do not know for sure.

Mr. LOTT. Like this committee, I am sure that the administration should be primarily a nonpartisan organization anyway. Maybe no matter what administration controls, hopefully they will speak with about the same voice down there.

I understand what the gentleman is saying. I just would urge the committee to be careful about the bills they put on suspension.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I appreciate that. Let me say further, in discussion with the President of the United States—and I think the gentleman knows this—he, the President has always expressed his very strongest concern over many of these items that are in this bill. I am not sure that his legislative recommendation would take this form, but he has great concern about the Vietnam veteran, about the possible implications of agent orange, about all matters bearing on the health and welfare of all our veterans. It is a matter of trying to find the right solution. I would say that the President has deep concern about everything that is in this bill.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Veterans' Health Care Act and I wish to commend the

gentleman and the committee for their action.

I cosponsored the legislation introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) to extend the veterans readjustment program for 3 years. I am very pleased that an extension of the program has been endorsed by Mr. MOTT and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

I have spoken here before on the importance of the readjustment counseling program for Vietnam veterans. It is a subject I can discuss with a great deal of pride and praise because the program we have in Vermont is excellent. Since the Outreach center opened in January 1980, about 500 vets have taken advantage of the center regularly and countless others drop in from time to time. It is truly the focal point for many Vietnam vets in the State. These men are getting back into the labor force, they are reestablishing relationships with their wives and families, and they are responding to the system without anger—something that many of them felt would never be possible. Most important, however, they seem to be becoming comfortable with themselves and with their status as veterans of the Vietnam conflict. In short, the program has been a tremendous success.

I also support the provision of this bill that expands the study on the effects of agent orange that is already underway to include an evaluation of the effects of other environmental agents or conditions. Pending the outcome of this study, this bill authorizes medical care for Vietnam veterans if VA-approved doctors find that treatment is necessary for symptoms that could be associated with agent orange or other defoliants.

This is a small step, but it is a beginning. Vietnam veterans in my home State of Vermont have been working very hard to inform one another of the consequences of exposure to agent orange. Nevertheless, there is still a need for a comprehensive study of the problem by an independent group.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to briefly mention two other bills that the House is considering today and indicate my strong support for them. H.R. 3423, the Veterans' Training and Business Loan Act of 1981 makes Vietnam-era vets eligible for educational assistance for the pursuit of on-the-job training and vocational training through 1983. It also creates a Small Business Administration loan program for Vietnam vets that is similar to what was extended to World War II and Korean war vets under their GI bills.

Another bill, H.R. 2039, authorizes the VA to guarantee home loans with provisions for variable payment plans used to purchase single family dwelling units.

I am pleased that the House is enacting these bills today. It is time we gave the considerations to Vietnam veterans that they deserve and heightened our awareness of the debt of gratitude we owe our veterans as a whole.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of our committee.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Health Care Act of 1981, designated H.R. 3499, contains several provisions essential to maintaining the continuity of health care being administered to eligible veterans. I recommend its adoption by our colleagues.

Of special interest to those of us who have received a high volume of constituent mail about the Vietnam veterans readjustment counseling centers is the section extending their authority to operate until September 30, 1984. These centers were scheduled to close September 30, 1981, by the law establishing them.

Hearings before the Veterans' Affairs Committee brought out the difficulty these centers have encountered in establishing themselves in a community. Time is required to overcome the doubt and skepticism that is frequently engendered by a new program and new approach. Operation Outreach, as these centers were called, was set up to provide readjustment assistance for veterans of Vietnam, not to administer a medical treatment program. This distinction broke new ground in the usual delivery of health services. The development of methodology and policy along with the counseling facilities themselves has taken more time than anticipated.

Based on the record they have so far established and on field investigations conducted by the staff of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, it appears these centers have not yet had the time to do the job they were established for. I recommend, therefore, that this bill giving them 3 more years of existence be considered favorably.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EDGAR), who has certainly contributed a great deal to this bill.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, we heard in the last few minutes that there is some controversy about this bill. I think the only controversy about this particular bill at this time in history is that the bill has not been to the floor sooner and that we may not pass the bill by unanimous consent.

This bill is a very good one and perhaps for the first time in a long time we are recognizing on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that there are some unique problems that face the Vietnam-era veteran, some problems like delayed stress syndrome, exposure to agent orange, needs for better, improved health care services, opportunities to walk in off the street to Outreach centers. I think the President of the United States ought to listen carefully to the words of those who serve actively on the House Vietnam-Era Caucus who have been lobbying for some time not only to recognize the great value of readjustment counseling centers, but the special needs of those veterans who served in a very troubled time in our history.

I think if the President of the United States and the ranking minority member and the ranking whip, the majority leader, and the Speaker of the House would listen, as we did, to the many hours of testimony, they would recognize that this bill is only controversial to those people who do not know the details and the needs.

I would hope that we would eliminate that controversy by passing this bill unanimously and by sending a clear message to the President of the United States, but more importantly a clear message to every Vietnam veteran who served this country well, that we care about them and their needs and their responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, today marks a very significant milestone. For the first time in many years the House of Representatives has taken the initiative over both the Senate and the executive branch in advancing the cause for progressive legislation in behalf of Vietnam-era veterans.

The 3-year extension of readjustment counseling and the long overdue medical provision for the treatment of agent orange disabilities contained in H.R. 3499 are only part of this achievement. When coupled with the employment, vocational, and business loan programs brought before the House yesterday, they comprise a well-rounded targeted readjustment package that will benefit thousands of deserving Vietnam veterans.

We have taken the lead on these issues with the unanimous bipartisan support of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I would like to thank the chairman of the full committee, SONNY MONTGOMERY, for his leadership. Special thanks are also in order for Congressmen TOM DASCHLE and DAVE BONIOR of Michigan of the Vietnam Veterans Caucus, Subcommittee Chairman RON MOTT and ranking minority members JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT and MARGARET HECKLER.

The action we are taking today is designed to clearly state the intent of the House Committee on Veterans' Af-

fairs and the House as a whole in support for full implementation of these programs. The battle over readjustment counseling has been waged within the Congress and in the White House for nearly 10 years. The program was implemented in 1979 with a limited budget and under a 2-year restrictive time period. Testimony before our committee as early as 1978 indicated that a minimum of 5 years of full operation was necessary to allow these centers to reach their full targeted veteran population. Even if the Congress approves the full 3-year extension contained in H.R. 3499, Operation Outreach is far behind the schedule already mandated by the Congress. The program, quite naturally was delayed in reaching full operation due to startup time lags. In addition, in recent months the program has been effectively crippled under OMB's hiring freeze and the deferral of expansion funds authorized by the Congress last December. We intend to see this situation corrected.

A major survey of Vietnam-era veterans mandated by the Congress and completed by the Center for Policy Research in New York indicates that up to 800,000 Vietnam veterans are still suffering from the residual effects of that war and are in need of these services.

Very few programs, scheduled for elimination in fiscal year 1982 by OMB have received so much attention and support both within the Congress and among the American people. It is a tribute to the value and effectiveness of this project that 91 small storefront counseling centers with an original \$9.9 million budget could spread so much good news. When our colleague DON EDWARDS of California introduced H.R. 747, the original legislation in this Congress which called for the 3-year extension we are voting on today, he was quickly joined by 100 additional sponsors.

But support for the program has also come from around the country: From State and local officials, and from all veterans' service organizations. However, the most telling support has come from individual veterans themselves and from their families whose lives have been touched by this valuable assistance.

Quite simply, readjustment counseling works. It works as originally designed by the health care professionals and dedicated VA employees who staff these centers. We need to send them a very strong signal of our support for this program and for the continuation of the services they provide. They have our confidence and our support. The vet center program should continue in full operation as mandated by this legislation, free from continued bureaucratic manipulation or administrative countervention.

I trust the statement made today in passage of this legislation will make clear the intention of the House supporting 3 more years of quality, peer group designed and implemented, readjustment counseling services.

Vietnam will always be with us. The scars of Vietnam will always be with us, too. In war there are no unscathed soldiers. However, at vet centers across this country, over 60,000 Vietnam veterans have already learned that they do not have to fight that war any longer. There are thousands more in need of help. Through this program and the others approved today we can show our good faith to welcome them all home again at full potential.

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

Mr. EDGAR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has worked on this legislation.

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3499, the Veterans' Health Care Amendments of 1981.

Consideration today of H.R. 3499 marks a turning point in the House regarding health care treatment for all veterans, but especially Vietnam veterans. This House has never before been presented with proposed Vietnam veteran legislation such as this, legislation which in one bold stroke would:

Expand the Operation Outreach vet center program an additional 3 years, until 1984;

Authorize Veterans' Administration treatment of Vietnam veterans for agent orange poisoning, and expand the VA study of agent orange to all herbicides used in Vietnam.

Establish maximum and minimum authorization levels regarding the number of hospital beds the Veterans' Administration must operate.

I am especially pleased that H.R. 3499 contains the provision of my bill, H.R. 2886, to extend the highly successful and needed Operation Outreach vet center program.

I personally have visited vet centers operating in my State and have worked closely with both counselors and veterans being counseled. My personal observation is that this program is an unqualified success.

I am pleased to say that the Veterans' Administration agrees. It therefore is paradoxical that the Veterans' Administration should recommend that this program be eliminated and eliminated abruptly on September 29.

By the Veterans' Administration's own figures, 82 percent of veterans counseled by Operation Outreach say they were counseled successfully and to each's own satisfaction. This is not a bureaucratic statistic—it is human. The number of veterans who say they were counseled unsuccessfully is a meager 2 percent.

The Hospitals Subcommittee of which I am a member heard testimony from veterans, counselors, medical care experts, and VA physicians on this subject. Testimony went only in one direction—commendation for the program and recommendations that it be extended.

In March, the congressionally mandated five-volume, 6-year study of Vietnam veterans was released by the Center for Policy Research in New York City. It further confirms what some of us have known for a long time: That Vietnam combat veterans suffer significantly more emotional, social, educational, and job-related problems than those who were not in battle.

It further found that exposure to combat has a direct relationship to current abuse of alcohol and other drugs, as well as arrested, medical, and stress-related problems.

The American Psychiatric Association has recognized a disorder unique to the Vietnam veteran—delayed stress syndrome. This disorder is defined as a veteran suffering emotionally or psychologically from combat, long after returning from the battle.

These problems are not disappearing. In fact, they are intensifying. Talk of cutting this program is exacerbating such problems. We need to be concerned about Operation Outreach and Vietnam veterans because there are 2½ million Americans who served in Vietnam. But there are 230 million veterans of Vietnam in America. We must preserve and extend Operation Outreach because we all—each and every one of us—are Vietnam veterans, and we all are benefiting from this highly successful program.

Section 3 of H.R. 3499 would specifically provide for treatment of a veteran by the VA for agent orange poisoning. Such treatment would be provided if a Veterans' Administration physician, or a physician under contract to the VA, diagnoses a veteran's health problem as connected to agent orange poisoning.

A significant number of Vietnam combat veterans have been seeking this type of treatment at the VA for years. This legislation has been too long in coming, but I commend the leadership of the Veterans' Committee for advancing this proposed legislation at this time.

Mr. Speaker, between 1964 and 1971, the Department of Defense sprayed 11 million gallons of agent orange—and millions more of other herbicides—on the Vietnam jungles as a defoliant.

Agent orange is a 50-50 mixture of two chemicals, the manufacture of which creates an inevitable byproduct, dioxin. Dioxin has been described by experts such as Dr. Epstein, of the University of Chicago, as one of the most toxic and potent synthetic chemicals ever produced.

Human and laboratory tests in lower animals have found that persons exposed to dioxin are more likely to contract cancer than are those who are not.

The Veterans' Administration recently awarded a congressionally mandated study contract to the UCLA Medical Center to conduct a comprehensive study of the health effects of agent orange exposure. Results will be available in 2 years.

In the interim, there is great concern among Vietnam veterans over the adverse health effects that are a consequence of exposure.

As one of those who first brought the agent orange concern before the Veterans' Committee in 1978, I feel it has taken too long for this kind of legislation.

Passage of this bill today will send a message to the frustrated and angry Vietnam veteran who feels his fears and needs are not being addressed or met. It will say that this House cares and will give the veteran in need the benefit of the doubt.

The benefit of the doubt as opposed to the bureaucratic cold shoulder. This our message in this bill.

I thank and commend Messrs. MONTGOMERY, HAMMERSCHMIDT, MOTT, DASCHLE, EDGAR, and BONIOR especially for their work on behalf of Vietnam veterans.

Section 8 of H.R. 3499 establishes minimum and maximum levels of beds that the Veterans' Administration will be required by Congress to have authorized and to operate. This benefits veterans of all wars.

The Veterans' Administration would be authorized a maximum of 125,000 and a minimum of 100,000 hospital beds throughout its 172-hospital system.

It would be required to operate not less than 82,000 acute care beds and not less than 9,000 nursing home beds.

By statutorily mandating minimum and maximum numbers of beds Congress will stop the erosion of hospital beds that has occurred against our will during the past decade.

During the past 10 years VA has lost 10,000 to the bureaucratic cutting at the Office of Management and Budget. This is directly contrary to the documented need for greater numbers of beds throughout the system as stated in the VA's 1978 report on the aging veteran.

The VA's own 1978 report on the aging veteran documents the need for 125,000 beds by the turn of the century. Instead, needed beds are being taken out of service. This provision would reverse that confounding trend and assert the will of Congress over the VA hospital system.

Mr. EDGAR. Let us join in recognition, as the gentlewoman has said, that the controversy rests in the minds of the Vietnam veterans. Let us

ease that controversy by unanimously passing this piece of legislation.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), who is not a member of the committee but has done a yeoman's job on behalf of the Vietnam veteran.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, last week, two Vietnam veterans ended a multiday hunger strike. They had sought through that hunger strike to communicate to America and its Government something of the needs felt by Vietnam veterans.

Their plea was not new to many of the Members of this House. We have all heard it before in the letters we receive from Vietnam veterans, in town hall meetings, in the briefings of our case workers. But it was no less urgent for being less new. Listen to their plea: "Extend and properly fund the readjustment counseling program." "Recognize and deal with the real problem of agent orange." "Develop inpatient psychiatric care in the VA hospitals which is appropriate to the needs of posttraumatic-stress-disorders, delayed-stress."

That is not a radical agenda. Nor a frivolous one, as the Members of this body know, the need has been well documented.

Documented in the 1976 National Academy of Science study which raised serious questions about the quality of VA psychiatric care;

Documented in the Forgotten Warrior project, funded by the Disabled American Veterans and run by Dr. John Wilson, which laid out the readjustment problems faced by Vietnam veterans;

Documented in the 1979 and 1981 Center for Policy Research Studies, done under a Veterans' Administration (VA) contract, which confirmed the underlying conclusions of Dr. Wilson and specifically called for an outreach program similar to the readjustment counseling program;

Documented in the European epidemiological studies, made public by the gentleman from South Dakota and myself, which demonstrated a correlation between exposure to 2,4,5-T, a major ingredient in agent orange, and cancer.

Today, this body takes action which will answer the pleas of Vietnam veterans.

Today, this body acts unequivocally to extend the readjustment counseling program for 3 years.

Today, this body breaks new ground by clarifying and establishing that veterans with health problems related to exposure to agent orange are eligible for health care.

Today, this body asserts its continuing concern that agent orange research be allowed to forcefully pursue

the most effective channel, whatever that channel may be.

Today's action reflects the leadership of several members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee who have acted to insist that we meet our national obligation. The chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. MOTTLE, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, the chairman of the full committee, who has worked to bring a new direction to the committee, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and the gentleman from South Dakota, the present chairman of the Vietnam veterans in Congress, Mr. DASCHLE, who joined by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. EDGAR, has served as a crucial ambassador for Vietnam veterans of the committee, also Mr. EDWARDS of California and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I extend them my thanks.

In acting today, we have not answered every need, which, of course, we may never be able to do. But we have started. In acting today, we have not guaranteed that what we pass will be finally enacted, and then properly implemented. But we have shown our resolve.

Let us carry that resolve with us as we face some of the outstanding problems:

The need for carefully and specifically designed psychiatric in-patient facilities for Vietnam veterans will remain.

But that does not require legislation. The VA could do that today, under existing authority.

Let the VA and the new administration show its resolve as well by demonstrating the regional availability of special psychiatric wards for Vietnam veterans.

The problem of implementation will still loom over us, a discouraging burden.

The magnitude of this problem can be suggested by the fate of the readjustment counseling program during fiscal year 1981—this fiscal year.

Appropriated for the program was \$30 million. This included a \$6 million increase for new staff and new centers, available for implementation in December of 1980.

While the Carter administration implemented the new funds, the Office of Management and Budget under the new administration first froze that implementation in January, and then in March deferred it until nearly the end of this fiscal year. As we talk today, the money is not yet in place.

Delaying expansion, however, was only a part of the problem. As the VA has itself testified, over and above the freeze and deferral, an additional \$12 was reprogrammed to cover hospital operation costs, not the costs of the vet centers.

Consider the bottom line: The program was budgeted for \$30 million; \$6

million was impounded, leaving \$24 million; \$12 million was then reprogrammed, leaving approximately \$12 million as the final budget.

The program received only 40 percent—less than half—of the money Congress appropriated for it.

What is even more startling is that while the reprogramming is, arguably, a "normal" exercise of the Executive's "abnormal" discretion over spending, the impoundment of the \$6 million was clearly illegal. Two separate rulings by the General Accounting Office (GAO) had made that clear.

For some reason, the Executive was so intent on ending this program that they would not only oppose its extension, they would not only reprogram 40 percent of the budget, but they would also illegally impound an additional 20 percent more. The message to Vietnam veterans was clear.

But so also was the message to Congress. At stake in the Executive action was the fundamental question of whether the Executive will abide by Congress control over spending.

As Members of this body know, these issues are being resolved now in the courts through a law suit brought by myself and other Members of Congress—some of whom are on the floor here today. Additional efforts to compel the Executive to abide by congressional intent have been brought by others, including the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. BOLAND. Finally, the Congress is expected to act this week to explicitly disapprove the Executive's decision to defer funding.

I am increasingly confident that the Executive will bend to the will of Congress—better late than never. I have always been confident that the courts will uphold the law and protect the integrity of the congressional spending power.

But let today's actions send a clear signal. Our resolve is firm.

We act today not only to extend the program, but to communicate our insistence that the intent of Congress be fulfilled in the implementation of the program.

Let the time end where Vietnam veterans must go on hunger strikes as a plea for action.

I would like to close with a question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. MOTTLE.

I am concerned about OMB's persistent statement that Congress did not specifically intend that the readjustment counseling program be implemented through the so-called store front Outreach centers based in the community, outside the traditional Veterans' Administration regional centers and hospitals. In my mind, the legislative history has clearly established that Congress did specifically

intend that the program be run through such vet centers. Would the chairman comment? Is it his understanding as well, that the committee clearly intends the program be run through separate vet centers like the 91 now in existence?

Mr. MOTTLE. If the gentleman will yield, it is the legislative intent of the subcommittee—I am speaking also for the full committee—that they be allowed to sustain themselves to 91. We expand this program as Outreach.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

I would note that, of course, the committee has already, in part, made clear that intent within their report. I refer, for example, to the statement on page 5 of the report, which states, the centers are "unique and should be allowed to operate outside VA facilities * * *".

Nor was this question left open in the past. The committee clearly stated their intent that the program be community based on page 23 of the report to the House bill which originally established the program, House Report No. 96-140, where the committee said:

The committee feels the readjustment counseling provided under the reported bill should be community oriented if it is to be effective, and that vigorous outreach must be undertaken . . .

Mr. MOTTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the very distinguished and capable representative of Puerto Rico (Mr. CORRADA), who looks out for the veterans' best interests in Puerto Rico.

Mr. CORRADA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3499, the Veterans' Health Care Act of 1981. This legislation encompasses different health provisions for veterans.

As Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, I can attest to the strong support of all island veterans' organizations for this important bill.

The bill has three main purposes. The first is to allow Vietnam veterans to receive Veterans' Administration hospital and nursing home care for conditions which a VA doctor determines may be associated with exposure while serving in the Republic of Vietnam to phenoxy herbicides and chemicals used as defoliants including agent orange. In areas where no such physician is available, the determination can be made by a physician carrying out such functions under contract or fee arrangement.

The second purpose is to allow the VA to expand the scope of the ongoing study of the health effects of agent orange exposure to include the possible health effects of exposure to other toxic chemicals used in Vietnam.

The third main purpose is to extend through fiscal year 1984 the current

VA psychological readjustment counseling program for Vietnam veterans. The present program is scheduled to expire at the end of fiscal year 1981.

The bill also contains three other provisions: First, it permits the VA to recover the costs of veterans' non-service-connected care if the disability is covered by State workers' compensation plans, by State-required no-fault automobile insurance, or by State "victims of crimes" compensation.

Second, extends the authority of the VA to contract for the care of U.S. veterans in the Republic of the Philippines through fiscal year 1986; it authorizes funds to replace and upgrade VA medical equipment in the Philippines; and it terminates VA's authority at the end of fiscal year 1981 to contract for the care of veterans who served in the Philippines' armed services.

Third, it extends the authority of the Veterans' Administration to provide contract hospital care and medical services to veterans in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands through September 30, 1982.

This will permit uninterrupted continuation of services to our veterans population and offers the Congress the needed additional time to consider the merits of the Veterans' Administration's "Report to Congress on Health Care for Veterans in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands." This report will indeed be very helpful in the future consideration of a definite path which will lead to offer adequate medical assistance to veterans in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not only important to our veterans, but essential to our most recent veterans—those of the Vietnam war. More than any other veteran in the history of our Nation, the Vietnam veteran has suffered from neglect by our Government. Having fought in an increasingly unpopular war from which we retreated in defeat, the Vietnam veteran returned to a nation which wanted to forget that era. Instead of receiving the support and appreciation warranted by his response to his country's call to duty, all Vietnam veterans fell victims to the charges that they were drug addicts, malcontents, and suffering from emotional problems. But while being ready to label them in those terms, we have not often stood willing to give them our assistance and help. Only those that served in Vietnam can truly understand the tremendous disappointment in realizing that their sacrifices in the battlefield were for naught; but we can insure that we live up to the commitments that as a nation we have always made to our veterans. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, fulfills a part of that commitment. I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, last but not least, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the very capable Representative who continues to champion the cause of the Vietnam veteran in the committee as well as in the Congress of the United States.

□ 1330

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I have been on the House floor many different times over the last 2½ years and I have to say without question that this is one of my finest moments. It is a moment that I will treasure for as long as I am in politics, as long as I am in Government.

I want to thank, in the most sincere fashion, the chairman of this subcommittee, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the ranking members for their unequivocal support of this most important effort. We have waited too long, Mr. Speaker, for the kind of support that we see here today. We have waited for years to be able to come home and tell these Vietnam veterans for the first time we are listening. We are listening to the problems that they have with psychological abuse, and with drug abuse. We are listening to the problems that they have in finding a need for employment and someone to talk to, but we are listening for the first time.

And it is to their credit and to the credit of those people who have worked as hard as they have on this legislation, that today we come with a unanimous voice.

Last week, Richard Cohen wrote in the Washington Post that it is unfortunate that we have to see the victims to appreciate the pain. For 10 years we have heard about the pain, we have heard about those victims of agent orange. Today, for the first time, we can tell those victims, yes, we are listening and we are doing something about it.

For the first time we are going to give you the kind of priority medical treatment that you deserve as victims of the last war, and indeed, we intend to build upon that kind of service.

We are going to continue to listen and continue to build on the documentation that we have as a responsibility in the Veterans' Affairs Committee by building on the research and the study that we have authorized through this legislation in agent orange.

So, I commend the chairman. I commend these Members for their persistent effort and I commend the veterans for their effort over these last 10 years, many times a lonely, desperate and very, very frustrating effort to get this Congress to come to the position we are today.

The legacy of agent orange has been with most of us only since 1977, yet it is one of the most unusual and controversial issues our Government has

faced in many years. The Veterans' Committee has taken a genuinely substantive and proper step by approving legislation I originally introduced in H.R. 2953 which will provide priority medical care for Vietnam veterans suffering from effects which may be related to agent orange or perhaps other chemicals used in Southeast Asia. This step will in the short term alleviate much of the financial burden on many of these men currently under treatment for chronic health problems and assure them that the Veterans' Administration and the Congress are concerned and willing to provide the treatment necessary to correct these conditions. Pending the completion of VA, Air Force, and Center for Disease Control studies on this issue, the subject of compensation will be addressed. I wish to assure both my colleagues and the 2.8 million veterans who served in Vietnam that if exposure to agent orange, or any other chemical used in Vietnam, is found to be detrimental, I will seek final approval of legislation I have introduced which authorizes compensation (H.R. 2493).

H.R. 3499 takes another very important step by reauthorizing the Vietnam Veterans' Outreach centers for an additional 3 years. The centers, many of them in operation for barely a year have been visited by over 56,000 veterans and 23,000 family members. A recent study commissioned by the VA estimated that as many as 450,000 additional veterans may be suffering from delayed stress. Without question, the unique and peculiar nature of the war itself and the treatment faced upon returning home has left many of these men bitterly frustrated and alienated from conventional VA sources of assistance. The peer group counseling network utilized at the centers has been endorsed by a number of reputable organizations. The Center for Policy Research, which recently finished a massive study on the readjustment problems of Vietnam veterans, has concluded that this approach is the best method available to reach out and bring these men back into the mainstream of society. I am most pleased that the committee disregarded the Reagan administration's request to discontinue the program. I fail to understand how the President could consider Vietnam a noble war, but its veterans unworthy of treatment to counter the side effects of the war itself and the bitterness and disillusionment they felt upon their return home.

This legislation also makes necessary refinements in the VA's epidemiology study, as proposed by the Scientific Panel of the Interagency Work Group. These changes will allow the VA to consider the effects of herbicides other than agent orange, pesticides,

and other chemicals which were extensively used in Vietnam.

Another very important provision in this legislation deals with the subject of hospital and nursing home beds in the VA hospital and health-care system. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has in recent years initiated a most unfortunate trend by forcing reductions in the number of beds and medical personnel maintained by the VA. The practical effect of this policy has been that the VA has been unable to provide the care and services mandated by the Congress and veterans are often denied care they have been promised. H.R. 3499 will require that no less than 82,500 hospital and 9,000 nursing home beds be maintained in the VA health and hospital care system. Passage of this legislation will thus help the VA resist continued OMB encroachment and allow the VA to provide the quality care veterans have come to expect. This is especially important in view of the fact that most World War II veterans are now in their sixties and will increasingly need the services which the VA now provides.

I wish to offer my gratitude to the members of the committee, especially the chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care, Mr. MORTL, the ranking minority member, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and the full committee chairman, Mr. MONTGOMERY, for their dedication and support in advancing this legislation. Together, the provisions of H.R. 3499 form a package which addresses the most imminent needs and concerns of America's Vietnam veterans. Though the answers are not yet all in concerning the effects of exposure to agent orange, we are going to provide the basic health care needs these men deserve and require until the effects of agent orange are more clearly understood. Though the agony and disillusionment of the war and return home cannot totally be erased, we are going to provide an outlet for the venting of these frustrations. And finally, though our Vietnam experience will haunt this Nation for many years to come, we can and have come to terms with Vietnam, and truly separated the "war from the warrior."

● Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to express support for a number of bills on which the House will vote on relating to veterans. I would specifically like to highlight:

H.R. 3499, the Veterans' Health Care Act of 1981, which would extend the Vietnam-era veterans' readjustment counseling program, provide medical care for Vietnam veterans exposed to herbicide defoliants—including agent orange—and to recover the cost of health care provided by the VA.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 2157, which would provide a presumption of service connection for veterans exposed to herbicides during the Vietnam era, I was pleased that this bill was encompassed in H.R. 3499.

H.R. 3423, the Veterans' Training and Business Loan Act of 1981, which provides vocational education and training opportunities for Vietnam-era veterans and disabled veterans. The disturbing reality is that a large percentage of Vietnam veterans have not successfully adjusted to civilian life. On top of feeling ignored, Vietnam veterans experience drug and alcohol problems, along with lack of proper job training and jobs. In a study prepared for the Veterans' Administration entitled, "Legacies of Vietnam: Comparative Adjustment of Veterans and Their Peers," it was recommended that the period of eligibility for GI education and training benefits be extended and training benefits be targeted to reach chronically unemployed veterans. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in response to these and other recommendations, has reported a bill to isolate and target job training and placement for those veterans of the Vietnam era still experiencing employment problems.

H.R. 1100, would expand the eligibility of former prisoners of war for certain health-care benefits provided by the Veterans' Administration. This bill changes from 6 months to 60 days the length of time a former POW must have been interned to establish a presumption of service connection for certain diseases. This legislation is important in that it assures former POW's of compensation and health care benefits for all their disabilities which were attributed to their internment.

Accordingly, I look forward to my colleagues joining me in voting for final passage of these bills.●

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my support, with some reservation, for H.R. 3499, the Veterans' Health Care Act of 1981.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I fully support the provisions in this bill that have the highly laudatory effect of liberalizing the services available to our Nation's veterans. I particularly applaud the committee's decision to extend the eligibility for health care to individuals who were exposed to agent orange and who, in the judgment of Veterans' Administration physicians, are suffering from health problems because of that exposure. This eligibility is temporary, however, pending the expected September 1981 completion of a study of the effects of agent orange mandated by Public Law 96-151.

However, it is with respect to that study that I differ with the committee and I regret that we are taking this bill up under the suspension of the

rules procedure. If we were free to offer an amendment, Mr. Speaker, I would move to incorporate into this bill the provisions of H.R. 1962, which I have introduced and which has been cosponsored by 33 of my colleagues. That bill would amend Public Law 96-151 to provide that the study be transferred from the VA to the National Academy of Sciences. I am convinced that a study done by the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the VA, would result in a study that would be more credible to the veterans whom it would affect most specifically—the veteran who has been exposed to agent orange, who fears that his health may have been affected, and who, based on its record on this issue, mistrusts the VA's ability to conduct an unbiased study.●

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3499, the Veterans' Health Care Act of 1981. As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and of its Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care, I am proud of the measure before us today.

I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) for the leadership he has shown in shepherding this bill, as well as the various other bills we have considered this week dealing with veterans benefits and services, through the House. I would also like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care, Mr. MORTL, for the key role he has played in the drafting of this legislation.

H.R. 3499 is an excellent bill containing a number of important provisions which our chairman has outlined for us. If I may, however, I would like to take a moment to highlight a few of the key features of the bill.

Under this legislation, the Veterans' Administration would be authorized to provide hospital care to Vietnam veterans if VA physicians determine that such care is necessary for the treatment of a condition that may be associated with exposure to agent orange. This provision provides a workable, fair, and immediate solution to a problem of serious concern to many Vietnam veterans.

There is not yet conclusive evidence of the effects of exposure to agent orange on Vietnam veterans. The VA is conducting ongoing research in this area, and in fact the provisions of this bill would expand the scope of their study. However, while this research continues, there is a need to treat health care problems that may arise among veterans who served in Southeast Asia when there is reason to believe that the problem could have been caused by exposure to this herbicide. H.R. 3499 will enable the VA to

provide such care now, even though the results of ongoing studies will not be reached for several more years. I think our enactment of this measure will help to alleviate concerns which I have heard expressed by many Vietnam veterans who fear for their health because of their exposure to agent orange.

Another crucial provision of H.R. 3499 is that which extends Operation Outreach, the VA's highly successful program of readjustment counseling, for another 3 years. Under this legislation, the program, which is due to expire this fall, would be continued until October 1, 1984.

In January of this year, I introduced H.R. 747, which also proposed a 3-year extension of Outreach, I did so because all the available evidence suggested that the readjustment difficulties of Vietnam-era veterans continued to be significant. Evidence also demonstrated that in their short time of operation, the 91 community-based, storefront centers established as Operation Outreach had been remarkably successful in reaching out to a segment of the Vietnam veteran population that had come to feel alienated from the Veterans' Administration as well as other governmental institutions.

I should take this opportunity to thank the 100 of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, who cosponsored H.R. 747. Their support was gratifying. Even more gratifying was the outpouring of support and encouragement I received from Vietnam-era veterans throughout the country. The hundreds of letters I received from these veterans—and from their families and friends—demonstrated vividly how effective Operation Outreach has been. In case after case these letters explained how the readjustment counseling services of Operation Outreach had helped veterans—10 years—15 years—or more after their service—to finally put the war behind them and take their place as productive members of their communities.

Reading these letters and listening to the testimony presented to the committee by the veterans organizations and experts in the area of readjustment counseling affirmed my belief that we would be doing a grave disservice to our Nation's veterans if we did not extend Operation Outreach.

I am pleased, therefore, that the bill which the committee adopted, and which is before us today, contains language to keep Operation Outreach in business for another 3 years.

I strongly support this measure. I hope that we can approve the bill unanimously, and that the Senate will schedule it for prompt consideration. ●
● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill that will enhance the medical care and treatment for our Nation's veterans. I want

to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, RON MORTL, for the tremendous work he has done in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that a major provision of this bill is contained in section 4. This section of the bill would extend, by 3 years, the period during which Vietnam-era veterans may receive psychological readjustment counseling. The enactment of this provision of the bill will mean that Vietnam veterans will have an opportunity to participate in the Outreach center program for another 3 years. It has been a very successful program.

I want to pay special tribute to the Honorable DON EDWARDS, the very able gentleman from California and the ranking majority member of the full committee for sponsoring this legislation. DON EDWARDS was instrumental in bringing about the legislation that created these Outreach centers. He was a strong advocate in conference with the other body when we resolved our differences and agreed to establish these centers. We are grateful to DON EDWARDS, Mr. Speaker, for working so closely with the former chairman of the subcommittee, Dave Satterfield of Virginia, in passing the enabling legislation creating this particular program.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good measure. It is well within the budget targets contained in the first budget resolution and I would urge my colleagues to support the bill. ●

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to renew my commitment to the health and well-being of our Vietnam veterans through my support for the Veterans' Health Care Act. This legislation before us today provides for the special health needs of thousands of Vietnam veterans who were exposed to the herbicide agent orange and for those who have had psychological difficulties readjusting to civilian life. I believe that the passage of the Veterans' Health Care Act will go a long way toward insuring these veterans that Congress has no intention of betraying their needs.

Unfortunately, many Vietnam veterans fear that they have been betrayed by proposed VA budget cutbacks. The President's recommendation that the psychological counseling program not be continued has sparked cries of betrayal and injustice from veterans across the Nation. The modest funding level of the counseling program belies its remarkable reach and effectiveness; thousands of Vietnam veterans have received counseling services in the short time that the program has been operative. It took 10 years for Congress to enact the readjustment program—this is reprehensible enough. To discontinue the program now, in the face of recent studies on the stress and disorders so many Vietnam veter-

ans suffer, would indeed be a betrayal—a betrayal to the veterans themselves, their families, and the entire Nation which prides itself on the deeds of its veterans. Today's legislation extends the counseling service through fiscal year 1984 and it deserves our hearty support.

The Veterans' Health Care Act provides another significant health-care service for Vietnam veterans: VA health care for those veterans suffering from exposure to agent orange. I have made public statements about the VA and its inadequate treatment of the agent orange problem. At the risk of repeating myself, I will say again that a recent VA survey shows that VA doctors are not discussing results of their tests with potential agent orange victims, that many Vietnam veterans believe the VA is giving their possible agent orange-related symptoms short shrift, and that the VA has indirectly acknowledged existence of the problem. This problem is a wide range of disabling ailments, which many believe are connected to agent orange exposure. These ailments include liver damage, cancer, and reproductive system damage resulting in stillbirths, miscarriages, and the bearing of children with severe birth defects. The Veterans' Health Care Act would allow Vietnam veterans suffering from possible agent orange-connected disabilities to receive VA hospital care. It has taken the VA 2 years to contract out an agent orange health study. Let's not allow any further dragging of the heels in providing vital health care services for disabled Vietnam veterans.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to sign their names on the dotted line of this figurative letter of commitment to Vietnam veterans by supporting the Veterans' Health Care Act. There are many veterans in this country who feel that a gap is yawning before them and at the far side of that gap recede veterans' health programs. With the Reagan administration yet to announce a successor for the VA Administrator position, I can understand why any veteran would feel like crying Judas. Let us give them the chance to cry hurrah instead. ●

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion we want to especially thank the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) for their leadership on this legislation, and especially the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT), who contributed a great deal in being here on the floor today.

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

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

that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3499, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill, H.R. 3499, just considered.

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

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2136) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the provisions of such title relating to the construction and alteration of, and acquisition of land for, national cemeteries, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2136

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1006 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1006. Construction and alteration of, and acquisition of land for, national cemeteries

"(a) For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'alter', when used with respect to a cemetery, means to remodel, improve, or expand the cemetery.

"(2) The terms 'construct' and 'alter', when used with respect to a cemetery, include such preliminary planning, engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies and such surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other similar actions as are necessary for the construction or alteration, as the case may be, of the cemetery.

"(3) The term 'cemetery' means any cemetery (or any part of a cemetery) that is, or will be, under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration as part of the National Cemetery System, including necessary roadways and necessary facilities (including superintendent's lodges, chapels, crypts, mausoleums, and columbaria).

"(b) No cemetery may be constructed or altered by the Administrator, and no land to be used as the site for, or for the expansion of, any cemetery may be acquired by the Administrator except in accordance with this section.

"(c) In carrying out this section, the Administrator—

"(1) shall provide for the location of cemeteries in a manner that results in the equita-

ble distribution of cemeteries throughout the United States, taking into consideration the comparative urgency of the need for each particular cemetery; and

"(2) shall give due consideration to excellence of design.

"(d)(1) Subject to subsection (e) of this section, the Administrator may construct or alter any cemetery and may acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise, such land or interests in land as the Administrator considers necessary for use as the site for such construction or alteration.

"(2) Any site authorized to be acquired under this section may be acquired without regard to title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

"(3) Whenever the Administrator determines that any site acquired for the construction of a cemetery is not suitable for that purpose, the Administrator may exchange that site for another site to be used for that purpose or may sell such site without regard to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

"(e)(1) No appropriation may be made for the construction or alteration of any cemetery, or for acquisition of any land to be used as the site for (or for the expansion of) any cemetery, if such construction, alteration, or acquisition involves a total expenditure by the United States of more than \$500,000, unless a document setting forth the proposed construction, alteration, or acquisition is first submitted by the Administrator to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives and, before the expiration of ninety days of continuous session of Congress following the date on which such document is so submitted, neither such committee adopts a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the proposed construction, alteration, or acquisition.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection—

"(A) continuity of a session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment sine die; and

"(B) days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the ninety-day period.

"(3) Each document submitted to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall contain—

"(A) a brief description of the cemetery to be constructed or altered or of the land to be acquired for cemetery purposes; and

"(B) an estimate of the cost to the United States of such construction, alteration, or acquisition.

A copy of each such document shall be delivered to both such committees on the same day and on a day in which both Houses of Congress are in session.

"(4) The estimated cost of any construction, alteration, or acquisition not disapproved under paragraph (1) of this subsection (as such estimated cost is set forth in the document submitted to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs under such paragraph) may be increased by the Administrator by an amount equal to the percentage increase, if any (as determined by the Administrator), in construction, alteration, or acquisition costs, as the case may be, from the date of submission of such document to the date of contract, but in no event may the amount of

the increase exceed 10 per centum of such estimated cost.

"(5) The Administrator may not enter into any project for any construction, alteration, or acquisition described in subsection (d)(1) of this section for which the estimated cost is not more than \$500,000 before the expiration of sixty days beginning on the date on which the Administrator submits a report of the facts concerning the proposed construction, alteration, or acquisition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs. Any such report shall be submitted to such committees on the same day. After entering into any such project, the Administrator shall report to such committees not less often than every two years on the progress of the project.

"(f)(1) The Administrator may carry out any construction or alteration authorized under this section by contract if the Administrator considers it to be advantageous to the United States to do so.

"(2) The Administrator may obtain, by contract or otherwise, and without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, the services of individuals who are architects or engineers and of architectural and engineering corporations and firms, to the extent the Administrator may require such services for any cemetery authorized to be constructed or altered under this section.

"(3) No corporation, firm, or individual may be employed under the authority of paragraph (2) of this subsection on a permanent basis.

"(4) The Administrator shall be responsible for all construction and alteration authorized under this section, including the interpretation of construction contracts, the approval of materials and workmanship supplied pursuant to a construction contract, approval of changes in the construction contract, certification of vouchers for payments due the contractor, and final settlement of the contract.

"(5) The authority of the Administrator to enter into contracts under this section is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose.

"(g)(1) The Administrator shall submit to Congress not later than January 31 of each year a report showing the location, space, cost, and status of each construction, alteration, or acquisition authorized under this section that was uncompleted as of the date of the last preceding report made under this paragraph.

"(2) The Administrator shall make such cemetery project surveys as may be requested by resolution by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, and within a reasonable time, but not later than six months after the date of the adoption of any such resolution, shall make a report thereon to Congress. Such report shall contain, with respect to any such project, the information specified in subsection (e)(3) of this section.

"(h) The Administrator shall make a continuing investigation and survey of the needs of the National Cemetery System in order to carry out this section."

(b) The item relating to section 1006 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 24 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"1006. Construction and alteration of, and acquisition of land for, national cemeteries."

SEC. 2. Section 1004 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out sub-

section (b) and by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (b) through (f), respectively.

Sec. 3. (a)(1) Chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1009. Contributions to local authorities

"The Administrator may make contributions to local authorities toward or for the construction of traffic controls, road improvements, or other devices adjacent to a national cemetery if the Administrator considers such traffic controls, road improvements, or devices necessary for safe ingress to, or egress from, such cemetery. The authority of the Administrator to make contributions under this section is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1009. Contributions to local authorities."

(b) Section 1009 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 1981.

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

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

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

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of H.R. 2136, as amended, will result in better planning and operation of our national cemetery system. The purpose of this measure is to permit greater oversight into the construction and alteration of, and acquisition of land for, national cemeteries. It will not result in any Federal outlays and will greatly assist the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in carrying out its oversight responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LEATH).

Mr. LEATH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2136. H.R. 2136 would revise current procedures relating to the construction or alteration of a cemetery, or the acquisition of land for a new cemetery, or the expansion of an existing cemetery.

Under the bill, no appropriation shall be made to construct or alter, or to acquire land to be used as the site for, or for the expansion of any cemetery if such construction, alteration, or acquisition involves a total expenditure of more than \$500,000 unless a detailed document justifying these actions is submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and before the expiration of 90 days of continuous session of Congress

following submission of the document, neither committee adopts a resolution that it does not favor the proposed action.

The bill further provides that the Administrator may not enter into any construction, alteration, or acquisition under \$500,000 before the expiration of 60 days after the date on which he submits a report of the facts concerning such proposed action to the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees. The Administrator shall report to the committees every 2 years on the progress of the project.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House of Representatives place oversight and legislative responsibilities with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that oversight responsibility without authorization authority is largely meaningless. I believe the enactment of this bill will enhance the committee's ability to carry out its responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 2136.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2136, a bill to revise current procedures relating to the construction and acquisition of land for national cemeteries.

This measure was the subject of recent hearings before our Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs under the able guidance of the gentleman from Texas, Chairman LEATH, and the former ranking minority member, the late Tennyson Guyer of Ohio and his successor as ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SAWYER). Testimony was received from the Veterans' Administration and the major veterans organizations.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is vested with both legislative and oversight responsibility for the National Cemetery System, according to the rules of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the clear jurisdictional mandate set forth in the rules, the Veterans' Administration arbitrarily selects sites for national cemeteries subject only to the availability of funds.

The bill before us will require authorization action by the House and Senate Committees on Veterans' Affairs on any cemetery construction or site acquisition project costing in excess of one half million dollars before any funds can be appropriated.

Mr. Speaker, until 1979, Veterans' Administration hospital construction operated in the same manner, with construction of new or replacement hospitals subject only to the funding limitation. Now, hospital construction must be authorized in the same manner as this bill will do for cemetery construction.

I would anticipate that the procedures authorized by this measure will operate as effectively as the procedures currently used in hospital construction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SAWYER), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2136, a bill that would give the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees effective oversight over the expansion and development of our national cemetery system.

This legislation revises procedures for acquiring land or making improvements where the total expenditure exceeds \$500,000. In accordance with its provisions, no appropriation of this order could be made unless a detailed document justifying the project was submitted to the two Veterans' Affairs Committees. The committees would have 90 days of continuous session of Congress to disapprove the action.

While the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has oversight responsibility for the national cemetery system, the Veterans' Administration has taken the position it has blanket authority to establish and locate national cemeteries without regard to Congress judgments in these matters.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that orderly development of the national cemetery system requires active oversight and approval by the authorizing committees of Congress. Accordingly, I support this measure and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support enactment of this bill, as amended, and hope it will receive the unanimous approval of the House.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2136, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **MONTGOMERY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill, H.R. 2136, just considered.

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

There was no objection.

VETERANS' MEMORIAL HEADSTONES AND MARKERS

Mr. **MONTGOMERY**. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1714) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Veterans' Administration to furnish memorial headstones or markers to commemorate veterans who by choice are buried at sea, who donate their bodies to science, or who are cremated and have their ashes scattered without interment, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1714

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 906 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Administrator shall furnish, when requested, an appropriate memorial headstone or marker to commemorate any veteran—

"(1) whose remains have not been recovered or identified;

"(2) whose remains were buried at sea, whether by the veteran's own choice or otherwise;

"(3) whose remains were donated to science; or

"(4) whose remains were cremated and the ashes scattered without interment of any portion of the ashes, for placement by the applicant in a national cemetery area reserved for such purpose under the provisions of section 1003 of this title, in a State, private, or local cemetery, or in any other appropriate location that is designated by the next of kin and that the Administrator, in the Administrator's discretion and having due regard for the circumstances in each case, approves."

Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 1003 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Administrator shall set aside, when available, suitable areas in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces and veterans—

"(1) who are missing in action;

"(2) whose remains have not been recovered or identified;

"(3) whose remains were buried at sea, whether by the member's own choice or otherwise;

"(4) whose remains were donated to science; or

"(5) whose remains were cremated and the ashes scattered without interment of any portion of the ashes."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1981, and shall apply with respect to the furnishing of memorial headstones or markers to commemorate veterans dying on or after December 7, 1941.

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

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. **MONTGOMERY**) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. **HAMMERSCHMIDT**) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. **MONTGOMERY**).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House that this legislation was introduced by our distinguished colleague from Hawaii (Mr. **HEFTEL**). I am pleased to say that he called this matter to the attention of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. **LEATH**).

Mr. **LEATH** of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1714. H.R. 1714 as reported is a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Veterans' Administration to furnish memorial headstones or markers to commemorate veterans who by choice are buried at sea, who donate their bodies to science, or who are cremated and have their ashes scattered without interment.

The headstone or marker could be placed in a national cemetery area reserved for such purpose, State, private, or local cemetery or any other appropriate location designated by the next of kin.

The benefit would be retroactive to December 7, 1941, so that it would include veterans dying in World War II, Korea, the Vietnam conflict, and thereafter.

Enactment of H.R. 1714 will have no inflationary impact. The Congressional Budget Office advises that the cost of this bill would be insignificant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 1714.

Mr. **MONTGOMERY**. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve my time so that the ranking minority member on this committee could make his remarks. Then I will yield time to

the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. **HEFTEL**).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1714, a bill to authorize the furnishing of a headstone or memorial marker for certain deceased veterans whose remains for one reason or another cannot be interred.

I also want to commend the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. **LEATH**) and the ranking member, Mr. **SAWYER** of Michigan, the other members of the subcommittee for their prompt action in bringing to the floor this measure that will eliminate a longstanding inequity in the law.

Existing law, Mr. Speaker, authorizes the furnishing of headstones or markers on behalf of veterans whose remains were not recovered or identified or who were buried at sea. It does not, however, authorize a memorial of this nature for the veteran who, by choice, was buried at sea, or for the veteran whose remains were donated to science or were cremated and the ashes scattered without interment. This measure will permit the furnishing of markers or headstones in such cases.

The bill will also permit the veteran's marker to be placed in the memorial area of a national cemetery that is presently limited to honoring the memory of members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will eliminate inequities in existing law at a minimal cost to the Government. I urge that it be approved.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. **SAWYER**).

Mr. **SAWYER**. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1714. While this is a relatively small group of individuals affected, those who choose burial at sea, those who choose cremation with their ashes being scattered, and those who donated their bodies to science, it seems to me there was an omission in the law that this clarifies and plugs and makes it equitable to that small group of people.

□ 1345

Mr. **HAMMERSCHMIDT**. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. **MONTGOMERY**. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. **HEFTEL**).

Mr. **HEFTEL**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to thank the chairmen of the committee and the subcommittee, Mr. MONTGOMERY and Mr. LEATH of Texas; Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, the ranking minority member, for the expeditious manner in which they moved this legislation once the matter was brought to their attention.

I particularly want to thank Mrs. Beverly Brew Miranda, of Kula, the island of Maui in Hawaii, who brought it to my attention when she found that her husband, who had elected to have his body donated to medical science, could not be memorialized in the Cemetery of the Pacific.

Once I learned of the problem and introduced the legislation and discussed it with the chairmen of the committee, I found that they were so responsive and moved so very quickly that it is a testimonial to the way in which we function and in the extent to which we care.

I am delighted to be able to participate in bringing this to the floor, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that we will have unanimous adoption of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1714, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Veterans' Administration to furnish memorial headstones or markers to commemorate veterans who by choice are buried at sea or who donate their bodies to science, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which that motion was entertained, and then on which further proceedings were postponed on Monday, June 1, 1981, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3499, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 2136, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 3337, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 1100, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 3423, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 2039, by the yeas and nays; and
H. Con. Res. 76, by the yeas and nays.

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

VETERANS' HEALTH CARE ACT OF 1981

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3499, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOTTL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3499, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

(Roll No. 54)
YEAS—388

Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Ashbrook
Aspin
Atkinson
AuCoin
Bafalis
Bailey (MO)
Bailey (PA)
Barnard
Barnes
Beard
Bedell
Bellenson
Benedict
Benjamin
Bennett
Bereuter
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Bingham
Blanchard
Bliley
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Bowen
Breaux

Brinkley
Brodhead
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Brown (OH)
Broyhill
Burgener
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Campbell
Carman
Chapple
Cheney
Chisholm
Clausen
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (TX)
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courtner
Coyne, James
Coyne, William
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Phillip
Crockett
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Danielson
Dannemeyer

Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
DeNardis
Derwinski
Dicks
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dornan
Dougherty
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Emery
English
Erdahl
Erlenborn
Ertel
Evans (DE)
Evans (GA)
Evans (IN)
Fascell
Fazio
Fenwick
Ferraro
Fiedler

Fields
Findley
Fish
Fithian
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Forsythe
Fountain
Fowler
Frank
Frenzel
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Ginn
Glickman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hagedorn
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Heckler
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Holland
Hollenbeck
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hubbard
Huckabay
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnston
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kazen
Kemp
Kildee
Kindness
Kogovsek
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Leath
LeBoutillier
Lee
Lehman
Lent
Levitas
Lewis

Livingston
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery
Lowry
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Madigan
Markey
Marks
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mattox
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McClory
McCloskey
McCullum
McCurdy
McDade
McDonald
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell (MD)
Mitchell (NY)
Moakley
Moffett
Molinari
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison
Mottl
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Napier
Natcher
Neal
Nelligan
Nichols
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ottinger
Panetta
Parris
Patman
Patterson
Paul
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Peyser
Pickle
Porter
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rallsback
Rangel
Ratchford
Regula
Reuss
Rhodes
Richmond
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts (KS)
Roberts (SD)

Robinson
Rodino
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rousselot
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Santini
Savage
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shamansky
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Simon
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (AL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarez
Solomon
Spence
St Germain
Stangeland
Stanton
Stark
Staton
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas
Traxler
Trible
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Wampler
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber (OH)
Weiss
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zerfetti

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—42

Badham
Bouquard

Brooks
Broomfield

Carney
Chappell

Coelho
Cotter
Deckard
Derrick
Dickinson
Dingell
Evans (IA)
Fary
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Frost

Fuqua
Gray
Grisham
Hillis
Kastenmeier
Leland
Marlenee
Mollohan
Nelson
Pashayan
Price
Roe

Scheuer
Schneider
Schulze
Stratton
Stump
Walker
Washington
Weber (MN)
White
Wilson
Wirth
Zablocki

□ 1400

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Pashayan.
- Mr. Fary with Mr. Schulze.
- Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Hillis.
- Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Walker.
- Mr. Gray with Mr. Badham.
- Mr. Chappell with Mr. Weber of Minnesota.
- Mr. Brooks with Mr. Broomfield.
- Mr. Kastenmeier with Mrs. Schneider.
- Mrs. Bouquard with Mr. Dickinson.
- Mr. Coelho with Mr. Evans of Iowa.
- Mr. Dingell with Mr. Deckard.
- Mr. Derrick with Mr. Carney.
- Mr. Florio with Mr. Grisham.
- Mr. Foglietta with Mr. Marlenee.
- Mr. Flippo with Mr. Frost.
- Mr. Nelson with Mr. Leland.
- Mr. Wilson with Mr. Stratton.
- Mr. White with Mr. Stump.
- Mr. Roe with Mr. Price.
- Mr. Wirth with Mr. Scheuer.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2136, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2136, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 8, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]
YEAS—383

Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Ashbrook
Aspin
Atkinson
AuCoin
Bafalis
Bailey (MO)
Bailey (PA)
Barnard
Barnes
Beard
Bedell
Bellenson
Benedict
Benjamin
Bennett
Bereuter
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Bingham
Blanchard
Bliley
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Bowen
Breaux
Brinkley
Brodhead
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Brown (OH)
Broyhill
Burgener
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Campbell
Carman
Chapple
Cheney
Chisholm
Clausen
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (TX)
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne, James
Coyne, William
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Phillip
Crockett
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Danielson
Dannemeyer
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
DeNardis
Derwinski
Dicks
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dornan
Dougherty

Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
Emery
English
Erdahl
Erlenborn
Ertel
Evans (DE)
Evans (GA)
Evans (IN)
Fascell
Fazio
Fenwick
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Findley
Fish
Fithian
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fountain
Fowler
Frank
Frenzel
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Ginn
Glickman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hagedorn
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Hatcher
Hawkins
Heckler
Hefner
Hefelt
Hendon
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Holland
Hollenbeck
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jeffries
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)

Jones (TN)
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Kildee
Kindness
Kogovsek
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Leach
Leath
LeBoutillier
Lee
Lehman
Lent
Levitas
Lewis
Livingston
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery
Lowry
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lunger
Madigan
Markey
Marks
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mattox
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McClory
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McDonald
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell (MD)
Mitchell (NY)
Moakley
Moffett
Molnari
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison
Mottl
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Napler
Natcher
Neal
Neilligan
Nichols
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ottinger
Panetta
Parris
Patman
Patterson
Paul
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Peyser
Pickle
Porter

Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rallsback
Rangel
Ratchford
Regula
Reuss
Rhodes
Richmond
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts (KS)
Roberts (SD)
Robinson
Rodino
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rousselot
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Santini
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder

Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shamansky
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Simon
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (AL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarez
Solomon
Spence
St Germain
Stangeland
Stanton
Stark
Staton
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tauke

Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas
Traxler
Trible
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vento
Voikmer
Walgren
Wampler
Watkins
Waxman
Weber (OH)
Wells
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zeferetti

NAYS—8

Craig
Edwards (OK)
Gregg

Hartnett
Johnston
Latta

Michel
Weaver

NOT VOTING—39

Badham
Bouquard
Brooks
Broomfield
Carney
Chappell
Cotter
Deckard
Derrick
Dickinson
Dingell
Evans (IA)
Fary

Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Forsythe
Frost
Fuqua
Gray
Grisham
Hillis
Leland
Marlenee
Mollohan
Nelson

Pashayan
Price
Roe
Schulze
Stratton
Stump
Walker
Washington
Weber (MN)
White
Wilson
Wirth
Zablocki

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mrs. Bouquard with Mr. Weber of Minnesota.
- Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Pashayan.
- Mr. Brooks with Mr. Broomfield.
- Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Badham.
- Mr. Dingell with Mr. Evans of Iowa.
- Mr. Fary with Mr. Deckard.
- Mr. Chappell with Mr. Walker.
- Mr. Nelson with Mr. Schulze.
- Mr. Leland with Mr. Forsythe.
- Mr. Price with Mr. Grisham.
- Mr. Roe with Mr. Marlenee.
- Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Carney.
- Mr. Florio with Mr. Hillis.
- Mr. Flippo with Mr. Frost.
- Mr. Derrick with Mr. Dickinson.
- Mr. Foglietta with Mr. Gray.
- Mr. Wilson with Mr. Wirth.
- Mr. White with Mr. Stump.
- Mr. Stratton with Mr. Washington.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT DEMONSTRATION AMENDMENTS OF 1981

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3337.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3337, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 309, nays 84, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—309

Addabbo	Donnelly	Hopkins
Akaka	Dorgan	Horton
Albosta	Dornan	Howard
Alexander	Dougherty	Hubbard
Anderson	Downey	Huckaby
Andrews	Dunn	Hughes
Annuzio	Dwyer	Hunter
Anthony	Dymally	Hutto
Applegate	Dyson	Hyde
Aspin	Early	Jacobs
Atkinson	Eckart	Jeffords
AuCoin	Edgar	Jenkins
Bailey (PA)	Edwards (CA)	Jones (NC)
Barnes	Emerson	Jones (OK)
Bedell	Emery	Jones (TN)
Bellenson	English	Kastenmeier
Benedict	Erdahl	Kazen
Benjamin	Erlenborn	Kemp
Bennett	Ertel	Kildee
Bereuter	Evans (DE)	Kindness
Bethune	Evans (IN)	Kogovsek
Bevill	Fascell	LaFalce
Blaggi	Fazio	Lagomarsino
Bingham	Fenwick	Lantos
Blanchard	Ferraro	Leach
Boggs	Fiedler	Lehman
Boland	Findley	Lent
Bolling	Fish	Levitas
Boner	Fithian	Lewis
Bonior	Foley	Long (LA)
Bonker	Ford (MI)	Long (MD)
Bowen	Ford (TN)	Lowry
Breaux	Forsythe	Lujan
Brinkley	Fountain	Luken
Brodhead	Fowler	Lundine
Brown (CA)	Frank	Markey
Brown (OH)	Frenzel	Marks
Burton, John	Garcia	Marriott
Burton, Phillip	Gaydos	Martin (NC)
Byron	Gejdenson	Martin (NY)
Campbell	Gehardt	Matsui
Carman	Gibbons	Mattox
Chisholm	Gilman	Mavroules
Clausen	Gingrich	Mazzoli
Clay	Ginn	McCloskey
Clinger	Glickman	McCurdy
Coats	Goldwater	McDade
Coelho	Gonzalez	McEwen
Coleman	Goodling	McGrath
Collins (IL)	Gore	McHugh
Conable	Gradison	McKinney
Cote	Green	Mica
Conyers	Guarini	Mikulski
Corcoran	Gunderson	Miller (CA)
Coughlin	Hall (OH)	Miller (OH)
Courter	Hall, Ralph	Mineta
Coyne, William	Hamilton	Minish
Crockett	Harkin	Mitchell (MD)
D'Amours	Hatcher	Mitchell (NY)
Danielson	Hawkins	Moakley
Daschle	Heckler	Moffett
Daub	Hefner	Molinari
Davis	Heftel	Moore
de la Garza	Hertel	Morrison
Dellums	Hightower	Mottl
DeNardis	Holland	Murphy
Dicks	Hollenbeck	Murtha
Dixon	Holt	Napier

Natcher	Roemer	Synar
Neal	Rogers	Tauke
Nelligan	Rose	Tauzin
Nichols	Rosenthal	Thomas
Nowak	Rostenkowski	Traxler
O'Brien	Roth	Trible
Oakar	Roukema	Udall
Oberstar	Roybal	Vander Jagt
Obey	Russo	Vento
Ottinger	Sabo	Volkmer
Panetta	Savage	Walgren
Parris	Sawyer	Wampler
Patman	Scheuer	Watkins
Patterson	Schneider	Waxman
Pease	Schroeder	Weaver
Pepper	Schumer	Weber (OH)
Perkins	Seiberling	Weiss
Petri	Shamansky	Whitehurst
Peyster	Shannon	Whitley
Pickle	Sharp	Whittaker
Porter	Shaw	Whitten
Pritchard	Shelby	Williams (MT)
Pursell	Simon	Williams (OH)
Rahall	Skelton	Winn
Rallsback	Smith (IA)	Wolf
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Wolpe
Ratchford	Snowe	Wortley
Regula	Solarz	Wright
Reuss	Spence	Wyden
Richmond	St Germain	Wylie
Rinaldo	Stanton	Yates
Ritter	Stark	Yatron
Roberts (KS)	Stokes	Young (AK)
Roberts (SD)	Studds	Young (MO)
Rodino	Swift	Zefteretti

NAYS—84

Archer	Gramm	McDonald
Ashbrook	Gregg	Michel
Bafalis	Hagedorn	Montgomery
Bailey (MO)	Hall, Sam	Moorehead
Barnard	Hammerschmidt	Myers
Beard	Hance	Paul
Billie	Hansen (ID)	Quillen
Brown (CO)	Hansen (UT)	Rhodes
Broyhill	Hartnett	Robinson
Burgener	Hendon	Rousselot
Butler	Hiler	Rudd
Chapple	Ireland	Santini
Cheney	Jeffries	Sensenbrenner
Collins (TX)	Johnston	Shumway
Coyne, James	Kramer	Shuster
Craig	Latta	Siljander
Crane, Daniel	Leath	Skeen
Crane, Phillip	LeBoutillier	Smith (AL)
Daniel, Dan	Lee	Smith (NE)
Daniel, R. W.	Livingston	Smith (OR)
Dannemeyer	Loeffler	Snyder
Derwinski	Lott	Solomon
Dreier	Lowery	Stangeland
Duncan	Lungren	Staton
Edwards (AL)	Madigan	Stenholm
Edwards (OK)	Martin (IL)	Taylor
Evans (GA)	McClory	Weber (MN)
Fields	McCollum	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—37

Badham	Flippo	Price
Bouquard	Florio	Roe
Brooks	Foglietta	Schulze
Broomfield	Frost	Stratton
Carney	Fuqua	Stump
Chappell	Gray	Walker
Cotter	Grisham	Washington
Deckard	Hillis	White
Derrick	Leland	Wilson
Dickinson	Marlenee	Wirth
Dingell	Mollohan	Zablocki
Evans (IA)	Nelson	
Fary	Pashayan	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Carney.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Deckard.
 Mr. Flippo with Mr. Evans of Iowa.
 Mr. Florio with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Derrick with Mr. Grisham.
 Mrs. Bouquard with Mr. Hillis.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Price with Mr. Marlenee.
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Pashayan.
 Mr. Fary with Mr. Walker.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Schulze.

Mr. White with Mr. Badham.
 Mr. Leland with Mr. Frost.
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Gray.
 Mr. Nelson with Mr. Wirth.
 Mr. Washington with Mr. Roe.
 Mr. Stump with Mr. Wilson.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Foglietta.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of an identical Senate bill (S. 1070) to extend the authorization for youth employment and demonstration programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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. 1070

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 "Youth Employment Demonstration Amendments of 1981".

Sec. 2. Section 112(a)(4) of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(D) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year 1982 to carry out part A of title IV."

Sec. 3. Section 441 of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act is repealed.

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.

A similar House bill, H.R. 3337, was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PRISONER-OF-WAR BENEFITS AND HEALTH-CARE SERVICES ACT OF 1981

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1100, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

MONTGOMERY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1100, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 2, not voting 34, as follows:

(Roll No. 57)
YEAS—394

Addabbo	Davis	Hawkins
Akaka	de la Garza	Heckler
Albosta	Dellums	Hefner
Alexander	DeNardis	Heftel
Anderson	Derrick	Hendon
Andrews	Derwinski	Hertel
Annunzio	Dicks	Hightower
Anthony	Dingell	Hiller
Applegate	Dixon	Holland
Archer	Donnelly	Hollenbeck
Ashbrook	Dorgan	Holt
Aspin	Dornan	Hopkins
Atkinson	Dougherty	Horton
AuCoin	Downey	Howard
Bafalis	Dreier	Hubbard
Bailey (MO)	Duncan	Huckaby
Bailey (PA)	Dunn	Hughes
Barnard	Dwyer	Hunter
Barnes	Dymally	Hutto
Beard	Dyson	Hyde
Bedell	Early	Ireland
Benedict	Eckart	Jacobs
Benjamin	Edgar	Jeffords
Bennett	Edwards (AL)	Jeffries
Bereuter	Edwards (CA)	Jenkins
Bethune	Edwards (OK)	Johnston
Bevill	Emerson	Jones (NC)
Biaggi	Emery	Jones (OK)
Bingham	English	Jones (TN)
Blanchard	Erdahl	Kastenmeier
Bliley	Erlenborn	Kazen
Boggs	Ertel	Kemp
Boland	Evans (DE)	Kildee
Bolling	Evans (GA)	Kindness
Boner	Evans (IN)	Kogovsek
Bonior	Fascell	Kramer
Bonker	Fazio	LaFalce
Bowen	Fenwick	Lagomarsino
Breaux	Ferraro	Lantos
Brinkley	Piedler	Latta
Brodhead	Fields	Leach
Brown (CA)	Findley	Leath
Brown (CO)	Fish	LeBoutillier
Brown (OH)	Fithian	Lee
Broyhill	Foley	Lehman
Burgener	Ford (MI)	Lent
Burton, John	Ford (TN)	Levtas
Burton, Phillip	Forsythe	Lewis
Butler	Fountain	Livingston
Byron	Fowler	Loeffler
Campbell	Frank	Long (LA)
Carman	Frenzel	Long (MD)
Chappell	Garcia	Lott
Chappie	Gaydos	Lowery
Cheney	Gejdenson	Lowry
Chisholm	Gephardt	Lujan
Clausen	Gibbons	Luken
Clay	Gilman	Lundine
Clinger	Gingrich	Lungren
Coats	Ginn	Madigan
Coelho	Glickman	Markey
Coleman	Goldwater	Marks
Collins (IL)	Gonzalez	Marrlott
Collins (TX)	Goodling	Martin (IL)
Conable	Gore	Martin (NC)
Conte	Gradison	Martin (NY)
Conyers	Gramm	Matsui
Corcoran	Green	Mattox
Coughlin	Gregg	Mavroules
Courter	Guarini	Mazzoli
Coyne, James	Gunderson	McClory
Coyne, William	Hagedorn	McCloskey
Craig	Hall (OH)	McCollum
Crane, Daniel	Hall, Ralph	McCurdy
Crane, Phillip	Hall, Sam	McDade
Crockett	Hamilton	McEwen
D'Amours	Hammerschmidt	McGrath
Daniel, Dan	Hance	McHugh
Daniel, R. W.	Hansen (ID)	McKinney
Danielson	Hansen (UT)	Mica
Dannemeyer	Harkin	Michel
Daschle	Hartnett	Mikulski
Daub	Hatcher	Miller (CA)

Miller (OH)	Richmond	St Germain
Mineta	Rinaldo	Stangeland
Minish	Ritter	Stanton
Mitchell (MD)	Roberts (KS)	Stark
Mitchell (NY)	Roberts (SD)	Staton
Moakley	Robinson	Stenholm
Moffett	Rodino	Stokes
Mollinari	Roemer	Studds
Montgomery	Rogers	Swift
Moore	Rose	Synar
Moorhead	Rosenthal	Tauke
Morrison	Rostenkowski	Tauzin
Mottl	Roth	Taylor
Murphy	Roukema	Thomas
Murtha	Rousselot	Traxler
Myers	Roybal	Tribble
Napier	Rudd	Udall
Natcher	Russo	Vander Jagt
Neal	Sabo	Vento
Nelligan	Santini	Volkmer
Nichols	Savage	Walgren
Nowak	Sawyer	Wampler
O'Brien	Scheuer	Watkins
Oakar	Schneider	Waxman
Oberstar	Schroeder	Weaver
Obey	Schumer	Weber (MN)
Ottinger	Seiberling	Weber (OH)
Panetta	Sensenbrenner	Weiss
Parris	Shamansky	Whitehurst
Patman	Shannon	Whitley
Patterson	Sharp	Whittaker
Paul	Shaw	Whitten
Pease	Shelby	Williams (MT)
Pepper	Shumway	Williams (OH)
Perkins	Shuster	Winn
Petri	Siljander	Wolf
Peyster	Simon	Wolpe
Pickle	Skeen	Wortley
Porter	Skelton	Wright
Pritchard	Smith (AL)	Wyden
Fursell	Smith (IA)	Wylie
Quillen	Smith (NE)	Yates
Rahall	Smith (NJ)	Yatron
Railsback	Smith (OR)	Young (AK)
Rangel	Snowe	Young (FL)
Ratchford	Snyder	Young (MO)
Regula	Solarz	Zerferetti
Reuss	Solomon	
Rhodes	Spence	

NAYS—2

Bellenson	McDonald
Badham	Foglietta
Bouquard	Frost
Brooks	Fuqua
Broomfield	Gray
Carney	Grisham
Cotter	Hillis
Deckard	Leland
Dickinson	Marlenee
Evans (IA)	Mollohan
Fary	Nelson
Flippo	Pashayan
Florio	Price

NOT VOTING—34

Roe	Schulze
Stratton	Stump
Walker	Washington
White	Wilson
Wirth	Zablocki

□ 1430

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Pashayan.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Walker.
 Mr. Price with Mr. Schulze.
 Mrs. Bouquard with Mr. Badham.
 Mr. Nelson with Mr. Carney.
 Mr. Florio with Mr. Deckard.
 Mr. Fary with Mr. Evans of Iowa.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Flippo with Mr. Hillis.
 Mr. Roe with Mr. Marlenee.
 Mr. Wilson with Mr. Stump.
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Leland.
 Mr. Foglietta with Mr. Wirth.
 Mr. White with Mr. Frost.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Washington.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility of former prisoners of war for certain benefits and health-care services provided by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' TRAINING AND BUSINESS LOAN ACT OF 1981

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3423, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3423, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 352, nays 41, not voting 37, as follows:

(Roll No. 58)

YEAS—352

Addabbo	Coats	Fascell
Akaka	Coelho	Fazio
Alexander	Coleman	Ferraro
Anderson	Collins (IL)	Fiedler
Andrews	Conte	Fields
Annunzio	Conyers	Pindley
Anthony	Corcoran	Fish
Applegate	Coughlin	Pithian
Ashbrook	Courter	Foley
Aspin	Coyne, James	Ford (MI)
Atkinson	Coyne, William	Ford (TN)
AuCoin	Crockett	Forsythe
Bafalis	D'Amours	Fountain
Bafalis	Daniel, Dan	Fowler
Bailey (MO)	Daniel, R. W.	Frank
Bailey (PA)	Danielson	Frenzel
Barnard	Daschle	Garcia
Barnes	Daub	Gaydos
Bedell	Davis	Gejdenson
Benjamin	de la Garza	Gephardt
Bennett	Dellums	Gibbons
Bereuter	DeNardis	Gilman
Bethune	Derrick	Gingrich
Bevill	Dicks	Ginn
Biaggi	Dingell	Glickman
Bingham	Dixon	Goldwater
Blanchard	Donnelly	Gonzalez
Bliley	Dorgan	Goodling
Boggs	Dornan	Gore
Bolling	Dougherty	Gradison
Boner	Downey	Gramm
Bonior	Dreier	Green
Bonker	Duncan	Gregg
Bowen	Dunn	Guarini
Breaux	Dwyer	Hagedorn
Brinkley	Dymally	Hall (OH)
Brodhead	Dyson	Hall, Ralph
Brown (CA)	Early	Hall, Sam
Broyhill	Edgar	Hamilton
Burgener	Eckart	Hammerschmidt
Burton, John	Edwards (AL)	Hance
Burton, Phillip	Edwards (CA)	Harkin
Byron	Emerson	Hartnett
Campbell	Emery	Hatcher
Carman	English	Hawkins
Chappell	Erdahl	Heckler
Chappie	Ertel	Hefner
Chisholm	Evans (DE)	Heftel
Clausen	Evans (GA)	Hendon
Clay	Evans (IN)	Hertel
Clinger		

Hightower	Minish	Sensenbrenner	Pritchard	Stump	Wirth	Dixon	Jacobs	Pepper
Holland	Mitchell (MD)	Shamansky	Roe	Walker	Zablocki	Donnelly	Jeffords	Perkins
Hollenbeck	Mitchell (NY)	Shannon	Schulze	Washington		Dorgan	Jeffries	Petri
Holt	Moakley	Sharp	Stratton	White		Dornan	Jenkins	Peyster
Hopkins	Moffett	Shelby				Dougherty	Johnston	Pickle
Horton	Mollinari	Shuster				Downey	Jones (NC)	Porter
Howard	Montgomery	Siljander				Dreier	Jones (OK)	Pritchard
Hubbard	Moore	Simon				Duncan	Jones (TN)	Pursell
Huckaby	Moorhead	Skeen				Dunn	Kastenmeier	Quillen
Hughes	Morrison	Skelton				Dwyer	Kazen	Rahall
Hunter	Mottl	Smith (IA)				Dymally	Kemp	Railsback
Hutto	Murphy	Smith (NE)				Dyson	Kildee	Rangel
Jacobs	Murtha	Smith (NJ)				Early	Kindness	Ratchford
Jeffords	Myers	Snowe				Eckart	Kogovsek	Regula
Jenkins	Napier	Snyder				Edgar	Kramer	Reuss
Jones (NC)	Natcher	Solarz				Edwards (AL)	LaFalce	Rhodes
Jones (OK)	Neal	Solomon				Edwards (CA)	Lagomarsino	Richmond
Jones (TN)	Nelligan	Spence				Edwards (OK)	Lantos	Rinaldo
Kastenmeier	Nichols	St Germain				Emerson	Latta	Ritter
Kazen	Nowak	Stangeland				Emery	Leach	Roberts (KS)
Kemp	Oakar	Stanton				English	Leath	Roberts (SD)
Kildee	Oberstar	Stark				Erdahl	LeBoutillier	Robinson
Kindness	Obey	Staton				Erlenborn	Lee	Rodino
Kogovsek	Ottinger	Stenholm				Ertel	Lehman	Roemer
Kramer	Panetta	Stokes				Evans (DE)	Lent	Rogers
LaFalce	Parris	Studds				Evans (GA)	Levitas	Rose
Lagomarsino	Patman	Swift				Evans (IN)	Lewis	Rosenthal
Lantos	Patterson	Synar				Fascell	Livingston	Rostenkowski
Leach	Pease	Tauke				Fazio	Loeffler	Roth
Leath	Pepper	Tauzin				Fenwick	Long (LA)	Roukema
LeBoutillier	Perkins	Taylor				Ferraro	Long (MD)	Rousselot
Lee	Petri	Thomas				Fiedler	Lott	Royal
Lehman	Peyster	Traxler				Fields	Lowery	Rudd
Lent	Pickle	Tribble				Findley	Lowry	Russo
Levitas	Pursell	Udall				Fish	Lujan	Sabo
Loeffler	Quillen	Vander Jagt				Fithian	Luken	Santini
Long (LA)	Rahall	Vento				Foley	Lundine	Sawyer
Long (MD)	Railsback	Volkmer				Ford (MI)	Lungren	Scheuer
Lott	Rangel	Walgren				Ford (TN)	Madigan	Schneider
Lowery	Ratchford	Wampler				Forsythe	Markey	Schroeder
Lowry	Regula	Watkins				Fountain	Marks	Schumer
Lujan	Reuss	Waxman				Fowler	Marriott	Seiberling
Luken	Rhodes	Weaver				Frank	Martin (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Lundine	Richmond	Weber (MN)				Frenzel	Martin (NC)	Shamansky
Markey	Rinaldo	Weber (OH)				Garcia	Martin (NY)	Shannon
Marks	Ritter	Weiss				Gaydos	Matsui	Sharp
Marriott	Roberts (KS)	Whitehurst				Gejdenson	Mattox	Shaw
Martin (IL)	Roberts (SD)	Whitley				Gephardt	Mavroules	Shelby
Martin (NC)	Rodino	Whittaker				Gibbons	Mazzoli	Shumway
Martin (NY)	Roemer	Whitten				Gilman	McClory	Shuster
Matsui	Rogers	Williams (MT)				Gingrich	McCloskey	Siljander
Mattox	Rose	Williams (OH)				Ginn	McCollum	Simon
Mavroules	Rosenthal	Wilson				Glickman	McCurdy	Skeen
Mazzoli	Rostenkowski	Winn				Goldwater	McDade	Skelton
McClory	Roth	Wolf				Gonzalez	McDonald	Smith (AL)
McCloskey	Rousselot	Wolpe				Goodling	McEwen	Smith (IA)
McCullum	Roybal	Wortley				Gore	McGrath	Smith (NE)
McCurdy	Rudd	Wright				Gradison	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
McDade	Russo	Wyden				Gramm	McKinney	Smith (OR)
McEwen	Sabo	Wylie				Gray	Mica	Snowe
McGrath	Santini	Yates				Green	Michel	Snyder
McHugh	Savage	Yatron				Gregg	Mikulski	Solarz
McKinney	Sawyer	Young (AK)				Guarini	Miller (CA)	Solomon
Mica	Scheuer	Young (FL)				Gunderson	Miller (OH)	Spence
Mikulski	Schneider	Young (MO)				Hagedorn	Mineta	St Germain
Miller (CA)	Schroeder					Hall (OH)	Minish	Stangeland
Miller (OH)	Schumer					Hall, Ralph	Mitchell (MD)	Stanton
Mineta	Seiberling					Hall, Sam	Mitchell (NY)	Stark
						Hamilton	Moakley	Staton
						Hammerschmidt	Moffett	Stenholm
						Hance	Mollinari	Stokes
						Hansen (ID)	Montgomery	Studds
						Hansen (UT)	Moore	Swift
						Hartnett	Moorhead	Synar
						Hatcher	Morrison	Tauke
						Hawkins	Mottl	Tauzin
						Heckler	Murphy	Taylor
						Hefner	Murtha	Thomas
						Hefel	Myers	Traxler
						Hendon	Napier	Tribble
						Hertel	Natcher	Udall
						Hightower	Neal	Vander Jagt
						Hiler	Nelligan	Vento
						Holland	Nichols	Volkmer
						Hollenbeck	Nowak	Walgren
						Holt	O'Brien	Wampler
						Hopkins	Oakar	Watkins
						Horton	Oberstar	Waxman
						Howard	Obey	Weaver
						Hubbard	Ottinger	Weber (MN)
						Huckaby	Panetta	Weber (OH)
						Hughes	Parris	Weiss
						Hunter	Patman	Whitehurst
						Hutto	Patterson	Whitley
						Hyde	Paul	Whittaker
						Ireland	Pease	Whitten

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Grisham.
 Mr. Price with Mr. Pashayan.
 Mr. Florio with Mr. Pritchard.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Schulze.
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Marlenee.
 Mrs. Bouquard with Mr. Deckard.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Fary with Mr. Evans of Iowa.
 Mr. Flippo with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Nelson with Mr. Carney.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Badham.
 Mr. Roe with Mr. Stratton.
 Mr. White with Mr. Walker.
 Mr. Albosta with Mr. Foglietta.
 Mr. Frost with Mr. Leland.
 Mr. Wirth with Mr. Hillis.
 Mr. Washington with Mr. Stump.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' HOME LOAN GUARANTEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2039, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2039, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—397

Addabbo	Billey	Coleman
Akaka	Boggs	Collins (IL)
Albosta	Boland	Collins (TX)
Alexander	Bolling	Conable
Anderson	Boner	Conte
Andrews	Bonior	Conyers
Annunzio	Bonker	Corcoran
Anthony	Bowen	Coughlin
Applegate	Breaux	Courter
Archer	Brinkley	Coyne, James
Ashbrook	Brodhead	Coyne, William
Aspin	Brown (CA)	Craig
Atkinson	Brown (CO)	Crane, Daniel
AuCoin	Brown (OH)	Crane, Philip
Bafalis	Broyhill	Crockett
Bailey (MO)	Burgener	D'Amours
Bailey (PA)	Burton, John	Daniel, Dan
Barnard	Burton, Phillip	Daniel, R. W.
Barnes	Butler	Danielson
Beard	Byron	Dannemeyer
Bedell	Campbell	Daschle
Bellenson	Carman	Daub
Benjamin	Chappell	Davis
Bennett	Chappie	de la Garza
Bereuter	Cheney	Deckard
Bethune	Chisholm	Dellums
Bevill	Clausen	DeNardis
Biaggi	Clay	Derrick
Bingham	Clinger	Derwinski
Blanchard	Coats	Dicks
	Coelho	Dingell

NOT VOTING—37

Albosta	Deckard	Gray
Badham	Dickinson	Grisham
Boland	Evans (IA)	Hillis
Bouquard	Fary	Leland
Brooks	Flippo	Marlenee
Broomfield	Florio	Mollohan
Brown (OH)	Foglietta	Nelson
Carney	Frost	Pashayan
Cotter	Fuqua	Price

Williams (MT) Wortley
 Williams (OH) Wright
 Wilson Wyden
 Winn Wylie
 Wolf Yates
 Wolpe Yatron

Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (MO)
 Zeferetti

[Roll No. 60]
 YEAS—391

Addabbo
 Akaka
 Alexander
 Anderson
 Andrews
 Annunzio
 Anthony
 Applegate
 Archer
 Ashbrook
 Aspin
 Atkinson
 AuCoin
 Bafalis
 Bailey (MO)
 Bailey (PA)
 Barnes
 Beard
 Bedell
 Beilenson
 Benedict
 Benjamin
 Bennett
 Bereuter
 Bethune
 Bevil
 Biaggi
 Bingham
 Blanchard
 Billey
 Boggs
 Boland
 Bolling
 Boner
 Bonior
 Bonker
 Bowen
 Breaux
 Brinkley
 Brodhead
 Brown (CA)
 Brown (CO)
 Brown (OH)
 Broyhill
 Burgener
 Burton, John
 Burton, Phillip
 Butler
 Byron
 Campbell
 Carman
 Chappell
 Chapple
 Cheney
 Chisholm
 Clausen
 Clay
 Clinger
 Coats
 Coelho
 Coleman
 Collins (IL)
 Collins (TX)
 Conable
 Conte
 Corcoran
 Coughlin
 Courter
 Coyne, James
 Coyne, William
 Craig
 Crane, Daniel
 Crane, Philip
 Crockett
 D'Amours
 Daniel, Dan
 Daniel, R. W.
 Danielson
 Dannemeyer
 Daschle
 Daub
 Davis
 de la Garza
 Deckard
 Dellums
 DeNardis
 Derrick
 Derwinski
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Dixon
 Donnelly
 Dorgan

Dornan
 Dougherty
 Downey
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Dwyer
 Dymally
 Dyson
 Eckart
 Edgar
 Edwards (AL)
 Edwards (CA)
 Edwards (OK)
 Emerson
 Emery
 English
 Erdahl
 Erlenborn
 Ertel
 Evans (DE)
 Evans (GA)
 Evans (IN)
 Fascell
 Fazio
 Fenwick
 Ferraro
 Fiedler
 Fields
 Findley
 Fish
 Fithian
 Foley
 Ford (MI)
 Ford (TN)
 Forsythe
 Fountain
 Fowler
 Frank
 Frenzel
 Garcia
 Gaydos
 Gejdenson
 Gephardt
 Gibbons
 Gilman
 Ginn
 Glickman
 Goldwater
 Gonzalez
 Goodling
 Gore
 Gradison
 Gramm
 Gray
 Green
 Gregg
 Guarini
 Gunderson
 Hagedorn
 Hall (OH)
 Hall, Ralph
 Hall, Sam
 Hamilton
 Hammerschmidt
 Hance
 Hansen (ID)
 Hansen (UT)
 Harkin
 Hartnett
 Hatcher
 Heckler
 Hefner
 Heftel
 Hendon
 Hertel
 Hightower
 Hiler
 Holland
 Hollenbeck
 Holt
 Hopkins
 Horton
 Howard
 Hubbard
 Huckaby
 Hughes
 Hunter
 Hutto
 Hyde
 Ireland
 Jacobs
 Jeffords

Pepper
 Perkins
 Petri
 Peyser
 Pickle
 Porter
 Pritchard
 Pursell
 Quillen
 Rahall
 Railsback
 Rangel
 Ratchford
 Regula
 Reuss
 Rhodes
 Richmond
 Rinaldo
 Ritter
 Roberts (KS)
 Roberts (SD)
 Robinson
 Rodino
 Roemer
 Rogers
 Rose
 Rosenthal
 Rostenkowski
 Roth
 Roukema
 Rousselot
 Roybal
 Rudd
 Russo
 Sabo
 Santini
 Savage
 Sawyer

Scheuer
 Schneider
 Schroeder
 Schumer
 Seiberling
 Sensenbrenner
 Shamansky
 Shannon
 Sharp
 Shaw
 Shelby
 Shumway
 Shuster
 Siljander
 Simon
 Skeen
 Skelton
 Smith (AL)
 Smith (IA)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (OR)
 Snow
 Snyder
 Solarz
 Solomon
 Spence
 St Germain
 Stangeland
 Stanton
 Stark
 Stator
 Stenholm
 Stokes
 Studds
 Swift
 Synar
 Tauke

Tauzin
 Taylor
 Thomas
 Traxler
 Tribe
 Udall
 Vander Jagt
 Vento
 Volkmer
 Walgren
 Wampler
 Watkins
 Waxman
 Weaver
 Weber (MN)
 Weber (OH)
 Weiss
 Whitehurst
 Whitley
 Whittaker
 Whitten
 Williams (MT)
 Williams (OH)
 Wilson
 Wolf
 Wolpe
 Wright
 Wyden
 Wylie
 Yates
 Yatron
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (MO)
 Zeferetti

NAYS—0
 NOT VOTING—33

Badham
 Bouquard
 Brooks
 Broomfield
 Carney
 Cotter
 Dickinson
 Evans (IA)
 Fary
 Flippo
 Florio

□ 1445

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Carney.
- Mr. Brooks with Mr. Broomfield.
- Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Pashayan.
- Mr. Nelson with Mr. Marlenee.
- Mr. Harkin with Mr. Badham.
- Mrs. Bouquard with Mr. Dickinson.
- Mr. Fary with Mr. Evans of Iowa.
- Mr. Savage with Mr. Hillis.
- Mr. Price with Mr. Schulze.
- Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Walker.
- Mr. Florio with Mr. Washington.
- Mr. Flippo with Mr. White.
- Mr. Roe with Mr. Stump.
- Mr. Stratton with Mr. Wirth.
- Mr. Foglietta with Mr. Frost.
- Mr. Leland with Mr. Grisham.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to guarantee home loans with provisions for variable-payment plans, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF CONGRESS FOR SECRETARY OF ARMY TO PLACE PLAQUE IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY FOR ARMED FORCES MEMBERS WHO DIED IN IRANIAN HOSTAGE RESCUE ATTEMPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 76.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 76) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 0, not voting 39, as follows:

NAYS—0
 NOT VOTING—39

Albosta
 Badham
 Barnard
 Bouquard
 Brooks
 Broomfield
 Cromley
 Conyers
 Cotter
 Dickinson
 Early
 Evans (IA)
 Fary

Flippo
 Florio
 Foglietta
 Frost
 Fuqua
 Gingrich
 Grisham
 Hawkins
 Hillis
 Leland
 Marlenee
 Mattox
 Mollohan

Nelson
 Pashayan
 Price
 Roe
 Schulze
 Stratton
 Stump
 Walker
 Washington
 White
 Winn
 Wirth
 Zablocki

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Winn.
- Mr. Fary with Mr. Dickinson.
- Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Hillis.
- Mr. Brooks with Mr. Broomfield.
- Mr. Mattox with Mr. Walker.
- Mr. Frost with Mr. Pashayan.
- Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Schulze.
- Mr. Florio with Mr. Marlenee.
- Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Gingrich.
- Mr. Roe with Mr. Carney.
- Mr. Flippo with Mr. Badham.
- Mr. Barnard with Mr. Evans of Iowa.
- Mr. Conyers with Mr. Leland.
- Mr. Early with Mr. Foglietta.
- Mr. Price with Mr. Nelson.
- Mr. Washington with Mr. Stump.
- Mr. Stratton with Mr. White.
- Mr. Wirth with Mrs. Bouquard.
- Mr. Albosta with Mr. Grisham.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls 54, 55, and 56, I was unavoidably detained and could not be present.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each one.

TRIBUTE TO DR. HOWARD W. THURMAN

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

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, the death of Dr. Howard W. Thurman—preacher, theologian, mystic, and writer—in San Francisco on April 9, 1981, removed from the American scene one of its most distinguished religious thinkers. Born into a family one generation removed from slavery in Daytona, Fla., Dr. Thurman rose to a position of international preeminence. Persons such as Mahatma Gandhi and the mystic Rufus Jones were among his intimate friends.

The city of Washington, D.C., was graced with Dr. Thurman's presence during the years he served as dean of the chapel and professor at Howard University. He subsequently held the position of dean of Marsh Chapel at Boston University and was cofounder of one of the first genuinely integrated churches in this Nation, the Church of the Fellowship of All Peoples in San Francisco.

A primary religious concern which consumed much of Dr. Thurman's reflection, preaching, and writing was "the search for common ground," that is, the unity between God and man, and between man and man, which transcended human divisions and arrangements with respect to religion and life. Though he took seriously the presence of contradictions and polarities in human communities and institutions, he expressed the faith that "in God there are no contradictions."

At the time of his death, Dr. Thurman was head of Howard Thurman Educational Trust, a nonprofit foundation dedicated to providing scholarship aid to students in higher education; to the distribution of books, tapes, and papers by Thurman; and to the convening of seminars and conversations focusing his thought.

The author of 22 books and over 200 articles, Howard Thurman's contributions to the intellectual and spiritual life of the past several decades are beyond measure. The world is richer for his having lived in it.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader as to what the schedule will be for the rest of the week.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished acting minority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The schedule for the remainder of the week is that on tomorrow we will have a session but a pro forma session with no legislative business, in honor of the passing of our late and beloved colleague, the Honorable Carl Vinson of Georgia, who will be buried tomorrow.

□ 1500

It is possible that a quorum call might be requested tomorrow. While there will be no legislative business, there will be the swearing in of our new colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, Steny Hoyer.

On Thursday, we will have two items of business which we hope to conclude on that day. We will meet at 10 o'clock on Thursday, and the first order of business will be the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill.

Following that, we will take up H.R. 3455, the military construction authorization.

If we are able to complete those two on Thursday, there will not be any business on Friday.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for that schedule.

THE LATE HONORABLE CARL VINSON

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

Mr. EVANS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty of informing you that former Representative Carl Vinson, who served as a Member of Congress for over 50 years from the great State of Georgia, passed away.

Representative Vinson was a man unsurpassed in his dedication to my home State and to the security of our Nation. His service as chairman of the Armed Services Committee is unmatched in fervor to the extent that Georgia will forever be honored by his memory. His name has been placed above the door of the Armed Services Committee Room.

Congressman JACK BRINKLEY and I have reserved time for a special order to pay tribute to Carl Vinson on Wednesday, June 10. I invite all of my colleagues to participate at that time in memory of a great Georgian and a great American.

THE TWO TAX PACKAGES

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say how very disgusted

I have been with the press of late on this whole issue of the two tax packages. I really think they have been treating it like a sporting event and I really hope the Speaker would have a press conference and give them a little pop quiz.

I am not sure they really have any idea what the real issues and the real differences between the two packages are. I do not think people understand that the reason the Democrats are so concerned is we want to do away with the marriage penalty tax, and we would like housewives to be able to have a retirement account, and we would like very much for middle-income people between \$15,000 and \$50,000 to be able to have the major portion of the tax cut, and that we are very worried about having a cut for more than 1 year and make sure we do it one at a time.

It is very easy to get votes for another cut next year if everything is working well.

I hope he gives this little pop quiz to the press, and I hope they know what this is about, and I hope they understand this is not a ball game; this is a very serious economic issue that this House is going to have to deal with.

SMALL BUSINESS TAX ACT OF 1981

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

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, smaller businesses are the overwhelming majority of business firms in the United States. During the last several years, these smaller businesses have been competing in a marketplace that has become increasingly more concentrated on the largest firms. Smaller businesses are not able to compete effectively when most of the rules of the game favor the larger firm. As all costs are rising each year, it is the small firm that is least able to cope with the higher cost of capital, labor, and taxes. In recent years small businesses have been faced with the nearly impossible task of expanding business while interest rates on loans have climbed above the previously unheard of 20-percent level. Smaller firms are generally more labor intensive. These firms hire more new workers than big firms. The new jobs that should be available from smaller businesses will materialize only if the firm hiring the new worker will realize greater productivity. Increased productivity for workers goes hand-in-hand with more efficient use of capital. Relief from the present burden of Federal income tax for small businesses is a step in the right direction. It will help to remove some

of the obstacles to capital expansion and productivity.

The bill that I am introducing today is the result of serious consideration to the needs of small business. It addresses these needs without losing sight of the general tax policy goals of equity and simplicity. Too often Congress has set forth with the best intentions to enact tax laws that seek to aid small businesses only to arrive at rules whose complexity defeats their purpose. This bill would provide tax rules that are easily understood, but hopefully would not provide new opportunities for tax shelter artists. As the Ways and Means Committee considers the several proposals for depreciation reform and individual tax cuts, I am hopeful that the plight of small businesses will be remembered. This bill may be easily coordinated with a simplified depreciation system.

Under the bill, small businesses could annually elect to take an immediate deduction for up to \$25,000 of tangible personal property placed in service during the year instead of recovering the property's cost through depreciation. The investment credit would not be allowed for amounts expensed in this manner. This provision would greatly simplify capital cost recovery for small business. It would allow most firms to use one class and 1-year writeoff for all of their capital expenditures.

My bill would also widen the corporate income tax brackets. Graduated corporate income tax brackets were first enacted in 1978. Under present law, the corporate tax rates range from 17 percent on the first \$25,000 to 46 percent on amounts over \$100,000. This bill would expand each of these brackets to \$37,500, with top rate of 46 percent on amounts over \$150,000.

The double taxation of dividends is a problem often cited by smaller firms. My bill would help to alleviate this problem for most small firms by not taxing the first \$100,000 of a small corporation's taxable income paid to shareholders as dividends for the taxable year. Taxable income in excess of the first \$100,000 of dividends paid would continue to be taxed at the normal corporate rates. Thus, a small business corporation with \$200,000 taxable income paying out at least \$100,000 in dividends for the taxable year would be taxed only on \$100,000—at the regular corporate rate. A small business corporation would be defined as a domestic corporation with not more than \$1 million received as a contribution to capital or as paid-in surplus. This proposal has been carefully drafted to avoid the pitfall of creating additional potential for tax abuse.

The bill would also double the investment credit used property limitation. Under present law, the investment credit is allowed only on the first

\$100,000 of used property purchased each year. This limit would be increased to \$200,000. I am hopeful that the Ways and Means Committee will review this used property limitation during the consideration of depreciation changes. The investment credit must be closely coordinated with depreciation reform. I am hopeful that the committee will view favorably a significant increase in the used property limitation. Under a new capital cost recovery system, the distinction between new and used property could be eliminated if appropriate recapture rules were devised.

Under present law, a 10-percent investment tax credit is allowed for the rehabilitation of buildings which are at least 20 years old which are used by the taxpayer in its trade or business.

In order to encourage the rehabilitation of older buildings, many of which are used by small businessmen, the bill would change present law to allow a 15-percent rehabilitation credit for buildings at least 30 years old, a 20-percent credit for buildings at least 40 years old, and a 25-percent credit for a certified rehabilitation of a certified historic structure. For purposes of this provision, certified historic structures include certified historic residential rental properties. No credit would be allowed for buildings less than 30 years old.

The bill also provides that the investor who acquires preferred stock in new corporations may realize ordinary losses if the venture fails. This tax treatment is presently available under section 1244 of the Tax Code, but it is limited to shareholders of common stock only. Extending ordinary loss treatment to losses on preferred stock issued by a small business to an individual shareholder would benefit the risk-taking investors whose finances support many new corporate ventures.

The bill would also increase the maximum number of shareholders in a subchapter S corporation from 15 to 25. Subchapter S allows certain small business corporations to elect not to be taxed at the corporate level, but pass all income or loss through to the shareholders. This proposal would allow more small businesses to take advantage of subchapter S.

The bill also requires the Treasury Department to complete, within 1 year of enactment, a detailed study of the appropriate methods of tax accounting for inventory during periods of inflation. This Treasury study would also require Treasury to report on ways to simplify inventory accounting for small businesses. The present accounting rules are very complex. Smaller firms are often placed in a disadvantageous position compared to larger firms that are much better able to cope with these problems. After receiving this detailed analysis, the Ways and Means Committee and the

Senate Finance Committee will be in a better position to enact new accounting rules that will meet the smaller firm's requirements during periods of inflation.

FIRSTHAND CRITICISM

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, a lot of experts have criticized the Reagan administration's proposals to cut social security. But I received a letter last week from a working wife in Portland, Oreg., that says it all.

The letter is from Mrs. Donna Miller, 8312 SE. Oak Place, and here is what she said:

I can't believe it!! I'm absolutely stunned about the penalties President Reagan wants to put on Social Security for age 62 recipients.

Once again the working people get penalized. We plod along working most of our lifetimes, trying to raise our families, pay our taxes, pay our own medical bills, receiving no help from anyone—and we're the ones who lose when budget cuts are made.

My husband, age 54, has been a welder for over 25 years. While laid off last year, he had a heart attack. We'd paid the insurance premium so our hospital bills were 80 percent covered, but because he was laid off work at the time, we were not eligible for disability payments or unemployment, of course. So, we survived on my salary of \$500 a month. We tightened our belts and made it, all on our own, with no help from anyone.

We have a mobile home, and a little house on our own lot. We live in the mobile home, and let my 80-year-old widowed mother live in the house, rent free, so that she can have enough money from her Social Security to buy decent food and pay her heat bills. Mama is diabetic.

It is most difficult for my husband to work as hard as he does since his heart attack, but he does, because he must.

When he asked the Employment Division if they could help retrain him to an easier job, the answer was no. The doctor had released him for work, and he had been welding since the heart attack, so that was that.

We've tried to plan for our retirement so our bills will be paid for by the time my husband would retire at age 62, so we can live on Social Security as comfortably as possible. But how can we retire at a 55 percent cut of his earned benefits?

He's paid in to Social Security all his working days. By the way, I am 47 years old, so it puts an added burden on us, as I couldn't collect any retirement for 7 years after my husband.

Jobs are nil, crime runs wild, and now our President wants to punish us further because we want to retire at age 62. I so wish he was in our shoes for a while, so he'd know how it feels to suffer through layoffs, worry about medical bills and have the rug pulled out from under you, when all you want is to retire and live a few years without job worries.

I'm scared, I'm mad and I feel completely defeated.

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION SPRING MEETING, MANILA, PHILIPPINES

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of April, I had the distinct privilege and pleasure of serving as chairman of a House delegation, appointed by the Speaker to represent the U.S. House of Representatives at the spring meeting of the Interparliamentary Union held in Manila, Philippines. I have requested this special order today so that members who attended that important international conference of parliamentarians can report on the accomplishments.

As with all recent IPU sessions, the Manila meeting provided the best opportunity available in the world today for parliamentarians of many lands to gather together to discuss significant world issues. Through IPU meetings it has even been possible for parliamentarians to discover areas of agreement and to publish joint resolutions designed to encourage their respective governments to develop and implement policies for which there is wide popular support among citizens of the world.

The IPU has been in existence now for nearly a century and has throughout that period given important impetus to positive international efforts by encouraging international arbitration and conciliation. Ninety-four countries are now members of the IPU, and 560 members of parliaments from 80 countries attended the meeting in Manila. Representatives from many international organizations, such as the United Nations organizations, also attended as observers. Needless to say, given the many representatives from developing and developed countries and from the many continents, diversity of views and points of disagreement were very apparent. The sharing of these different views and the negotiation process of the drafting sessions allowed all the parliamentarians ample opportunity to learn clearly where other parliaments stand.

My colleagues in the House who participated in the Manila meeting deserve high commendation for their diligence and persistence in representing the United States and carrying messages on issues very important to Americans. Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, designated by the Speaker to serve as House vice chairman, through his many and longstanding contacts with other parliamentarians who regularly attend IPU sessions and his enthusiasm for making the American participation a success, performed great service. The other delegation members included Representatives J. J. PICKLE, E. (KIKI) DE LA GARZA, GEORGE E. DANIELSON, DAVID R.

BOWEN, ANTONIO WON PAT, ROBERT McCLORY, and GUY VANDER JAGT. We from the House were complemented by a highly qualified Senate group, headed by Senator ROBERT T. STAFFORD, that also included Senators QUENTIN N. BURDICK and HOWARD W. CANNON.

Our delegation was a fine example of bipartisan and bicameral cooperation.

With pride I can report that each and every member of our delegation was intensely engaged in the activity of the conference. Our delegation presented four American draft resolutions which we defended as positions worthy of international support. Obviously with the give and take on negotiation in the drafting committees, all of the American positions were not adopted. But we can be satisfied that other nations' parliamentarians are now better aware of American views.

Five of our delegates spoke formally to the meeting to explain views on the agenda issues, and U.S. delegates participated on all five drafting committees established to compose draft resolutions that serve as the communiqués of parliamentarian opinion of the IPU. Some of the drafting lasted late into the night.

The issues before us in Manila were important ones and included arms control and disarmament, Parliaments and human rights, energy, the U.N. International Year of Disabled Persons and decolonization. These issues were fully debated in Manila, and draft resolutions on them were adopted for consideration by all national groups before final adoption at the fall conference.

In statements and negotiation, U.S. delegates were quite forceful in making clear how we view these matters. Our delegates reaffirmed opposition to the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and the insistence that they withdraw their armed troops from Afghan soil. We also stressed how disastrous any Soviet military intervention in Poland would be. On the question of the disabled persons, I personally spent hours together with other parliamentarians, shaping a resolution that should add momentum to international efforts on behalf of these very disadvantaged people. This resolution, specially adopted unanimously by the Interparliamentary Council in Manila, urges greater efforts to facilitate the integration of disabled persons into economic, social, and cultural development and recommends a number of concrete actions to ease and prevent disability. This resolution of the IPU complements efforts of our own body on behalf of the disabled, such as embodied in House Concurrent Resolution 55.

The Manila meeting also devoted special attention to the energy crisis, human rights, and decolonization.

Resolutions on these subjects contain many helpful suggestions and should be considered. Some of the ideas advanced, however, particularly concerning energy and decolonization, go way beyond what the American Congress would support. I am sure that U.S. delegates to the fall conference will want to propose amendments that could make IPU positions on these matters more universally approved.

In conclusion, the Manila IPU meeting was a productive and enlightening session. Opinions of the world's parliaments were registered so we can move ahead better informed of possibilities and obstacles. Methods and program proposals were advanced that deserve study. A final report, detailing more fully the results of the meeting, will be published in the near future.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON).

Mr. DANIELSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the spring meeting of the Interparliamentary Union held at Manila, Republic of the Philippines, during the period of April 20 to 25, 1981, was my first opportunity to serve on our delegation. The experience was for me a most exciting and informative one. The opportunity to meet with, work with, and debate the important issues facing the world today with fellow parliamentarians from throughout the world was both unique and valuable. Our cochairmen, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, from the House of Representatives and the Honorable ROBERT T. STAFFORD from the Senate assigned me to the Committee on Parliamentary, Juridical, and Human Rights Questions. I feel that I was most fortunate in that assignment. During the days of the spring meeting our committee concentrated on the subjects of human rights and the various international treaties and agreements implementing human rights policies throughout the world. I personally took up the subject of international terrorism since it is clear to me that terrorism is the most palpable and vicious form of the violation of human rights. On behalf of our group I also advocated that parliaments throughout the world take an evenhanded approach to the consideration of human rights violations and that the people of the world, and their parliaments, should be objective in evaluating the conduct of all regimes, be they authoritarian or democratic, and should get away from the tendency to apply an international double standard in the field of human rights. Too often, in my opinion, we have looked upon conduct by one regime differently than we look upon identical conduct by other regimes solely be-

cause of our relationships to those several regimes.

A text of my speech on that subject, which I made before my subcommittee on Wednesday, April 22, 1981, follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE E. DANIELSON

Mr. Chairman, and Fellow Parliamentarians, the question before us is what role Parliaments can play to control governmental activity on human rights, and what Parliaments can do to promote adherence to and the effective implementation of meaningful international standards on human rights.

The recognition of international standards of conduct on human rights has been a part of the basic tradition of the United States for more than 200 years—at least as far back as the American Declaration of Independence—in 1776.

Ever since that time civil, political and economic rights have been the basis of our legal system and the United States Congress has enacted innumerable laws to secure those rights for individual Americans. Certainly, and historically, there have been those for whom full respect for human rights have been denied. But a free and independent Congress—a President freely elected by and responsible to the people—a free, inquisitive and courageous press, and a people blessed with the rights of freedom of thought and speech, have provided the self-criticism needed to bring about improvements where improvements have been necessary.

We in the Congress strongly supported the emphasis laid by the U.S. delegation to the recent Geneva session of the UN Human Rights Commission on the grievous threat to human rights posed by the rising tide of terrorism in the world today—much of it sponsored from abroad.

Terrorist attacks on life, liberty and security of person are attacks on the very governmental and political structures which provide and protect those rights. Terrorists believe that their violent acts will compel the abandonment of the defense of those rights and thus bring about the destruction of a free society. As the direct representatives of the people, we in the Parliaments should condemn and strongly resist this terrorist assault on fundamental freedoms and on our free institutions.

At the HRC session in Geneva the U.S. delegation also protested the violation of another fundamental human right—the freedom of a people to choose their own political system, free from coercion, from intimidation, and from external interference.

We in the United States believe that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Yet, today we see glaring examples of human oppression imposed from abroad: by Soviet troops in Afghanistan, which the IPU deplored last September in Berlin. The threat of foreign intervention since has been raised by the Soviets and their surrogates against the stirrings of the human spirit in Poland. By condemning such moves and by supporting effective government counter-measures, Parliaments can register their determined opposition to these massive violations of human freedom.

In my country the Congress has enacted laws to integrate the consideration of human rights into foreign policy and to serve as a policy guide for the Executive. We have legislated to include human rights criteria as conditions to the granting of for-

eign assistance. We have insisted upon scrutiny of the human rights records of other nations as well as our own.

As an example, the U.S. Congress created a Commission on Security and Co-Operation in Europe to monitor and report on compliance with the Helsinki Final Act, including its Principle Seven, on Respect for Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, including Freedom of Thought, Conscience, Religion and Belief. We know that the United States record on human rights is good, and we know that our compliance with the Helsinki accords can stand up to close inspection.

At the same time, on the part of some signatories, we note wide discrepancies between their performance and their obligations to abide by the human rights provisions of the Final Act. Some of these same signatories argue that the examination and discussion of their human rights record by others constitutes interference in their internal affairs and that it is contrary to other provisions of the Helsinki accords. To this we reply that the matter of compliance with the provisions of the accords is a matter of legitimate and proper concern for all of the signatories. We will continue to monitor, and we will continue to press for full compliance. To do less would render that great effort but an idle act. No country's human rights record should be above scrutiny, or beyond criticism, whatever the country and whatever its political system.

We have observed that closed, totalitarian regimes, with their endemic oppression of human rights, often virtually escape international censure, while more open societies may be judged much more harshly. We parliamentarians know, all of us know, that all societies, all regimes, should be held accountable to the same, commonly-accepted, standards on human rights. Parliaments can, and should, press for this needed objectivity and even-handedness, and for the elimination of an international "double standard" in the field of human rights.

The new U.S. Administration is currently reviewing four international human rights conventions submitted earlier by President Carter to the Senate for ratification. These are: the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; and the American Convention on Human Rights. While this process is underway, the U.S. delegation to the recent HRC meeting in Geneva joined in backing a consensus resolution urging support of the two above UN covenants, and it strongly supported the HRC's adoption of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance based on Religion or Belief.

Mr. Chairman, while understanding the desire of governments to weigh carefully, as ours is doing, the legal and other implications of international human rights instruments to which they have not yet adhered, we call on all countries to fulfill their commitments under those instruments to which they have already subscribed. Only thus can we hope to realize the high intentions expressed and give them genuine impact on the human rights and the lives of our peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that I was assigned to the drafting subcommittee on my committee. In drafting our committee's resolution, I was able to include a provision to condemning terrorism and vio-

lence in all forms as grave threats to the assurance of human rights.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I found my service on our delegation to the Interparliamentary Union to be most valuable and rewarding. I hope that it will be my good fortune to participate in future work of that fine group.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for his leadership of the House delegation at the Interparliamentary meeting in Manila and to concur in the remarks the gentleman has addressed that this was a most important meeting.

Mr. Speaker, the subject which was assigned specifically to the Education, Science, Culture, and the Environment Committee, upon which I was named to serve, gave primary consideration to the subject of the Year of Disabled Persons, taking note that the United Nations has designated 1981 as the Year of Disabled Persons.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I participated in the preparation of a memorandum which was thereafter filed in behalf of our U.S. group. The memorandum, which outlines activities undertaken by various segments of our Nation, including the private sector, is included at the end of these remarks. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I addressed the members of the committee, briefly sketching the work of the U.S. Council for the International Year of Disabled Persons established by the President and calling attention to the concurrent resolution that was adopted on April 7, 1981 (H. Con. Res. 55) shortly before our delegation departed for the spring conference in Manila.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks to the members of the committee are as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT McCLORY (U.S.A.) ON THE YEAR OF DISABLED PERSONS

What should we do as members of the world's parliaments to support and implement the United Nations' action in designating 1981 as the Year of Disabled Persons—in particular disabled children?

We should, indeed, do the best and the most that is possible.

In short, we should share with each other our experiences as members of our respective parliamentary bodies. We should inform, and we should support each other—and we should coordinate our efforts for the maximum good for the largest number of our disabled brothers and sisters of every land—and of every race, color and creed.

It seems to me counter-productive to criticize, to condemn, or to seek to make political propaganda from this issue. To criticize the internal policies of a member nation, or to use this issue as a forum for political debate is a disservice to those whom we wish

to aid—and repugnant to the kind of useful exchanges which the IPU makes possible.

First, of course, we can all participate in a great awareness program to bring to the individual attention of countless millions of our constituents and fellow citizens both the plight and the potential of our disabled brothers and sisters. When we stop to consider that physical and mental disability touches about one out of every ten families, this awareness task seems entirely realizable.

In the United States, both a Presidential proclamation and a Concurrent Resolution of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate are directed primarily at bringing the subject of disabled persons to public notice. A postage stamp commemorative of the Year of Disabled Persons will be issued in July.

A full schedule of public events has been planned touching virtually every segment of our society and reaching into every part of our geographic boundaries.

Second, we seek to identify and reach every type of disability and every age of individual with particular influence on young people. It is not simply a federal or national government effort. It seeks, indeed, to reach every subsidiary unit of government and public officials at all levels.

Third, since the maximum benefit can come from individual understanding and cooperation, the governmentally initiated programs in the United States rely substantially on participation by private organizations and persons.

One of my long-time friends, and a fellow alumnus of my college alma mater, and himself a paraplegic—Alan Reich—is President of the U.S. Council for the International Year of Disabled Persons. Already, he has given assurance of a successful national program in my country by securing cooperation in all 50 states on the part of governmental and non-governmental entities.

Let me mention just two projects of special interest to the delegates attending this Spring IPU meeting, namely, (a) a conference of representatives of the disabled community from North and South America and the Caribbean with the plans scheduled for development this month and the full conference to be held in November, and (b) a meeting of selected disabled persons from the developing nations to share experiences and techniques also to take place in November. It is expected that both of these projects will be sponsored by private companies.

Finally, what we have learned and what we discover this year and hereafter we offer for the benefit of disabled persons everywhere. The Year of Disabled Persons is not a goal nor an end in itself. On the contrary, it is a starting point, a launching pad for world-wide cooperation among governments, parliamentarians, and individual citizens and organizations everywhere in behalf of 500 million of our fellow citizens who are disabled and who need us—and whom we need to make this a better and happier world in which to live.

MEMORANDUM PRESENTED BY THE AMERICAN GROUP AT INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

On December 16, 1976, the United Nations General Assembly designated 1981 as a special year in which the needs and aspirations of disabled persons the world over could be addressed. The purpose of the International Year is to promote full participation in society, to promote the achievement of living conditions equal to those of other persons in the country, and to assure disabled persons an equal share in the improvement of living

conditions resulting from social and economic development.

On February 6, 1981, President Reagan issued a proclamation stating that through partnerships of disabled and nondisabled persons of private sector and government and of national, state and community organizations, the United States can expand opportunities for disabled persons. These goals are being addressed both at the federal governmental level and by a nationwide organization of entities in the private sector.

A number of statutes have been enacted over the years to help develop services and ensure rights for disabled persons. It is the philosophy of the United States that disability may be ameliorated by early identification and training of young disabled children, by education of disabled youngsters along with nondisabled youngsters when possible, and by vocational training and employment opportunities for disabled adults. The participation in society of disabled persons of all ages offers disabled persons the fullest opportunity for a normal life and gives nondisabled persons the opportunity to personally know and work with disabled persons. Attitudes can be improved by experiences of learning and working together. In the United States the abilities of persons are stressed, and it is well known that for most disabled persons ability far outweighs disability. Efforts are being made to help expand the abilities of impaired individuals and to work to accommodate the disabilities of such individuals. Accommodations made for disabled persons include the accessibility of public buildings, the provision of interpreters for deaf persons and readers for blind persons, and a vast array of technological devices to assist individuals to hear, see, talk, walk, breathe, and otherwise function as normally as possible. Increasingly, disabled persons are participating in the educational, economic, and social life of the United States.

As a means of early identification of disability, low income children are screened for physical and mental deficiencies which could lead to disability if not corrected early. Pregnant women and young children are provided supplementary feeding, if needed, to prevent disability and promote optimal prenatal and early developmental growth.

A free, appropriate education is the right of all handicapped children in the United States. Disabled children are educated in the same setting as nondisabled children, insofar as this is possible, and special assistance and supportive services are provided to the disabled children to enable them to participate in the regular classrooms. Some severely disabled children must be provided their education in a special facility, but efforts are made to integrate such children into normal school activities as much as possible.

Vocational rehabilitation is provided to disabled persons who require training or special services to prepare themselves for employment. Under this program an individualized plan is prepared for each person to ensure that he or she receives all services necessary to allow the disabled individual to engage in productive activity. The services provided include physical and mental restoration, counseling, college instruction, training in sheltered workshops, transportation, and income maintenance. Many persons in the vocational rehabilitation program receive job training in private industry where such training frequently leads to a permanent job in the private sector. Severely dis-

abled persons who are not able to work are taught the skills necessary to allow them to live within the family or the community as independently as possible.

All programs which receive federal funds must serve disabled persons who would otherwise qualify for these services. Colleges and universities receiving federal funds cannot deny an education to disabled persons who otherwise qualify for entrance into the school. Other federal programs to which this requirement applies include health facilities, public housing, public transportation, and public recreation facilities.

Disabled persons who are unable to contribute toward their own support may qualify for a variety of benefits including medical services, subsidized housing, food stamps and income maintenance.

To prevent disability, a broad research program is underway which includes basic biomedical research, rehabilitation engineering research, and research which addresses the special educational needs of disabled children.

The National Council on the Handicapped has broad responsibility to review and evaluate policies, programs, and activities conducted by federal agencies. Members of the National Council on the Handicapped are representative of handicapped individuals, national organizations concerned with the handicapped, individuals engaged in research related to the handicapped, business concerns, and labor organizations. The Council makes recommendations respecting ways to improve research concerning handicapped individuals and ways to increase the effectiveness of service delivered to handicapped persons. The dissemination and utilization of research findings are also responsibilities of the National Council.

In addition to the governmental activity, the private sector is engaged in furthering the goals of the International Year of Disabled Persons. A broad coalition has been established which includes the corporate community, public interest groups, and state and local governmental groups. This organization, the United States Council on the International Year of Disabled Persons, is promoting programs to implement the following goals:

- Expanded educational opportunity;
- Improved access to housing, buildings, and transportation;
- Greater opportunity for employment;
- Greater participation in recreational, social, and cultural activities;
- Expanded and strengthened rehabilitation programs and facilities;
- Purposeful application of biomedical research aimed at conquering major disabling conditions;
- Reduction in the incidence of disability through accident and disease prevention;
- Increased application of technology to ameliorate the effects of disability; and
- Expanded international exchange of information and experience to benefit all disabled persons.

The U.S. Council has organized a community partnership program, a corporate partnership program, and the Council plans to take special national initiatives involving the public and private sector. The community partnership program is an effort to encourage communities to establish goals and programs. To date, 14,000 mayors and other chief elected officials and all governors have pledged cooperation. The corporate partnership program urges corporations to make a firm commitment to full participation of

disabled persons and to undertake special initiatives. National initiatives of the U.S. Council include activities in the areas of attitudes toward disability, biomedical research, technology, international exchange, and volunteerism.

A major activity of the U.S. Council is the corporate partnership program. Through joint programs with other interested groups such as voluntary and non-profit agencies, organizations of disabled and nondisabled persons, labor unions, and national, state and local governments, private corporations are making a significant contribution to the quality of life of the 35 million disabled persons in the United States. In this way, the United States hopes to demonstrate world corporate social responsibility and create entrepreneurial leadership in this important area of human concern. The following corporate initiatives are currently being undertaken in the United States:

Corporations are seeking to increase employment, including training and recruitment, of handicapped individuals. It is recognized that handicapped persons can be recruited for all levels of employment. Special success is occurring through employment of severely handicapped persons in the computer area, and some corporations have established home-based employment using computers for persons who are unable to travel to work.

Corporations are improving access to buildings and job sites. This increases employment opportunities for handicapped individuals and improves business by making commercial areas accessible to handicapped persons.

Corporations are undertaking programs to positively affect attitudes within the workplace and in the business world generally.

The corporate community is utilizing technology to lessen the effect of disability in the work environment. Devices, such as talking typewriters, reading machines, and broad use of computers are greatly increasing employment opportunities for disabled persons.

Corporations are working to reduce disability-causing accidents and diseases associated with the workplace.

The corporate community is participating in the community partnership program, a U.S. Council activity designed to increase knowledge of, and opportunities for, disabled persons at the community level.

Activities taking place at the community level to commemorate the International Year of Disabled Persons include television programs to increase positive attitudes regarding disabled persons, examination of retail stores to determine accessibility for disabled persons, sports events involving disabled and nondisabled persons, recruitment centers for disabled persons seeking employment, and awareness programs in public schools.

It is the hope of government and corporate leadership in the United States that the activities undertaken in the International Year of Disabled Persons can further the quality of life and the participation in society of disabled persons in the United States and around the world. It is hoped that the sharing of ideas and technology between countries will result in a more productive and satisfying life for all disabled persons.

Mr. Speaker, I have received word, just in the last few days, of the recent passing of the longtime Secretary General of the Interparliamentary Union, André de Blonay.

Mr. de Blonay was a most distinguished Swiss citizen who had a broad background in international organizations. Even before he came to head the Interparliamentary Union in 1953, I should point out that André de Blonay was a celebrated citizen of Switzerland coming from a Swiss family whose roots ran deep in the history of this great little country.

It was during André de Blonay's tenure that the membership of the IPU was expanded substantially to take in representatives from those many other nations whose parliamentary systems differ substantially from the parliaments of the western free world. While many may question the wisdom of this change in the membership rolls of the IPU, there can be no question but that the opportunities for contacts between the representatives of our country and other free world nations increased substantially when membership was granted to the Eastern bloc and other nations having single party parliaments or legislative bodies.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all who recall André de Blonay will attest to his skill as an administrator of this great international organization. He provided prestige, distinguished and experienced leadership, and was, himself, a most imposing and commanding personality.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I bespeak the sentiments of all of my colleagues, and particularly those of us who have had the opportunity to represent our Nation at meetings of the Interparliamentary Union, in expressing our respect and affection for André de Blonay. Let us also add our sympathy to the surviving members of his family.

Mr. Speaker, may I add these other unrelated comments regarding the recent Interparliamentary Union Conference held in Manila which is the subject of the special order which our colleague from Florida, Chairman of the House Delegation to the Spring Conference, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, has reserved. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues to the Manila conference know, I traveled to Mainland China after departing from Manila. While visiting in the People's Republic of China, I had occasion to visit with the Deputy Secretary of the People's National Congress and with a Vice Chairman of the Standing Committee of the People's National Congress. In these meetings in Peking, I urged these officials of the People's National Congress to consider affiliation with the IPU. Certainly, it would add to the interest and influence of the IPU if parliamentary representatives of the one billion citizens of the People's Republic of China were a part of this great international organization.

Mr. Speaker, without elaborating upon my meetings in the PRC, I wish,

merely, to observe that the relations between that country and ours, as evidenced by the words and actions of Chinese officials and citizens alike, are more cordial than at any time in recent history. There is an apparent attitude which permeates the citizenry of the People's Republic of China—an attitude of warmth and of friendship which evidences their strong desire for enhanced economic, political and social ties from which our respective nations and the entire world would seem destined to benefit. Mr. Speaker, based in large part on these observations and the favorable reaction to my initiatives during my conferences in Peking, I am hopeful that the People's Republic of China will affiliate with the IPU and that the delegates representing this great mainland area of Asia will join in forthcoming meetings of the IPU.

Mr. Speaker, finally, may I pay a special tribute to our delegation leader, Senator BOB STAFFORD of Vermont and to my colleagues, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida, Chairman of the House group and to Congressman ED DERWINSKI of Illinois and Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Vice Chairmen of our delegation, for their leadership during this important Spring Conference of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman from Illinois, who has been a long-time representative from the House to the Interparliamentary Union and is highly esteemed by the members from all the countries who attend those conferences, and who made a splendid record again this year.

MR. DE LA GARZA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

MR. DE LA GARZA. I want to add my commendation to the leadership of the gentleman from Florida that he gave us during all this session that we had in the Philippines, and I say, as a much younger Member, I want to commend him for his untiring effort in our behalf and on how diligently he worked every hour of the working session. I want to thank him also for giving me the honor of serving, of representing our country in the drafting session on the energy issue. This was to me very interesting and certainly quite a challenge. It was with great pride that we were able to have a resolution that was unanimously adopted by the conference, and again, I thank the gentleman for allowing me this privilege and commend him for the excellent leadership which he gives us when we attend these very important sessions.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to thank the very able gentleman from Texas, one of the outstanding members of our

delegation to Manila, for the splendid work he did on the Energy Committee. You may be sure that he had very difficult obstacles to overcome in that committee, where there were so many nations that came from the other part of the world and the other kind of philosophy from ours who were trying to keep us from getting adopted principles that we think make for peace and security in the world.

One of the strong efforts that the distinguished gentleman from Texas and we made was to try to get a declaration of commitment from all the nations, including the Soviet Union, that they would not interfere with the ownership of the oil reserves in their critical areas nor would they interfere with the transportation or accessibility of the oil ports to the ships of the world or the areas that wanted to obtain those supplies. But while we did not get all that we wanted, the gentleman from Texas, by his persistence and the excellence of his efforts, did get a commitment in there that the roots of transportation, the means of access to the oil reserves of the critical oil countries, would be available to all the countries of the world that wanted to purchase in those markets, a very significant recognition.

□ 1515

Let me add that one of the things that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLOY) and I were able to get done in that Committee on the Disabled was to get a resolution adopted which called upon the United Nations to establish a special agency, the function of which should be to serve the disabled people of the world.

We are hopeful, therefore, that what we did may have meaning in the lives of many disabled people all over the globe.

May I just add, Mr. Speaker, that we all returned with a warm gratitude in our hearts for the very gracious hospitality extended to our delegations and all those delegations attending the assembly by the distinguished President of the Philippines and his very able and lovely wife. We also are very much indebted to our Ambassador in the Philippines, Mr. Murphy and to his lovely wife for the gracious hospitality they extended to us and the invaluable assistance that the Ambassador and his lady and the members of the Embassy staff rendered to our delegation in performing our duties in respect to the conference.

So I think I can report with satisfaction, Mr. Speaker, that our delegation made an earnest effort to be worthy of the representation of this House and we hope that shall be the record of those who observed our contributions.

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the other Members who attended the spring meeting of the Interparliamentary

Union in Manila, the Philippines, in reporting our activities at this most important international conference.

It has been my impression, after attending numerous IPU meetings over the years, that U.S. relations abroad are very definitely benefited by the parliamentary contacts which IPU meetings facilitate. Those of us who have served as delegates to these meetings have interacted closely with parliamentarians who have gone on to direct their government's policies. Our relationship with them has continued to have an abiding influence on our respective nations' foreign policies.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the delegation from the House, the gentleman from Florida, CLAUDE PEPPER, for the outstanding job he did in leading our group in Manila. He deserves special praise for his negotiation skill in helping to shape a final resolution on the work of the United Nations in the International Year of the Disabled Persons. His expertise was a valuable asset to our delegation.

The strong leadership of Senator ROBERT STAFFORD, who was chairman of that body's delegation, was instrumental in promoting the U.S. position which became universally approved. As usual, he was a very active and effective participant.

We were successful in getting adopted a draft resolution endorsing the International Year of the Disabled Persons, in particular the disabled child. The purpose of this designation is to give special emphasis to promoting the full participation in society of the disabled person; to improve their living conditions equal to other persons in the country; and to provide for their aspirations and needs. Efforts to help expand the abilities of impaired individuals by education, vocational training, and employment opportunities for disabled adults were areas stressed in adopting this resolution.

Other issues that required our attention were arms control and disarmament, the world energy crisis, the implementation of the United Nations recommendations on decolonization, parliaments and ways of promoting human rights. We were successful in getting draft resolutions adopted condemning terrorist activities, the continued Soviet aggression in Afghanistan, and for the rights of peoples in non-self-governing territories. The IPU Council also considered requests for future agenda issues, and as with past years, the subject of the Mideast figured prominently.

One of the ongoing activities of the IPU is their continued investigations of the reported violations of the rights of parliamentarians. At a special Council meeting which I attended, a status report of the ongoing investigations was presented to the Council detailing the situation with respect to

120 parliamentarians from Ethiopia, who have been arrested without charges and punished without trial.

The IPU is now pressing the Ethiopian authorities for information on these individuals. This IPU action on behalf of the detained Ethiopian parliamentarians has had my full support and I will be looking for progress reports, hopefully, of the release of these parliamentarians.

In debate, in long hours of negotiation, and in many dialogs with parliamentarians from many other national and ideological perspectives, our delegates, in my view, did an outstanding service in communicating American and congressional views on important international matters. Much was also learned on how other nations view U.S. policies as a result of the great debating skill exhibited by members of the U.S. delegation.

There are several parliamentary associations where representatives meet to share ideas and views and seek common directions and solutions. But the IPU is the oldest and largest and the only parliamentary association where representatives from the United States and from virtually all the Eastern bloc nations can meet. It is also a unique opportunity for north-south dialog between the developed and developing countries.

I again commend the gentleman (Mr. PEPPER) and I also commend all those who took part in the work of the Interparliamentary Union. I believe this is an extremely important activity in which Members of this body participate. Working with our counterparts from the over 94 countries who are now members of the IPU is an invaluable form of communication.●

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my esteemed colleague Representative CLAUDE PEPPER today as he reports on the spring meeting in Manila of the Interparliamentary Union. As a member of the U.S. delegation to that meeting I was privileged to work closely with Representative PEPPER who was the chairman of the delegation from the House of Representatives.

I want to call particular attention to the fine work done by our colleague Representative DAVID BOWEN who addressed the Conference about non-self-governing territories on April 22. His statement did an outstanding job of clarifying American responses to the needs of such areas and did much to reinforce the image that this Nation is a friend to developing nations.

It was my pleasure and privilege to also address the Conference on this same subject. As a resident of a U.S. territory, I have had a long experience with this issue. We on Guam are justly proud of our many years of association with this Nation and as Representative BOWEN said: "Guam is another ex-

ample of the exercise of a mode of free association chosen instead of sovereign independence."

The work of the Conference covered many other subjects and it is my belief that the work done there by the American delegation was a credit to this country and to the Congress of the United States.

It is important that this exercise in communications between legislators from all nations continue. We have much to learn from each other and I believe that meetings such as that which took place in Manila provide the background for cooperation between this body and the legislatures of other countries in the future.

Congressman PEPPER did an outstanding job as chairman of our delegation from the House and I also congratulate my other colleagues from the House and Senators ROBERT STAFFORD, HOWARD CANNON, and QUENTIN BURDICK for their significant contributions at the Manila Conference. Thank you. ●

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

VIVE LA FRANCE!

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we hear constantly that there is a wave of conservatism sweeping the world, bringing with it the economic structure of the 19th century. We are told that the election of Ronald Reagan is proof that Margaret Thatcher was no fluke, that the industrial world is ready to march back to the happy days when governments catered only to the needs of the rich, leaving everyone else to fend for themselves. The latter-day social Darwinists see triumph in their grasp.

But looking at the world in a different way, we see that they may very well be wrong.

France, so often the leader in the world, has done anything but move to the right. In fact, France has just thrown out a rightwing that has been in power since 1938. The people of France have just spoken. They are tired of unemployment, tired of economic repression, and tired of the non-answers of the right. They want opportunities to work, they want economic opportunity, they want social justice.

And in Great Britain, so often the last to lead, Margaret Thatcher can go nowhere without being greeted by bitterly unhappy Britons. London has been besieged by unprecedented demonstrations by people who are unemployed as a result of her economic policies. Britons have seen Reaganomics and lived with it, and they do not think it works. They would like to see a solution to their problems, and they do not see it in a bigger dose of the British version of Stockman's poison.

Even in Germany, that bastion of conservatism, Helmut Schmidt sees his party losing in by-elections. Germans may fear inflation more than the devil, but that does not mean they embrace the prescriptions of Herr Schmidt, whose policies may please bankers, but surely have brought pain and more displeasure than even placid Germans are willing to endure.

No, we are not seeing a tilting of the globe to the right; France has demonstrated that.

If a victory by the left in France has taken place, as indeed it has, there are few here in the United States who understand and appreciate just how long the odds were against it. After all, in France, the press is controlled. It is the government that runs the television services there, and the government names its own people to run the networks. It is as if Ronald Reagan had the power to name the president of ABC, CBS, and NBC. The incumbent right wing government of France has had decades to use the media as its own propaganda agent, but that has not been enough to keep the right in power.

And it is not only the electronic media that the French Government influences. Agence France-Presse, the French version of AP and UPI, gets 70 percent of its operating money from the Government. You can imagine that when the Presidential Palace frowns, the wire service of France takes due note and acts accordingly.

With all that, and much, much more going for it, the right wing government of France lost.

The people of France sent a message: They want jobs and justice.

The people of Great Britain have been saying the same thing: they want jobs and justice.

The people of Germany have been saying the same thing: they want jobs and justice.

We here in America have not been told much of this, perhaps because we are preoccupied with our own problems. But we should be watching and listening, because in the policies and experiences of other countries we can see our own future foreshadowed.

The Giscard government of France was hellbent on nuclear power, just as the Reagan government is. Mitterand said that he would moderate that all-out drive.

The Giscard government put economic stability above all else, at the cost of record unemployment. The people of France have said that 1.6 million unemployed Frenchmen is too many.

The Giscard government followed a cavalier foreign policy. The people of France have said that they want a government that respects human rights, does not underwrite and prop up tinpot despots in former French possessions in Africa, and is staunchly anti-Communist. That is another reason why they elected Mr. Mitterand.

In other words, all of the things that are being advanced as our own policies have been tried in France. They did not work, and the people of that country have rejected them.

We have in our history gained much from our relatives across the sea. It was France that supported our own revolution—with money, with ships, with ideas, and with what we would today call military advisers. Had it not been for French support, our independence might never have been won—and that is a debt we ought to acknowledge.

In more recent years we have been inclined to castigate France for moving out of the NATO alliance. And yet if we but reflected on it, perhaps we should be grateful for that as well.

We took upon ourselves the task of defending Europe after World War II. We still spend a vast amount of our defense budget in building forces and maintaining forces on the continent—even though Germany and others have the economic strength to carry their own load. And why do we do this? We do it because we have never attempted to devise a policy to fit the realities of the postwar world. We have simply temporized, tinkered, and never moved an inch toward realistic policies.

France has said they will carry their own load. They will be responsible for themselves. Perhaps it is because they know NATO is anything but a grand alliance; perhaps they know that the shield is cardboard. In any case, we should seek to learn what it is we can do in a truly cooperative spirit with Europe—and it may well be NATO is not the way that can be done. Maybe now, 40 years later, we should again look at Europe as independent, not subordinate. After all, Europe's economic power is equal to our own.

□ 1530

It was France that led the way in pointing to the unreality of the postwar monetary structure. France insisted on making the United States make good its promises to redeem the dollar in gold—not because of the gold, but because of the fact that the monetary structure represented by that

gold redemption promise was untenable. We fumed and we condemned DeGaulle, but in the end, Nixon killed the Bretton Woods monetary agreement, long years after France saw the writing on the wall, and so impolitely asked us to read it.

So here we are today, launching Reaganomics on the promise that it is the only right thing to do. Yet if we but look at the world, we will see that others are telling us, the right wing is the wrong wing. Vive la France.

BEN PLUCKNETT SETS DISCUS AND SHOTPUT RECORD

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House, and of all Americans, the extraordinary achievements of Ben Plucknett, whose parents, Mr. and Mrs. Glenn Plucknett of Sikeston, Mo., live in my district. On May 16, 1981, Ben broke the world record in the discus throw at a world class track meet in southern California.

Plucknett, who represented the Southern California Striders Track Club, set this world record at the 40th annual California relays at Modesto. He tossed the discus a record 233 feet 7 inches in his final throw of the day. His toss broke the previous world record of 233 feet 5 inches, set by Wolfgang Schmidt of East Germany.

Not only did Plucknett break a world record at the meet, but 4 hours after his world record-breaking toss, he stepped into the shotput ring and put the shot a personal record of 67 feet 7 inches. The combination of the two records is thought to be the best combined performance by an athlete in history.

Plucknett, a native of Nebraska, was a two-time Big Eight Conference champion while a student at the University of Missouri-Columbia and was an all-American while at the University in 1976.

I am sure that all Americans join me in sending the heartiest congratulations to Ben Plucknett and his family for his truly extraordinary achievements.

FREEDOM IS PRICELESS

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

● Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, we have just observed another Memorial Day in which we paid our respects to those who have given so much to our great Nation. I, along with many Members of this body, gave speeches on Memorial Day in which we took note of the sacrifices that have been made in all

America's wars that we might enjoy the freedoms we have today. Especially, I think it is good that we recognize the families of America who have given up loved ones—those who have made the supreme sacrifice for the love of their country.

Patriotism is not dead. We have seen vivid examples in the last year or two of how Americans unite for the good of the Nation at crucial times. We may squabble among ourselves, but let no outsider trod on the United States of America. That is when we come together. We did it when our hostages were taken by Iran. And again, when they came home, there was a great outpouring of love and patriotism from a united nation.

There are still those who are willing to fight and die for America, like those who went voluntarily to try to free our hostages in Iran. Eight of them gave their lives in this cause.

Yes, Memorial Day is a good time to honor those who have given so much for our Nation. We recognize and pay our respects to the living veterans as well as the dead. The veterans of all our wars should be given due honor and this is especially true of our Vietnam-era veterans since this conflict was so recent in our history.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a poem written by Homer S. Jackson, principal of Haney Vocational Technical Center in Panama City, Fla. This poem was recited at a Memorial Day ceremony on May 25, 1981.

FREEDOM IS PRICELESS

Everybody talks about Freedom
But Freedom is a priceless thing,
It brings great happiness
And makes the birds sing.
Freedom comes to many
Through blood, sweat, and tears,
But there is everlasting joy
Cause Freedom lasts throughout the years.

Some men take Freedom lightly
Others take it with great concern,
But if you don't appreciate Freedom
You have much to learn.

There is great joy in resting now
In the places of your choice,
Think how you were unshakable
So now you have a voice.

Think about those before you
Who had no kind of say,
They worked from morn to sunset
From light till the close of day.

They had to go to the back woods
To get a secret word to pray,
Hell and damnation followed them
Each and every day.

Now let us look at Freedom
It's more than a gift to stay,
It is a sign of happiness
That comes to those who obey.

Freedom goes beyond the sunset
It outdistances the rain,
Freedom brings peace of mind
With it woes and stain.

Some came today to celebrate
Others have come to commemorate,
But if you just look around
And thank God for Freedom you've found.

So organize your good thoughts

And spread the news everywhere,
Let the world know you are concerned
And that you live each day above fear.

Let them see you moving ahead
Through happiness and sad times,
But remind each and everyone
That this Freedom is mine.

Say to those who don't know
And say to your fellowman,
That without this great Freedom
America could not stand.●

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

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

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, June 2 marks a stirring event in the rich history of Italy. For on that day in 1946, the great Italian people gave a resounding vote of confidence for political democracy.

It was 35 years ago on this day that the Italian people voted in a plebiscite to end their constitutional monarchy and establish a republic. By replacing the Italian monarchy with a republican form of government, Italy began her return to the cultural and political prominence she had long enjoyed.

Eleven days after the referendum, King Umberto II left Italy. With the aid of the Marshall plan, the determined and ingenious Italian people launched upon a great period of economic, political, and social progress. In addition to outstanding postwar achievements on the domestic scene, Italy also placed herself in the vanguard of European integration. Moreover, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Italy has been and continues to be a stalwart and loyal Western ally.

The beautiful land of Italy, washed by the blue waves of the Mediterranean and cradled within the Alps, has boasted of an advanced civilization for thousands upon thousands of years. It may be truly said that Italy constitutes a mosaic of human history. She is a major source of Western culture—her legal system is a model for the West, her language is the tongue of music, and her Renaissance stands as one of mankind's greatest achievements.

I take this opportunity to extend my greetings and best wishes to the people of the Italian Republic, as well as to the Italian Americans in my own 11th Congressional District of Illinois and throughout our country who are joining in this 35th anniversary observance.

Mr. Speaker, an article on the restoration of Italy's art treasures from the news magazine *Panorama* of Milan follows as it appeared in the June 1981 edition of the *World Press Review*:

The eyes of experts all over the world are fixed on him, but Prof. Gianluigi Colalucci seems unbothered. Tireless and precise to a millimeter, since last June Colalucci has borne the most important responsibility of his life: to return all the paintings in the Sistine Chapel to their ancient splendor.

Flanked by assistants, Colalucci has a twelve-year plan just for the work on Michelangelo's "Universal Judgement." A movie crew will record each step while laboratory technicians proceed with physical and chemical analysis.

As director of restoration for the Vatican museums, Colalucci is satisfied with the work so far. "The thrill of seeing the brilliant colors laid down by Michelangelo's own hand is enormous. Remember that Buonarroti took four years to execute the dome and seven for the 'Judgement,'" he notes. "Since then there have been centuries of protective treatments, nearly always with a glue base. There are coats of glue that are no longer used and that obscure the original colors."

To bring Michelangelo's tones back to life, the magicians of restoration now have at their disposal a miraculous solvent called AB 57, a honeylike material made of sodium bases, fungicides, and other substances. To cancel out the injuries of time the workers spread a light film over the painting, let it stand twenty-four hours, and then repeat the process.

Interest in the Sistine restoration is not due only to technical advances. Historians of art have made no official comment, but it is whispered that once the work is completed there will be a major new discovery in Michelangelo's painting.

While the ills of the Vatican masterpiece are being cured, another of the world's famous invalids has begun a time of healing: Leonardo da Vinci's "Last Supper." The work is in the hands of Pinin Brambilla Barisano, who works with a surgeon's microscope to cure a painting in critical condition. "Besides the layers of repainting since 1700 there are also scales of color peeling and dropping off," she notes. "And the whole work also seems shrouded in a gray mist due to humidity and pollution."

Nevertheless the result so far is breathtaking. The work has already saved Saint Simon and the halo above him. "We're counting on recovering half of Leonardo's painting by next year," says Carlo Bertelli, art superintendent of Milan. "So far the work has cost very little: \$47,000 to \$57,000. But Rome has been silent about further funding."

Other masterpieces are also under the surgeon's scalpel. Bronze experts are at work on the horses of St. Mark's at Venice and on the statue of Marcus Aurelius in Rome, where both horse and rider are stricken with a cancer caused by pollution. Concerned parties have suggested an underground museum to save the ancient equestrian statue.

Also seriously ill are the marble works of the Roman Forum, the arches and columns of the city's historic center. X-rays of Giotto's campanile in Florence have revealed fearful deterioration of the structure's iron supports. "It will take a restoration effort of at least two years," say Florentine experts. Another patient is the Basilica of St. Francis of Assisi, where the frescoes of Giotto have not been touched.

From north to south monuments are falling, columns are tottering, paintings and colors are fading away, never to be seen again. No more than 300 people travel the

peninsula stopping leaks and remedying past mistreatment. With degrees from Rome's Central Institute of Restoration or Florence's Fortezza da Basso, the restorers are nearly all private citizens, often organized in consortia or small cooperatives. Among them are experts in metal, mosaics, ceramics, architecture, and solvents.

It is a patrol flanked and coordinated by the profession's masters in Rome. At the Central Institute of Restoration, just twenty-one professors either offer advice or intervene directly in the more difficult cases. Above all they pioneer new methods and teach the profession.

Extremely rigorous—three years of courses plus an optional year of specialization—the Roman school furnishes a dozen restorationists every year. There are also graduates from Florence and those from semi-secret private courses like one run by the Christian Workers' Society of Brescia (a 1939 law bars the proliferation of private schools).

"The problem is not with the low number of restorationists," the Central Institute's directors say. "We lack a global intervention policy. This is why all the restoration work is late. The restorationists arrive to plug up a frightful, chronic emergency. Decades of insensibility cannot be canceled with miracles." ●

REMARKS OF STUART E. EIZENSTAT BEFORE DUKE UNIVERSITY FORUM ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATIONS

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, recently, Stuart E. Eizenstat, former domestic policy adviser to President Carter, offered some thoughts on revisions that might be made in the Presidential nominating process before the Duke University Forum on Presidential Nominations on May 11, 1981, in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Eizenstat's observations are most interesting and, among other things, focus on the need to involve more participation by elected officials within the parties. I commend Mr. Eizenstat's views to the consideration of my colleagues.

Mr. Eizenstat's remarks follow:

There are two essential changes which I believe should be made in the nomination process for Presidential candidates: a) reduce the duration of caucuses and primaries; and b) increase the importance of the political parties and the elected officials of the parties in the selection.

Since 1972, there has been a growing proliferation of primaries. Now, more than one-half of the States have them. The caucuses and primaries now stretch from January to June, stretching the resources of candidates and the patience of voters.

It is no accident that our last three elected Presidents—Nixon, Carter, and Reagan—all held no elected public office when they were nominated and later elected. Only non-office-holders have the time required to build organizations in all of the primary States and to make themselves known by the voters in those States. Those elected officials with significant responsibilities have

the greatest difficulty competing in such a system—although this stature gives them significant qualification for the job of President which they seek.

Moreover, individual primaries, like the one in New Hampshire, take on a role of exaggerated importance which fails to reflect the nation's diversity on its views. These take on a life of their own and have too great an influence on later primaries.

I do not believe one national primary is the answer to these problems. Such a system would put an even greater premium on full-time campaigning, would be extraordinarily costly to candidates, would make it difficult for lesser-known, but qualified candidates to gain stature and financial backing from early victories, would further eviscerate State and local parties which are badly in need of strengthening, and would ignore regional and local issues that often test a candidate's ability to balance regional issues against the national interest.

I would require that the primaries and caucuses be held within a four-month period so that the campaigns are somewhat shortened.

I would endorse the plans of Congressmen Morris Udall and John Ashbrook that all primaries must fall on the first Tuesday of each month from March to June, with States having their choice of date. I do not think it wise to require that each of these be a regional primary, since this would tend to lead to regional favorite sons, and would give too much emphasis to regional issues over national issues. Moreover, such a set-up might guarantee one region, with less populous States, having no effective voice in the selection process, if it followed the regional primary of the industrial Northeast or Midwest.

Where primaries are employed, they should not be "open" primaries, where voters can vote even if they are independents or members of another Party, as in Wisconsin. A recent Supreme Court decision permits the Republican and Democratic Parties to keep the primaries available only to voters with that Party identification. This power should be utilized, to preclude members of one Party from crossing over and trying to influence the primaries of another Party.

Of even greater importance than these modifications, is to find ways to strengthen the influence of elected officials and party organizations in the nomination of Presidential candidates.

Parties at all levels have been debilitated by the false glorification of independence from Party labels, unrestricted funding by independent organizations (like the National Conservative Political Action Committee), primaries themselves, the enormous impact of television, the diminished role of elected and Party officials due to the changes of the past decade, and the rise of single issue groups.

Parties are important harmonizers in our society of disparate views. They can also serve as the umbrella under which elected officials from a Party and their Party's Presidential candidate, can have an earlier and closer identification.

I do not think it practical in our heterogeneous nation to scrap our Constitution and try to develop a parliamentary form of government—despite the fact that with a stable ruling party this is the most efficient form of democracy. But, I do think it is important to tie our Congressman and President more closely together.

In 1976 and 1980, Democratic Congressmen and Senators had little hand in selecting their Party's nominee, Jimmy Carter, and thus felt less of a stake in his Presidency. He, in turn, owed them little in return. In 1980, at the Democratic Convention, only 45 of the 3,331 delegates were Congressmen and Senators.

While in 1976, it might have been somewhat more difficult for Jimmy Carter to secure the Democratic nomination if elected and Party officials had played a greater role, it would have made it easier for him to govern had they played a more significant part in securing his nomination.

Likewise, while there was in 1980 a set-aside for State organizations to select Party officials to serve as delegates, it was a small one indeed. We cannot expect to rebuild State and local parties unless we provide some incentives for Party participation. Attendance at a national Convention provides such an attraction.

Moreover, exclusion of Party and elected officials has made the Party Platform one which often represents the sum total of the maximum demands of every group which participates in the Convention. No wonder that Platforms are as ignored as they are by Members of Congress, when they have had no role in developing them. I believe Platforms are important, having been one of the principal authors of the 1976 and 1980 Democratic Party Platforms. To assure they are more meaningful and are taken more seriously, I suggest again that elected and Party officials be given a greater hand in drafting them.

None of the changes I propose suggest abolishing primaries and closing the nomination process. I believe, however, that we should do more to mix the advantages of participatory democracy through the primaries with changes to enhance the opportunity for those who must ultimately govern with a President to have a stake in his nomination—and for him to have some obligation to them in turn.

I would have the Parties, certainly the Democratic Party, change its rules to require that every Democratic Congressman, Senator, and Governor be automatically a full voting delegate to both the Midterm and the National Convention. They should not have to run against their own constituents for such a position.

They also should be a greater percentage of the total number of delegates.

Primaries should select no more than 60 percent of the delegates to the Convention. I do believe these delegates should be bound through the first ballot—or the voice of the majority in the State primary would be nullified. We should not play fast and loose with the primary results or we will add to the cynicism which already surrounds the nomination process. The other 40 percent should come from the elected officials and from people selected by the State Party organization. These people should go unpledged and uncommitted to any particular candidate, to maximize their influence.

Elected officials and Party officials should also participate in drafting the Party Platform. Greater Congressional input here will instill a greater sense of balance in the Platform and a greater sense of Congressional responsibility to implement it.

To further strengthen our political parties, I would suggest Congress remove all limits in giving through National Committees, so that they can become dispensers of more campaign financing vis-a-vis political action committees than is now the case.

Caps should be enacted on the maximum contribution which candidates can receive from political action committees, individually or cumulatively.

These modifications will help add cohesion to a fragmented and chaotic nomination process.

I commend President Terry Sanford and Duke University for its interest in helping to modify a system badly in need of change.●

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION ACT OF 1981

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. Brown) is recognized for 20 minutes.

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, throughout the 96th Congress and continuing into the 97th Congress, the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology has been studying the critical issues of innovation and productivity. Hearings have covered patent policy, university-industry relations, Federal laboratory utilization, the Government's role in industrial innovation high-technology small business, a focusing point for technology through a foundation, and several other areas. In the United States private enterprise is the sector of society primarily responsible for providing jobs, goods, and services. I believe this is appropriate and the Government should not attempt to take over this responsibility. Government, however, must provide an environment in which private enterprise can flourish in both the short and long term. If needs for essential goods and services are not being met by private enterprise, the Federal Government should take steps to remove barriers to action. The subcommittee's study has made it clear that current efforts of the Federal Government to facilitate technology development are fragmented and too small to provide a focus for a national economy in which innovation can thrive.

Today, I am introducing the National Technology Foundation Act of 1981, a bill designed to correct many of the problems we have found. The bill would establish a National Technology Foundation to facilitate technology advancement and innovative utilization for the national welfare. It is a revised version of H.R. 6910 introduced in the 96th Congress and incorporates valuable suggestions received through direct communications and 5 days of hearings held on the bill in September 1980. Joining me as cosponsors of this bill are the current chairman of the subcommittee, DOUG WALGREN, and HAROLD HOLLENBECK, ALLEN ERTEL, WES WATKINS, JOHN SEIBERLING, and MERV DYMALLY.

Responsibility for technology-related programs is now scattered throughout the Federal Government. The various mission agencies—Department of

Defense, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Energy, and so forth—each support technology development related to their mission. The National Science Foundation and the Department of Commerce have components directed at technology and innovation, but these are minor portions of the budgets of those agencies and are often treated as stepchildren by those agencies. Recent budget cuts have made this situation even more true.

In considering how the Federal Government can most effectively organize itself to support technology for the national welfare, one extreme is to leave programs scattered but to make each the best possible. The other extreme would be to consolidate all science and technology activities of the Federal Government in a single Department of Science and Technology; an idea that received considerable attention in the midseventies during consideration of the bill that became the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976. The idea of a Department was not adopted at the same time because of compelling arguments that most science and technology activities should be kept closely tied to the missions which they support—defense, energy, space, health, and so forth, and hence should be kept as integral parts of the agencies which pursue those missions. The National Technology Foundation bill represents an intermediate position. It would consolidate technology-related activities which are not now closely tied to a specific agency mission and would insure that the Federal Government will assume a coordinating role among additional responsibilities for technology planning, advancement, and transfer to utilization which have heretofore not been adequately discharged by any sector of society.

The programs which this bill would consolidate in a single agency might, in theory, be adequately supported in their current homes, the Department of Commerce and the National Science Foundation. This has not been the case. Support has been modest at best and even at their best they still suffer the fractionation of being in several agencies. I am reserving judgment on which course of action is best, consolidation in a new agency or strengthening in existing agencies. The bill to establish a National Technology Foundation is a vehicle by which we can continue to focus the discussion of alternatives. If the Department of Commerce and the Science Foundation are unable to strengthen and broaden their current programs, the National Technology Foundation may emerge as the only feasible alternative.

At hearings held in September 1980 the major focus of testimony centered

on whether or not it would be in our Nation's best interests to create a new autonomous agency or whether existing institutions were sufficient to resolve the problems associated with technology and innovation. The administration spokesmen testified to their position that existing programs were capable of promoting applied research and development. A few other witnesses testified that if given more resources they thought existing departments or agencies could be flexible enough to address these issues. However, there was strong sentiment expressed by most of the nonadministration experts that existing institutions were unable to deal with the technology innovation and development issues in the coordinated manner that was needed. There were differences expressed amongst this group with some suggesting a narrower focus of only the engineering portion while others suggested an even broader scope. Many also addressed specific details of functions and composition while generally concurring that a void existed which the National Technology Foundation would fill.

WHY A NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION

The population of the world is growing inexorably while its resources are inexorably being consumed. It does not take a mathematician to determine that per capita consumption in the future cannot match the per capita consumption of an average American today if technology does not dramatically improve. Only if there are continual major improvements in technology can the world provide for its inhabitants. By improved technology I mean not only the development of hardware but also the better organization of society to assist in the efficient use of technology, the Foundation would support development of the requisite knowledge base, the resources of high-quality manpower, high-technology small business, the promotion of technology transfer for appropriate civilian utilization and stimulation for entry into the stream of commerce, the establishment of technological standards, and the long-range planning and forecasting needed for each of these areas. In short, the Foundation would be a focal point for all that technology embodies.

While the U.S. Government has adopted a largely *laissez faire* attitude toward international trade in high-technology items—other than military hardware—governments in other countries—most notably Japan—have planned and provided a national atmosphere in which both technology development and the export of high-technology products are carefully nurtured. These other countries have often been highly successful in their efforts. We are buying Sonys, Volkswagens, Datsuns, and Seikos. The international balance of trade has been

unfavorable to the United States for several years. It is likely that without a coherent Federal policy of technology development and promotion the United States will not be able to compete effectively in future world trade. The National Technology Foundation would provide a focus for one of the two needs, technology development and movement into the stream of commerce. The other needs, assistance for exports, should be provided by an expanded and reoriented Department of Commerce and Trade, as other legislators have recommended—for example, Senator ROHR in his bill S. 970.

The United States is faced with seemingly uncontrollable inflation. By finding improved ways to produce and deliver goods and services—and this is the meaning of technological progress—we can make a significant contribution to the efforts to control inflation. The National Technology Foundation would contribute to that process.

High-technology industries have been responsible for the creation of a higher share of new jobs than low-technology industries, and the development of new technologies promises fuller national employment.

The profession that takes knowledge and converts it into the design of products and processes is engineering. Engineers take science and turn it into technology. Heretofore there has been inadequate recognition of past and potential contributions of engineers. In the Federal Government, engineering has been overshadowed by science. In research support, engineering receives less than 10 percent of the budget of the National Science Foundation. The National Academy of Engineering is subordinate to the National Academy of Sciences. Moreover, there is a shortage of engineers in the country today at all levels of training, including a shortage of the most educated, who will be needed to train future generations. Among other things, the National Technology Foundation would recognize the importance of engineering and help harness its potential.

THE SPECIFIC NEEDS ADDRESSED BY THE NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION

Links between the generation of knowledge and its use need to be strengthened. The National Technology Foundation would help tie science to useful applications. This would be accomplished by several means. First, extramural grants and contracts would be provided to researchers and technologists in areas of science and technology showing promise for useful results. Second, it would disseminate scientific and technical information, and third, it would have, as an integral part, its own intramural science and technology laboratory which already exists.

The United States needs to insure that an adequate supply of technologi-

cal manpower, training or educational institutions, facilities, and equipment is available to it. This country has never had a scientific and technological manpower policy to guide where Federal funds would be best used. As a result the Federal Government has funded the training of too many in some areas and not enough in others. This is a national planning failure that ought to be corrected. The National Technology Foundation would do that.

The bill provides for the continuation and establishment of a new type of technology institution called centers for industrial technology. These centers would join industry and universities in cooperative technology activities including generic research—research on technology of use to many industries, such as welding or micro-fabrication—and the training of individuals in technology innovation. The 96th Congress passed, and the President signed, legislation for such centers as part of the Stevenson-Wydler Innovation Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-480). In this bill they are transferred to the National Technology Foundation because I consider these centers to be only one part of a broader focus as expressed by the Foundation.

In order to make sensible decisions about technology and society, there is a need in all sectors of society to understand the workings of technology development, of technology management, and of the interactions of technology with society. The National Technology Foundation would analyze the workings of technology in modern society. It would formulate policies based on these analyses, both for its own operations and for the benefit of other parts of the Federal Government and society as a whole. This function was also included in Public Law 96-480 and again is considered as one part of the broader responsibilities of the Foundation.

Technology, in the sense I am using it, includes not only what comes immediately to mind—machinery, electronics, chemicals, and so forth—but also the structure and management of the human organizations of our society. The Foundation would study technology policy in this broader sense.

The National Technology Foundation would foster high-technology small business. The past performance and the potential of small business are tremendous in high technology. We need more Silicon Valleys and Route 128's, and we need to encourage them in all areas of the country.

State and local governments are a large sector of the national economy. They should be as efficient and productive as possible and need assistance to become so. The National Technology Foundation would encourage and

assist State and local governments to be more productive and make better use of science and technology in their operations and decisionmaking as well as offer assistance to any statewide organized technology distribution network.

The inadequacy of the Nation's position in engineering has already been cited. This inadequacy needs to be corrected. The National Technology Foundation would work to see that the Nation has an appropriate supply of engineers. In addition it would provide support for fundamental engineering studies. The bill would provide that the National Technology Foundation would bear primary responsibility for nominating award winners for the National Technology Medal, an award established by Public Law 96-480.

We are living in a time of rapid change. Degrees of change that once took a century now come about in a decade. The Nation needs to look down the road and anticipate better what tomorrow will bring. The principal agency of change is technology. The National Technology Foundation would identify emerging national problems and support research and development of solutions to those problems.

The Nation needs to provide incentives for development of innovations, and the Nation needs standards of measurement and product performance or design to permit the efficient flow of commerce. The National Technology Foundation would provide for these needs.

Many, but not all, of the needs mentioned above are already being addressed by Federal programs. For example, the Patent Office provides incentives for innovation, and the National Bureau of Standards provides standards. None of the needs are being met with complete adequacy. There is a tremendous need, moreover, for such existing programs as there are to be coordinated more fully for most effective utility. One of the primary accomplishments of establishing a National Technology Foundation with strong centralized focus would be to meet the need for coordination.

DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

The National Technology Foundation Act of 1981 establishes the Foundation as an independent agency in the Federal Government.

STRUCTURE OF THE FOUNDATION

The Foundation would have eight main branches, as follows.

First, the Office of Small Business. This Office would serve as the focus of the Foundation's small business activities. It would carry out the small business innovation program that would be transferred to it from the National Science Foundation. This program provides funding for the research and development phases of new technology small business and links small

business with venture capital for the production phase. The program has been very well received in the small business community and is ripe for expansion. The National Technology Foundation would have the authority to operate other types of programs for the development of high-technology small business, as well. Other functions of the Office of Small Business would be to foster communication between scientific and technological agencies of the Federal Government and the small business community, assist high-technology small businesses in dealing with the Federal Government, and recommend policies enabling the Nation to benefit more from high-technology small businesses.

Second, the Office of Institutional and Manpower Development. This Office would collect and analyze information on technological manpower, providing quantitative manpower need projections, and would provide for adequate training and educational institutions for technological manpower to meet the needs. The Foundation would provide support as necessary directly to individuals to obtain training, provide support to existing institutions—such as schools of engineering—support the development of new curricula or training programs, encourage the exchange of professional personnel between academia and industry, and support with funding—or if need be operate—new kinds of institutions—for example, the Centers for Industrial Technology authorized by Public Law 96-480, Federal responsibility for which is transferred by the bill.

Third, the Office of Technology Policy and Analysis. This Office would conduct technology assessments, develop indicators of the health of technology on the economy and vice versa—including foreign trade matters—study the impacts of policies on technology, identify emerging problems, and make recommendations for steps with the potential for advancing technological innovation. In short, this Office would be the brain trust of the Foundation. The National Science Foundation's Innovation Processes Research Section would be transferred to this Office to form the nucleus of its activities.

Fourth, the Office of Intergovernmental Technology. This Office would facilitate the integration of scientific and technological resources into the policy formulation, management support, and program operations of State and local governments. The intergovernmental programs of the National Science Foundation and the Center for Utilization of Federal Technology of the Department of Commerce would be transferred and serve as the nucleus of this Office.

Fifth, the Office of Engineering. This Office would support, by extra-

mural grants and contracts, fundamental research in all engineering disciplines and applied research not adequately supported from other sources. A major portion of the National Science Foundation's engineering directorate would be transferred to the Office of Engineering and would constitute the initial program of the Office.

Sixth, the Office of National Programs. In conjunction with the Office of Technology Policy and Analysis, this Office would identify emerging national problems—for example, novel ways of producing materials—and support basic and applied research leading to their solution. It would also support applied research and development in focused areas of national concern not adequately supported by other agencies—for example, earthquake hazards reduction. Specific problem focused programs of the National Science Foundation's engineering directorate would be transferred to form the core program of the Office initially.

Seventh, the National Bureau of Standards. The Bureau would be transferred intact from the Department of Commerce to the National Technology Foundation and function as the Foundation's intramural science and technology laboratory. It would continue in its current missions—maintaining measurement standards, performing basic research related to standards, serving as a laboratory for other Federal agencies, and so forth. It would also assist other activities of the Foundation, as determined by the Director of the Foundation. The act gives authority to the Foundation to support U.S. interests in international voluntary standardization activities, which is not adequate under existing law. The Bureau would be the proper branch of the Foundation to exercise that authority. Whether international activity would be undertaken by Federal employees or by representatives of private voluntary standards organizations with Federal funds is a matter deserving further consideration.

Eighth, the Patent and Trademark Office and National Technical Information Service. These two agencies would be transferred from the Department of Commerce to the National Technology Foundation and administered as a single branch of the Foundation. Both agencies deal with the classification and dissemination of scientific and technical information and closer coordination would provide improved service. The Patent and Trademark Office has had a particularly hard time in the Department of Commerce and hearings have been held regarding the advisability of making this office an independent agency. Because the purpose of the office is the promote technology, it would be more ap-

propriate to incorporate it in a larger entity devoted to the same purpose and having additional functions.

MANAGEMENT OF THE FOUNDATION

The Foundation would have a Director, a Deputy Director, and eight Assistant Directors—one for each branch. It would also have a National Technology Board.

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY BOARD

The Board would have 24 members and would have powers over the National Technology Foundation similar to those the National Science Board has over the National Science Foundation. Members would be Presidential appointees and would be selected from people eminent in a wide variety of fields. It would be expected that nominations for the Board would be solicited widely, including from all member societies of the American Association of Engineering Societies.

The intent of having a Board is to insure that the community of those who will be affected by the Foundation will have a say in the operation of the Foundation. There is considerable risk in any Federal agency either that it will be "captured" by a narrow segment of its potential community or that it will operate solely under motivations and incentives internal to the Federal Government, thus failing in either event to serve properly. The best way to insure proper service is by control from the community. There is little risk of the Board running amok because the President has control over the Director, the membership of the Board and the budget.

The principal specific functions of the Board would be to establish the policies of the Foundation, review its budget, review its program, and approve any large grants or contracts.

DIRECTOR AND ASSISTANT DIRECTORS

The Director, the Deputy Director, and the eight Assistant Directors of the Foundation would be Presidential appointees at executive levels II, III, and IV, respectively. The Director's term of appointment would be 6 years.

In order to permit the strong central operation needed to coordinate activities of the various branches of the Foundation, all authority over the Foundation other than that reserved to the Board, has been given to the Director. The Director may delegate parts of that authority and would be expected to do so, but would always have the ability to take personal control of any aspect of Foundation operations.

COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS

A separate section of the National Technology Foundation Act, section 11 requires close coordination of the Foundation's programs with other activities in technology.

The strongest tie created by the act is between the National Technology Foundation and the National Science

Foundation. This is because of the need expressed earlier to strengthen links between the generation of knowledge and its use. One of the virtues of having applied activities in the National Science Foundation has been the closeness of the activities to basic research. The act preserves this virtue by requiring that the membership of the National Technology Board overlap the National Science Board by six to eight members. Terms of service of National Technology Board members are to be of the same length and to have the same starting dates as Science Board members to facilitate the overlap. The act also requires that to the maximum extent feasible extramural basic research support that the National Technology Foundation wishes to provide should be channeled through the National Science Foundation. This provision would not apply to basic research in engineering since it would be transferred entirely to the Technology Foundation.

Section 11 also requires that the Technology Foundation coordinate programs closely with the Small Business Administration. SBA has not in the past provided strong support for high-technology small business, but it has authority to do so and appears to be moving in this direction. The act gives the Director of SBA the authority to assure that any small business activities of the Foundation do not duplicate SBA activity.

Section 11 requires further that Foundation activities be coordinated with State and local governments. The Centers for Industrial Technology authorized by the act for example, will be of interest to State and local governments and their participation in the Centers should be explored.

Other coordination is required in other sections of the act. The President's Office of Science and Technology Policy and Analysis would be assisted in two ways, by support from the Foundation's Office of Technology Policy and Analysis and by staff assistance from the Foundation's Office of Intergovernmental programs to the Intergovernmental Science, Engineering and Technology Advisory Panel.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

Sections 10 and 12 of the act provide miscellaneous authorities to the Foundation that are common throughout Government: reorganize, have regional offices, transfer funds to a modest degree among authorized categories, make rules for its operation, expend funds, enter into grants and contracts, acquire and hold real property, and so forth.

AUTHORIZATIONS

The act would provide for authorization of activities in fiscal years 1982, 1983, and 1984. Any funds for years beyond 1984 would have to be authorized by further acts. The following table gives an analysis of the current

funding of programs that would be transferred to the Foundation, and levels of funding proposed by the act for the offices of the Foundation.

A brief rationale for the funding levels also follows. In general, these are activities which have been chronically underfunded in comparison to the need, so that proposed funding increases at a moderately rapid pace. The total amount appropriated for these programs in fiscal year 1981 is \$354 million. The act proposes \$500 million in fiscal year 1982 and \$730 million and \$935 million in fiscal years 1983 and 1984, respectively.

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION OFFICE—BUDGET ANALYSIS

(In millions of dollars)

National Technology Foundation Office	Fiscal year—			
	1981 ¹	1982	1983	1984
1. Small Business.....	* 7.5	10	20	40
2. Institutional and Manpower.....	* 22.5	45	90	150
3. Technology Policy and Analysis.....	* 1.5	15	20	20
4. Intergovernmental Technology.....	* 6.1	10	20	30
5. Engineering.....	* 65.5	80	150	200
6. National Programs.....	* 24.7	70	90	110
7. National Bureau of Standards.....	* 102.4	120	145	170
8. Patent and Trademark Office and National Technical Information Service.....	* 116.9	130	170	190
9. Other purposes.....	* 6.9	20	25	25
Total.....	354.0	500	730	935

¹ Appropriated.

² NSF.

³ NSF and DOC.

⁴ DOC.

⁵ This is a prorated share (121.6/1080.4 of NSF's overhead (61.7)).

RATIONALE FOR FUNDING

First, Small Business. This is an excellent existing program with plenty of demand. It should increase as quickly as possible. The amounts budgeted are small compared with Small Business Administration programs—which are budgeted at over \$1 billion.

Second, Institutional and Manpower Development. This is the area of greatest need in the Foundation. Rapid increases are proposed to a level that can have national impact.

Third, the Office of Technology Policy and Analysis. This office should quickly be put together to help formulate Foundation programs and begin longer range studies. It should not need to grow much thereafter.

Fourth, Intergovernmental Technology. This area should also grow rapidly from its current size. National impact can be accomplished without enormous funds.

Fifth, engineering. This is a chronically underfunded area which needs substantial increases.

Sixth, national programs. These have been virtually strangled at NSF. They need immediate resuscitation and continued revitalization.

Seventh, the National Bureau of Standards. The Bureau is a mature organization. Continued growth at a moderate rate is appropriate. Expansion of innovation programs and of

linkages between NBS and industry will be encouraged.

Eighth, Patent and Trademark Office and National Technical Information Service. The Patent and Trademark Office is mature but malnourished. More high-quality patent examiners are needed and a computer based information system for getting access to patents should be developed. A substantial increase between 1982 and 1983 is provided for this purpose.

Ninth, other purposes. This is intended to provide funds for the central administration, the National Technology Board, certain personnel costs, support staff, and other inevitable overhead costs. Once the Foundation is fully staffed increases should be slight.

SUMMARY

The concept of a National Technology Foundation grows out of continuing study of innovation and productivity by the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology. There is a clear need for the Federal Government to improve its programs in support of technology, and the consolidation and enhancement of existing fragmented programs in a National Technology Foundation is an alternative deserving careful consideration.

The principal needs the Foundation would address are the need for improved technology for the benefit of all mankind, the need to improve the U.S. balance of trade, the need to fight inflation, the need to provide full employment, and the need for more adequate support and recognition of engineering.

The National Technology Foundation would be an independent agency with eight main branches for, first, small business; second, institutional and manpower development; third, technology policy and analysis; fourth, intergovernmental technology; fifth engineering; sixth, national (problem focused) programs; seventh, National Bureau of Standards; and, eighth, Patent and Trademark Office and National Technical Information Service. The agency would have programs transferred from NSF—all of engineering plus most of industrial science and technological innovation—and from the Department of Commerce—almost all of the programs of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology.

The National Technology Foundation Act incorporates the two main features of Public Law 96-480, passed with bipartisan support of the 96th Congress by putting the Office of Industrial Technology functions of Public Law 96-480 into the technology policy and analysis branch of the Foundation and putting the responsibility for the support of centers for Industrial Technology in the institutional and manpower development branch.

The National Technology Foundation would not have any responsibility for assisting foreign trade. Independently, the Department of Commerce should be upgraded to a Department of Commerce and Trade and should be assigned a foreign trade assistance function. The Foundation would work closely with the Department.

The governance of the Foundation would be handled by a Director and a National Technology Board patterned in organization, but not composition, after the National Science Board. Key functions of the Board would be to establish the policies of the Foundation and Review the Foundation's budget and programs. The Director would have all powers not assigned to the Board and would be assisted by a deputy and eight assistants, one for each branch.

The bill contains authorizations for fiscal years 1982 (\$500 million), 1983 (\$730 million), and 1984 (\$935 million). In each year the eight branches plus an "other purposes" category each have a line item. Each branch grows over the 3 years of authorization.

The bill requires close coordination between the National Technology Foundation and other agencies, particularly the National Science Foundation. The two foundations are to have interlocking directorates.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome any comments on, or support for this legislation. ●

INTRODUCTION OF THE OMNIBUS SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL FORMATION ACT OF 1981

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) is recognized for 20 minutes.

● Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which contains a number of proposals to amend our tax system in a way that will permit small businesses to retain and attract the capital necessary for their survival. More specifically, this measure would, among other things, lower capital gains taxes, graduate and reduce corporate tax rates, accelerate and simplify depreciation schedules, reduce gift and estate taxes, and liberalize certain provisions contained in subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code.

This bill is identical to a bipartisan measure introduced in the Senate. I am introducing the measure at this stage of our tax discussions because I believe that it offers a number of thoughtful approaches which are needed to ease the burdens of small business brought about by high interest rates, inflation and an outmoded and discriminatory Federal Tax Code.

For too long the Federal Government has conducted a policy of benign neglect of the small business capital

shortage. To permit the continuation of this policy will only encourage fewer private sector jobs, less innovation and more absorptions of small businesses by the corporate sector.

We are all in agreement that greater economic growth is vital to our future as a nation. It is therefore imperative that we keep in mind that small business accounts for 43 percent of the gross national product, 53 percent of all private sector jobs and more than 50 percent of all industrial inventions and innovations.

This bill, which includes many of the major promising tax recommendations of small business organizations and the White House Conference on Small Business, recognizes the special role played by small business in our economy and offers concrete proposals to restore our tax system to permit small business to grow and innovate.

I would not claim that it offers all the answers to restructuring our discriminatory Tax Code to foster the creation, expansion, profitability and continuity of small business enterprises; nor would I claim that it should not be amended, modified, or improved upon. I am indeed hopeful, however, that its introduction will serve to focus our attention on the needs of small business. Should we fail to do so we will further jeopardize the very backbone of our free enterprise system.

I insert a factsheet outlining this bill in the RECORD at this point:

FACTSHEET—OMNIBUS SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL FORMATION ACT OF 1981

The provisions of the Omnibus Small Business Capital Formation Act of 1981 fall into five broad categories:

I. Capital Formation.—To improve the ability of small business to attract needed capital from external sources of financing by providing greater incentives for investors.

A. Investment tax credit for investments in new stock issues of small businesses. A 10 percent tax credit (up to \$1,000 per person) would be provided for an investment in stock issued by businesses with less than \$25 million in net worth.

B. Authorize the creation of a new financing instrument, the "Small Business Participating Debenture" (SBPD). The SBPD would be a hybrid security, with elements of equity and debt capital. SBPD's issued by eligible firms (net worth less than \$25 million) would bear a relatively low stated rate of interest, but also could involve a distribution of the company's earnings, which would be taxable to the investor at the preferential long term capital gains rate.

C. Capital gains tax reduction for individuals and corporations, with maximum rates reduced from 28 percent to 21 percent for investments in small businesses.

D. Capital gains "rollover." Gains resulting from the sale of an investment in a small business would not be recognized if reinvested in another qualifying small business within 18 months.

E. An increase in the maximum number of shareholders permissible for Subchapter S corporation election from 15 to 100. This

would improve the access of small businesses to new sources of capital.

F. Broker-dealer Reserve. Would permit dealers "making a market" in small business equities to transfer, with deferred tax recognition, up to an aggregate of \$1 million in capital gains resulting from the sale of such stock, to a reserve for future market-making activities. This would greatly enhance the marketability of small business stock.

II. Capital Retention.—to permit small businesses to retain a greater share of internally generated capital.

A. Graduation and reduction of corporate tax rates. Would increase the number of brackets to seven and reduce tax rates, particularly helpful for smaller businesses. Present law corporate tax brackets and rates are as follows:

Taxable income:	Percent
\$0 to \$25,000	17
\$25,000 to \$50,000	20
\$50,000 to \$75,000	30
\$75,000 to \$100,000	40
Over \$100,000	46

Under the bill, brackets and rates would be:

Taxable income:	Percent
\$0 to \$25,000	15
\$25,000 to \$50,000	17
\$50,000 to \$75,000	25
\$75,000 to \$100,000	30
\$100,000 to \$150,000	35
\$150,000 to \$200,000	40
Over \$200,000	44

B. Accelerated and simplified depreciation tax treatment for more realistic capital cost recovery for smaller businesses. Bill would propose "5-3" classification (from 10-5-3) for equipment and vehicles, respectively, with 10 percent investments and 6 percent credit for investment in trucks and other vehicles. First \$100,000 of small business investment not subject to any phase-in period. Bill would not address question of depreciation for structures.

C. Increase in the amount of permissible accumulated earnings from \$150,000 to \$300,000. Accumulated earnings tax would apply only to amounts in excess of \$30,000.

D. Increase in the ceiling on the used property investment tax credit from \$100,000 to \$250,000.

III. Estate Tax Reforms.—to reduce onerous burden of gift and estate taxes of small businesses.

A. Increase the present estate tax exemption from \$175,000 to \$600,000.

B. Provide an unlimited gift and estate tax marital deduction.

C. Increase the annual gift tax exclusion from the current limit of \$3,000 to \$6,000 per year per donee.

D. Make several changes in special use valuation rules for farm land and closely held businesses.

E. Set the value of gifts made within 3 years of decedent's death at the value at the time of the gift rather than at the date of death.

F. Permit the 5 year deferral/10 year installment election for payment of estate taxes, provided that at least 35 percent of the gross estate or 50 percent of the taxable estate is a closely held business. (Present law limitation is 65 percent of adjusted gross estate.)

IV. Employee Stock Options.—bill would permit employees to exercise stock options without tax consequences, as opposed to present law requirement of paying ordinary income tax on "spread" between option price and market price. Employees would be

eligible for capital gains treatment when the stock is sold, with option price being cost basis. This provision would enable smaller businesses to attract better management by encouraging the use of stock options for key employees. Bill would include conditions set forth in H.R. 5829 as reported by Senate Finance Committee in 1980.

V. Inventory Accounting for Small Business.—inflation has the effect of creating illusory profits for firms on "first in—first out" (FIFO) inventory accounting, since reported "cost of goods sold" are based on original, lower inventory price. Lower "cost of good sold" means higher taxable incomes and tax liabilities. Conversion to more realistic "last in—first out" (LIFO) method is very complicated and costly for smaller business. Under the bill:

A. Cash accounting (immediate expensing) would be permitted for businesses with total annual sales of \$1 million or less.

B. Tax penalty associated with conversion to LIFO, which results from requirement to take back into income all previously written down inventories, would be payable over 10 year period.

C. Bill would delay until after December 31, 1980, compliance with Revenue Procedure 80-5 and Revenue Ruling 80-60, which require taxpayers to take back into income the value of erroneously written down inventories (Thor Power Tool case), to give small business more time to comply.●

OVERSIGHT HEARINGS ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

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

● Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 15, and 16, the Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights will hold general oversight hearings on the Freedom of Information Act. The hearings will begin at 9:30 a.m. in room 2203, Rayburn House Office Building. The purpose of the hearings is to assess how well the Freedom of Information Act is working and accomplishing its objectives.

It has been many years since any congressional committee has taken a broad look at the FOIA. Much of the recent debate on FOIA has centered on specific problems and narrow complaints that have been separately raised. One consequence of this has been that little formal attention has been paid to the importance of FOIA in the public oversight of Federal Government activities. In these hearings, I hope that we will be able to assess the value of the act as well as evaluate the problems that have developed.

Another consequence of the piecemeal approach is that some issues have been resolved in isolation from one another. Solutions with general applicability may have been overlooked, and unnecessarily different procedures have resulted. By accepting comments on all aspects of the Freedom of Information Act, the subcommittee should be able to discern trends and identify patterns. This will

simplify the consideration of any legislation.

Although a number of bills amending the FOIA have been introduced and referred to the subcommittee, and others may be introduced in the near future, these hearings will not focus on legislation. We would like to be able to make some general judgments about the act before concentrating on specific bills. There will be plenty of opportunity for consideration of legislation later in this Congress.

We hope to have a broad range of viewpoints on all aspects of FOIA represented at the July hearings. Those who use the act as well as those who are affected by it are invited to participate by submitting testimony or by appearing as witnesses. We will select as witnesses a representative sample of those who request to appear. In addition to the public witnesses, a number of agencies will be invited.

Anyone interested in testifying at these hearings should contact the subcommittee no later than June 22. Written testimony will be accepted for the record until 30 days after the hearings.

INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENT TAX STATUS ACT

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

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend to recognized Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages the same tax treatment which is applicable to other governmental units. These amendments will enhance the ability of the tribes to serve the needs of their members, while furthering the Federal Government's longstanding policy of self-determination for Indian tribes and Alaska Natives.

Under the Internal Revenue Code, State and municipal governments not only are exempt from taxation, but enjoy a variety of other forms of favorable treatment intended to protect and strengthen government at the State and local levels. Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages provide many of the same essential public services as our States and municipalities. These include law enforcement, fire protection, schools, roads and transportation, water, sewage and garbage services, natural resource development, land use planning, housing, social and health programs, legal services, business licensing and regulation, and other activities. However, while an Internal Revenue Service ruling does exempt Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages from taxation, the Internal Revenue Code does not confer upon these tribes and villages any of

the other forms of favorable treatment now enjoyed by States and municipalities.

More important, this distinction in treatment clearly is at odds with Federal Indian policies promulgated for the past several administrations. Specifically, for the past half century, the Federal Government virtually without exception has sought to strengthen tribal governments politically and economically. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 authorized tribes to modernize their governmental structures to deal more effectively with contemporary problems and needs. In more recent years, both Congress and the executive branch have sought to reaffirm and strengthen tribal governments. Indeed, most Federal legislation enacted during the past 20 years to provide assistance to local governments also has expressly included assistance to tribal governments.

In an effort to assume greater local responsibility for financing their own public services, Indian tribes have attempted to raise funds on the reservation through the imposition of tribal taxes. These efforts, however, have been only partially successful because under the Internal Revenue Code taxes paid to Indian tribes are not treated in the same manner as taxes collected by non-Indian State and local governments. This difference in treatment undermines the tax initiatives of tribal governments and seriously interferes with their efforts to improve conditions of life in Indian country.

The proposed legislation has become increasingly vital for tribal governments as a result of the Reagan administration's policy of substantially reducing the Federal budget and transferring more public functions to State and local governments. Federal assistance to Indian tribes has been cut by one-third in the Reagan administration's proposed 1982 budget. Thus, Indian tribes are being asked to assume still greater responsibility for providing public services, even as they face severe cuts in Federal funding. If these tribes are to shoulder the new responsibilities being placed on States and municipalities, they must be accorded the same tax treatment as other State and local governments.

This bill generally accomplishes that objective. The term "recognized Indian tribe" includes any tribe, band, community, village, or group of Indians or Alaska Natives which is recognized by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, as performing substantial governmental functions. This definition includes the Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages which are treated as governmental units for certain revenue sharing purposes under the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972. Three hundred

and forty-seven groups are presently listed as eligible for revenue sharing entitlements under that act.

The bill also provides equivalent tax treatment with respect to interest paid on certain tribal debt obligations, pension and retirement income and contributions, charitable contributions, excise taxes, tribal income and real property taxes, and certain unrelated business income. Finally, the bill provides that certain tribal officials are to be "Government officials" for purposes of the tax on self-dealing between a private foundation and disqualified person.

The bill enjoys broad support among tribal leaders as well as a number of national Indian interest organizations. I would like to insert in the RECORD an example of this support: a strong letter of support from Mr. Ross O. Swimmer, the principal chief of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONES: I am writing to request your strong support and sponsorship of the proposed "Indian Tribal Governmental Tax Status Act".

This legislation would extend to Indian tribes the same general tax treatment under the Internal Revenue Code which at the present time is accorded state and local governments. More specifically, the measure grants, inter alia, a deduction from the federal income tax for taxes paid to an Indian tribe, exempts tribal governments from a variety of federal excise taxes, and provides a tax exemption for income on certain tribal governmental obligations.

The fundamental concept of the bill—namely, that Indian tribes are governments and, therefore, should receive the same federal tax treatment as other governments—is completely consistent with the legal history of tribes and current federal policy. As you are aware, Indian tribes long have exercised services, including health, education, police and fire protection, and general welfare, to their members. Furthermore, for a generation the established policy of the federal government has been to strengthen the political and economic institutions of tribal governments.

I am convinced that the "Indian Tribal Governmental Tax Status Act" would represent a significant step toward the economic enhancement and, hopefully, independence of Indian tribes. As I am sure you can appreciate, this progress ultimately would make Indian tribes far less dependent upon federal funds—a not untimely consideration in light of current national budgetary policies.

Very truly yours,
ROSS O. SWIMMER,
Principal Chief,
Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma.

Finally, let me conclude by giving you the revenue implications of this bill. Passage of this legislation would nominally affect the Federal budget. The revenue loss would be approximately \$5 million annually. These days, that is a bargain, and I urge my colleagues to swiftly approve this legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ●

AN INTERVIEW WITH LECH WALESA

(Mr. SOLARZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of Solidarity, the first independent trade union in a Communist country, was an extraordinary event in the annals of communism. It was a vivid demonstration of the weakness of the economic system imposed by the Soviets upon Eastern Europe, as well as a stirring reminder of the desire for greater individual freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

If not for the exceptional leadership of Lech Walesa, it is extremely unlikely that Solidarity could ever have been established. Walesa is to politics what Michelangelo was to sculpture. His unusual blend of principle and pragmatism has enabled him to guide Solidarity, and Poland, through numerous crises virtually without bloodshed.

The Washington Post recently printed a remarkable interview with Walesa by the noted Italian journalist Oriana Fallaci. In view of the insights it provides about Walesa, who continues to play a crucial role in the ongoing drama in Poland, I would like to enter into the RECORD the complete text of this interview.

LECH WALESA: THE MAN WHO DRIVES THE KREMLIN CRAZY

LECH WALESA. One moment, First of all we have to clear things up. I am not a diplomat, I am not a master of ceremonies and even less an intellectual. I am an uncouth man, a worker. I have never read a book in my life, and I am a man with a goal to reach, so I don't give a damn for certain things. Not for the books, not for the interviews, not for the Nobel Prize and even less for you. I have no complexes, I don't. Neither toward the generals, nor toward the prime ministers, nor toward you. I can give a punch on the desk of a prime minister, I can leave a general in the lurch without saying goodbye, and as for you I can do the same. Anyway, I am the one who puts the first question: What do I lose, how much do I lose with this interview? Besides, why do you look at me that way?

ORIANA FALLACI. I look at you because you resemble Stalin. Has anybody ever told you that you resemble Stalin? I mean physically. Yes, same nose, same profile, same features, same mustache. And same height, I believe, same size.

A. Nie, nie, nie. No, no, no, nobody told me and I don't care. I didn't know it, I don't want to know it and you haven't answered my question yet. So I put another one: This interview, how do you write it? Question and answer, question and answer, or all together with the comments inside? Because the comments inside, I don't like them. It isn't fair, it is the reader who must make his comment and decide if the guy is right or wrong.

Q. Listen, Walesa. My interviews are written question and answer, question and answer, always. Whether you gain or you lose with this one, I don't know, because it depends on what you will tell me. And if

you don't mind, I am the one who asks. Now let's start. Seven months ago, nobody knew your name outside Poland and very few, I guess, inside Poland. Today you are one of the most famous men in the world and you drive Brezhnev crazy with your Solidarity movement, you put [former Polish Communist Party chief Edward] Gierek out of a job, you give [present Polish Communist Party chief Stanislaw] Kania a headache each time you call for a strike. When you go to Rome you are received by the pope as a head of state or a star and . . .

A. Stop, stop, stop, stop.

Q. Why? What happened?

A. It happens that you have a very authoritarian style, a typically dictatorial one. And as I do too, we have a problem. The problem is to find a compromise. So let's make a deal. From now on I will be nice with you and you will be nice with me, OK?

Q. OK. Here is the question: When you measure this glory, this power which fell on your shoulders, don't you ever say, my God, this is too much for me, I cannot keep it?

A. Yeah, yeah, yeah. The Holy Virgin knows. I'm tired, bloody tired, and not only in my body because I never sleep, my heart doesn't work as it should, it throbs, it hurts. I'm tired inside, in the soul. This life is not for me. Meeting people for whom you must wear a tie, knowing good manners, listening to recommendations: Don't do this, don't do that, please smile. Ties strangle me, I cannot wear them, why in hell should I smile when I don't feel like it? Nothing is permitted to me anymore, nothing. I cannot have a drink, I cannot pick up a girl, else the whole world falls apart and they say that the soda water went to my head. It isn't right. And you must say it, you must explain that men are men even if they make politics, men are sinners, so what?

Q. Yes, but I meant something else, Walesa. I meant the responsibility you took in front of your country and of history. Don't you ever feel scared by it, inadequate?

A. Nie, nie, nie. No, no, no, because I am a man of faith and because I know that this moment needs a guy like me. A guy who can make decisions with good sense and solve problems in a cautious, moderate way. I am not a fool. I do understand that too many injustices got accumulated during these 36 years, so things cannot change from morning to night. It takes patience, it takes wisdom I mean, the rage that people would like to burst like a bomb must be controlled. And I know how to control it, because I know how to reason through I am not a learned man, I know how to say things with the proper words. Like I did with the peasants at the strike in Jelenia Gora, for instance, when I yelled at them: "You've started the wrong strike, you idiots, you champions of stupidity, I'm against you." And 300 people remained speechless. Well, speaking to the crowds isn't always the art of going with the crowds, sometimes it's the art of going against the crowds and . . . Do I look pretentious?

Q. You don't. Why?

A. Because sometimes I give this impression. But I am not pretentious, believe me. I am a guy who wants to help people, for instance, if you ask me a favor, get me there, get me something, I immediately do my utmost. And I get you there even if I get myself into trouble, even if my friends say: "Mind your business. Is it your business? I like to make myself useful. It was so even in December 1970 and in August 1980, when I did what I did because nobody wanted to do it. It was so when I worked in the opposi-

tion, and today it is the same. I mean, I know how far we can go with our demands, I know what country we live in and what our realities are. I know the path we must follow. And the danger is to abandon such a path, to stray from the line because of a few blockheads or a few hotheaded idiots who don't understand.

So I have to keep repeating to them that things cannot be obtained too fast, that the demands must be put at the right time, without impatience. Look at the monument we erected for our dead, our workers killed by the police in 1970. Had we built it at once or two years later, now it would be simply the branch of a tree, easy to cut. Instead, today it's a tree and its roots are so deep that nobody can extirpate them, and if it will be cut it will blossom again.

Q. Lech, where did you learn to talk like that, from whom?

A. I don't know. I told you that I never read a book, anything. I never had teachers either, nor examples to imitate. I always solved my problems alone. Even the technical ones, like to fix a TV set or a sink, I think them over and I fix them in my way. Politics is the same. I think it over and I find the solution, or at least a solution. As for the moderate line I gave to Solidarity, however, I can tell you that I set it after the defeats of 1968 and 1970. It was then that I realized the necessity of working without impatience; otherwise, we would break our heads. I said to myself: Lech, a wall cannot be demolished with butts, we must move slowly, step by step, otherwise the wall remains untouched and we break our heads. You know, I have been arrested a hundred times, more or less, usually 48-hour arrests, and one thinks very well in jail because in jail there aren't noises and one is alone. It was in jail that I also found the way of sowing doubt into the minds of my jailers, to make them release me and to make them understand how wrong they were toward the country and themselves. Finally, it was in jail that I discovered the system of informing people about my arrests. Because it is useless to be arrested if people don't know.

Q. What was this system, Lech?

A. Well, when they released me and I went home, I placed myself in front of a bus stop and even if I had money to buy my ticket I pretended to be penniless. So I asked the people to buy my ticket, explaining that I had been arrested and why. People got interested and bought my ticket. Then I took the bus and during the trip I continued to explain, I held sort of a rally for them to warm up feelings. I did so for years. Wherever I went, whatever I did, I made something happen.

Q. This is great politics, Lech.

A. Nie, nie, nie. I am no politician, I have never been. Maybe one day I'll be one. I have just started to look around and understand their tricks, their calculations, but today I am no politician. The proof is that if I were a politician I would like doing what I do now, I would never have enough of it. Instead I'm fed up and I tell you at once what I am: I am a man full of anger, an anger I have kept in my stomach since I was a boy, a youngster. And when a man accumulates the anger I have accumulated for so many years, he learns to manage it all right. Which explains why I control so well the crowds and the strikes. Ha! One has to be very angry in order to know how to control the anger of the people. One has to have learned to live with it. Listen, my rage has been stored up for so long that I could keep

it in at least five more years. That is, until 1985. It burst in August 1980 because I became aware that the occasion was bigger than I could hope. And I jumped beyond the fences of the Lenin shipyards in Gdansk.

Q. Let's talk about that, Lech, about the day you jumped beyond the fences.

A. Well, long before it happened we had considered the possibility of some big strike in Gdansk. We had considered it in our meetings when we taught the workers the history of Poland and the union laws. In fact, I had made myself ready to avoid an excessive situation and I had told the workers if there is an uproar I want to be informed at once. And when I was informed I immediately realized that the uproar had burst early because the situation was ripe, thus I had to get into the shipyards. The trouble was that four gentlemen—I mean, four policemen—watched me day and night. I got them lost—I won't tell you how, because I might need that trick again in the future—and I got to the shipyards and I jumped inside. I got there at a crucial moment. In fact, there was a meeting of 2,000 workers and the big boss was asking them to leave, making his promises. And nobody cared to oppose him. As a matter of fact, they were already leaving. I felt my blood boil. I elbowed my way through the crowd, I set myself in front of him and—do you know boxing? I landed him a straight left and I put him down so quickly that he almost fell out of the ring. I mean, I shouted at him that the workers wouldn't go anywhere if they weren't sure they had obtained what they wanted. So they felt strong, and I became their leader, and I still am.

Q. Lech, what does it mean to be a leader?

A. It means to have determination, it means to be resolute inside and outside, with ourselves and with the others. Here is what it means: I have been always so, even as a boy, when I was a poor boy living in the country and I wanted to become an aviator. I have always been the ringleader, like the billygoat that leads the flock, like the ox that leads the herd. People need that ox, that billygoat, otherwise the herd goes on its own here and there, wherever there is some grass to eat, and nobody follows the right road. A flock without an animal that leads is a senseless thing without a future. However, I don't know if I really am a leader. I simply know that I smell things, I feel situations, and when the crowd is silent I understand what it silently says. And I say it with voice, with the proper words. But now I have something to ask you. Because you travel a lot, and you know a lot of people, and you can answer. What do people say about me in the West?

Q. Well, they ask themselves, "Who really is this Walesa?"

A. Ha! This is a question they put to themselves in the East, too. "Who is this guy who makes our soldiers sleep in their boots for six months?" "Is he a general?" And it goes without saying that, in the East, they gave themselves an answer already.

Q. Yes, they call you an anarchist, a counter-revolutionary, an enemy of socialism, according to Tass and Pravda.

A. Tell them that I only am a man who wants some justice, a man who wants to be useful to them too, beyond any frontier and color and ideology. The hungry hare has no frontiers and doesn't follow ideologies. The hungry hare goes where it finds the food, and the other hares don't block it passage

with tanks. They should learn from the hares. But let's not talk about the East, let's talk about the West. What do they say about me in the West?

Q. Some say that you are a Christian Democrat, others say that you are a grandchild of Rosa Luxemburg [a Polish-born early associate of Lenin who broke with him over the issue of democracy within communism], others that you are a Social Democrat. And there are even some who call you a Eurocommunist. What shall we answer to them?

A. Nothing, because I refuse to express myself with their words, their labels, their slogans, left and right—socialism and communism, capitalism and Luxemburgism, Christian Democrat and Social Democrat. I express myself with my words: good, bad, better and worse. And I say: If it serves the people, it is good. If it doesn't serve the people, it is bad. Of course, one has to see how and in what sense it serves. One day I shared a little piece of bread with a nice girl, and I felt happy. Another day my wife served me a large portion of excellent sausages, but she did it so rudely that I felt unhappy and I couldn't eat them. I mean, having much food isn't enough and sometimes a little piece of bread is better than a large portion of excellent sausages. At the same time, one has to admit that if there isn't even that little piece of bread we cannot know happiness at all. Thus, we should build up a system which combines the two things: food and happiness. Then I say: Damn it, we live on this earth 50 or 60 years and on one side there are the rich who get richer and richer, on the other side there are the poor who get poorer and poorer. It doesn't work. Richness must be shared. But what do they store up, those rich who don't divide with the others? Anyhow they die, and when they die they leave all to heirs who are never satisfied and who curse them all the same.

Q. But, more or less, the socialists and the communists say these same things, Lech.

A. Nie, nie, nie. I told you that I don't want to use slogans invented by them.

Q. Do you mean that communism has failed?

A. Ha! It depends on the way you measure the concept of good, bad, better, worse. Because if you choose the example of what we Polish have in our pockets and in our shops, then I answer that communism has done very little for us. If you choose the example of what is in our souls instead, I answer that communism has done very much for us. In fact, our souls contain exactly the contrary of what they wanted. They wanted us not to believe in God, and our churches are full. They wanted us to be materialistic and incapable of sacrifices; we are antimaterialistic, capable of sacrifice. They wanted us to be afraid of the tanks, of the guns, and instead we don't fear them at all.

Q. Lech, let's go back to the sausages without freedom. How to obtain it?

A. Freedom must be gained step by step, slowly. Freedom is a food which must be carefully administered when people are too hungry for it. Suppose that Solidarity obtains some access to TV and through TV it starts yelling: "Away with the thieves, the rascals, the gangsters who robbed us for so many years." How would people react? Cutting off heads, I tell you, flooding the streets with blood. It would be chaos, anarchy. It already happened in the countryside, I saw it with my eyes. All at once the government got busy selling TV sets to the peasants, TV filled their houses with pro-

grams which attacked religion, and as a consequence many peasants lost their faith. They even became atheists. *Nie, nie, nie*. Things cannot change suddenly. It's dangerous. Don't you agree?

Q. Not really. I think that we should never be afraid of freedom, because there is only one thing which teaches freedom, and this is freedom itself. Freedom should never be administered by drops, like a spoonful of milk in the stomach of a starving person.

A. Well . . . On the other hand, one cannot exaggerate it as you do in the West, with all those political parties which don't know what they want, and one disturbs the other, doesn't let the other work, yet one supports the other—what kind of brothel is that? It seems a brothel to me and nothing else. Never mind that here in Poland it wouldn't be possible to have political parties, because things stay as they are. Here the control must be exercised by the unions. If we will be able to do it, we'll function better than your parties, which waste their time biting each other, insulting each other, accusing each other, collecting gossip on each other: He goes to sleep with her, she goes to sleep with someone else. It doesn't seem to me that your parties have done much, and in all that brothel I see only one indisputable fact: They say they want something and they do the reverse. Am I right?

Q. Yes, but if the unions substitute for the political parties, there is no pluralism, there is only a sharing of power between the party and the unions. Don't you want the pluralism, Lech?

A. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Sure. Every person, every group in the whole society must have the right to express itself. But why imitate the parties and use the world party? One can say "association," "club." The club of those who raise canaries, for instance. Or the club of those who pray with the rosary. And as wheat doesn't grow on stones—I mean, as in Poland we cannot have political parties but the one which already exists, as men must adapt themselves, let the canaries' breeders get together. Let them have a statute which welcomes the formation of other clubs—the club of those who raise rabbits, or pheasants, or ducks—and let us all become breeders of canaries, rabbits, pheasants, ducks, chickens. The important thing is that such groups exist freely, so they can serve society, and that the master does not arrest them. Do I say stupid things?

Q. No, Lech, you don't say stupid things.

A. Well, maybe I do. I don't know much about concepts, I never have time to think, and there are so many problems that I must fix in my mind. With you I'm rather thinking out loud. Yet I like it. Gee, do I like it. Because it happens so rarely that you hear the right questions. And right questions make me think. I mean, sometimes it is in talking with others that one gets an idea and says: "Why didn't I think of it before?" Yes, that's how ideas blossom, and this canaries idea might turn out very well.

Q. Yet the idea of growing wheat on stones is good, too.

A. Yeah, yeah, yeah. The problem is that one should remove the stones first. And what if under the stones there isn't the soil to grow wheat? What if the wheat grows short and deformed?

Q. Better than nothing.

A. I don't know. Maybe you are right, maybe you are wrong. But I think that you are wrong, and I am going to demonstrate it. If you want a child, and you want it with all your heart, desperately, do you prefer to

have a deformed dwarf or not to have him at all? Oh, I would like to be less tired and to express myself better. I would like . . . Let's go on. But don't put those difficult questions to me, because they give me a headache, and now I have a headache.

Q. All right, an easy question, then. I know that your stepfather lives in America, so I guess that he has invited you many times to join him there. Have you ever planned to emigrate there?

A. *Nie, nie, nie*, never. I could never leave Poland, never. Besides, I've always thought that a man must live where he was born and grew up, in order to give back to his country what he got from it. Yes, my second father has invited me many times. I call him my second father because he married my mother after the death of my father. My real father died in 1945 from the privations he suffered in the extermination camp where the Germans put him. "Come here. What do you do there?" my second father wrote. But besides the fact that I couldn't live outside Poland, I felt that his invitation didn't come from his heart. It came from the dollars in his pockets. And I was not wrong because, when I met him again in Rome last month, I did not recognize him. In Poland he was a poor man, yet always ready to make sacrifices and divide what he had with others. Now he thinks only about money, amusements, and he has lost humanity. The dollars went to his head, I guess, and the result is that I don't get along with him anymore. I see life in a different way, I don't like money as he does. Yes, it's good to have money, we need money to live and raise our children properly, but money isn't all and doesn't give dignity. On the contrary, it gives a lot of temptations and sometimes makes people nasty. Which is why I would never try to become a millionaire.

Q. Then tell me, Lech: Were you angry at your stepfather when he let himself be photographed with Reagan?

A. Nie, nie, nie, I like Reagan. Yeah. I like him a lot. The way he moves, the way he talks: just like me. Well, maybe he talks a little better than me, but for sure he moves like me. Look how he walks, or how he waves his hands and his arms. I only hope that he doesn't change, that he doesn't forget where he comes from. It would be a pity. Has he already changed? I'll see when I go to America and I will meet him, I hope.

Q. When will you go to America, Lech?

A. On the one hand I would like to go at once, on the other hand, never. Because I'm still black and blue from the hugs of the Roman crowds and I don't like it when people push me and touch me and kiss me like that. Anyhow, I'll go soon. As soon as I've put some order in the movement, let's say in six or seven months if nothing bad happens. Poland needs help. Not dollars help, I mean political help, economic help, and in order to obtain such help we must have contacts abroad. Nor should we forget that in the West there are people who make cold calculations, agreements, who would like to use the blood of Poland to solve their problems. Yes, I really must go to America. And with the help of our queen, the Holy Virgin, I shall go.

Q. Is that why you wear on your jacket this image of the Black Virgin (a statue of the Madonna that Poles credit with turning back a 17th-century Swedish invasion)? And isn't that image a label too?

A. Nie, nie, nie. It isn't a label, it is a habit. Or, better, a blessing. The Black

Virgin has always been sort of blessing for us Polish, and this particular one . . . I don't even remember who gave it to me, or when. Someone must have put it on my jacket after a pilgrimage. With the rosary also, it happened like this. Someone put a rosary in my hands, and I kept it until it broke. This is not easy for you westerners to understand, I know. The church has never been for you what it has always been for us, a symbol of struggle, I mean, the only institution which never submitted to the oppressors. And when we examine the factors which led to what is happening today in Poland, it is not enough to mention the workers' uprisals in 1956, 1968, 1970, 1976. It isn't even enough to consider our contact with foreigners, I mean the fact that we have been traveling abroad very much in these years and that we have seen how you live in your countries. We also have to consider the election of Pope Wojtyla, his travel to Poland and the continuous obstinate smart work of the church. Without the church nothing could happen, my case itself would not exist, and I would not be what I am. I'll say more: If I hadn't been a believing soul, I wouldn't have resisted, because I had so many threats. So many.

Q. But have you always been so religious, Lech?

A. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Ask my bishop. Even at school, when they taught us communism and I didn't pay any attention. Only between 17 and 19 I got far from the faith. Ha! I got on the wrong path: drinking, idleness, girls. Then something happened. One day I felt very cold, very tired, and I started looking for a place where I could go inside and rest. But there was nothing except a church in the area, so I entered the church and I sat down on a bench. And immediately I got well. So well that I left the wrong path. Now don't misunderstand me, don't believe I am an angel. Angels do not exist and I am no angel, I'm rather a Satan. However, I go to church every morning, and every morning I receive communion, and if I have some major sin to confess, I also go to confession. I say so because I am not that bad, after all. Since I've lived in this world I only got drunk a couple of times, and as for the girls . . . Listen, my wife is not bad. I rather say that she is the ideal woman for me. Had I another wife, by now I would be divorced or killed with a kitchen knife. So I have no reason to betray her. Besides, we have six children. Doesn't that show that we make love well? Much and well. Well, of course, when I happen to be far from her for many weeks as I was recently, I get temptation. I told you that I am no saint.

Q. OK, Lech, it seems to me that your headache is over. So let's go back to the difficult questions. Don't you ever have fears about being manipulated? For example, yesterday in Warsaw a high prelate said to me: "Walesa never does what the cardinal doesn't want."

A. In this respect it is true. I would never do a thing against the faith, the church and even less against Cardinal Wyszyński. He is a great man, his wisdom is immense and his help has been enormous. All the time and in every way. People don't know that it was Cardinal Wyszyński who arranged our meetings with Gierk and Kania, and even during the strikes of the peasants of Rzeszów and Bielsko-Biala I had to ask him to give me a hand. Without his intervention I wouldn't have been able to call an end to these strikes. So it would be stupid of me if I did something against the cardinal. Nor would he permit anyone to do something

against me. Not even somebody with a black skirt [a priest's cassock]. But if somebody with a black skirt tries to use me . . . Listen, I cannot swear that no one tries, on any side. But I can swear that I don't permit anybody to manipulate me, not even to influence me. And if someone tries, I break his nose.

Q. What about the intellectuals, in that sense?

A. From the intellectuals and the peasants, *liberas nos Domine* [free us, Lord!] I say so. You would never believe the hangover I got from those peasants during their strikes. I kept yelling: "You are mean. Selfish, mean. Stubborn, mean. Don't you understand the situation we are in?" The intellectuals are like them, in a sense. Because they are unable to adjust themselves to the reality of the moment. During the struggle they were perfect, in fact I respect them a lot, yet now they cannot adjust. They would like to go on with the methods we followed before August 1980. Which is the reason why I always shout: "Be realistic. Use your brain." And this proves that I am not manipulated by them. Neither by the church nor by them. Then why do you keep so many professors and teachers and university lecturers in your movement, you may ask. Ha! Because, should I refuse them, they would dig underground like moles and they would get in all the same, through the tunnel. Better say: Come in, sit down. Besides, they're intelligent, and intelligent people are always useful. Provided you don't get inferiority complexes toward them. I don't. Know why? Because intellectuals need a lot of time to understand things, and even more to make a decision. They stay there to discuss, examine, discuss, and in five hours they reach the same conclusion I reached in five minutes or five seconds.

Q. And what about the Communist Party, Lech? I always asked myself why they let you rise so high and so fast. To exploit you? To use you as an alibi or as a scapegoat? Or maybe to assimilate you?

A. *Nie, nie, nie*. Being assimilated by the powers is a possibility that I don't even consider. If I wanted such a thing, I would have done it when I was Mr. Nobody. You can't imagine the offers I had. Being assimilated by the powers? I'd rather shoot myself in the head. Dignity counts more than life. Listen, they let me emerge because they didn't have another choice. Literally. Of course, this doesn't . . . I mean, when we speak about Poland we have to consider also the situation abroad. We are controlled. Thus, victims cannot be avoided. People always ask me: "Lech, aren't you afraid of being killed?" And as an answer I shrug my shoulders. I do so little to protect myself. Some of my friends try, they follow me wherever I go, but what is the use? One can be murdered in so many ways, not only with guns. They killed my best friend, they might kill me. I'm a fatalist. If it must happen, it will happen. And I will go to paradise.

Q. Lech, there is a three-month armistice between the government and Solidarity. But not all armistices end up with a peace treaty. What will happen then?

A. To begin with, Solidarity did not sign any armistice. We only said that we wouldn't be hostile toward the new government of [Premier Wojciech] Jaruzelski. Poland needs a strong government, a government capable of governing, and Jaruzelski can do it. Because he is a soldier, a general, therefore used to giving orders and to imposing discipline on others and on him-

self. As a soldier, he also should have the clean hands which are necessary to clear the country out of bastards with dirty hands. We must let him work. But if the hostilities will come from him and his government, we'll fight. We will, I promise. Whether someone likes it or not.

Q. Whether the Soviets like it or not, you mean. And what if Jaruzelski fails?

A. If he fails and our "brothers" don't "help" us, if he fails and our "allies" don't intervene, then it should be Solidarity that takes the responsibility of government. It is not very likely—as a matter of fact, it's so unlikely that such a possibility seems to me fantastic. Yet it is a possibility. Yet it is a possibility, it exists. Now let me make this clear: I don't want it, Solidarity doesn't want it, we only want to arrange it so the poor people eat a little more and are a little more satisfied. We want to arrange it, not to make politics, not to govern. But if other choices will not exist, Solidarity must be the choice. If the government says, "This is a mess, we resign," Solidarity should take the responsibility and I should take the situation into my hands. I say it in a firm way. And I add: Poland will never go back to being what it was before August 1980. Never.

Q. Lech, I want to make sure I have understood you. Did you really say that, should this government fail, Solidarity should govern and you should take the situation into your hands?

A. Yes, I said it.

Q. So you were not joking. And do you believe that you would be capable?

A. Yes, I believe it.

Q. Do you also believe that the Communist Party and the Kania government would accept such a capitulation? Yesterday in Warsaw a very important member of the government who also is a very important member of the [Communist Party] central committee said to me: "We shall never agree to share power, and even less to give up power."

A. Today they say so. Tomorrow, who knows? Great empires have fallen during the history of man.

Q. And what would the consequences be with your "brothers," your "allies"—I mean, with the Soviets? How can you hope that they would permit such a thing, that they wouldn't intervene to help?

A. This is the point, this is the problem, this is why I said that I regard such a possibility as a fantastic possibility.

Q. Less fantastic than a Soviet intervention if you even think to take over, Lech? So let us pronounce these two words that you Polish never pronounce, not even whisper, as if avoiding them could serve to exorcise them: Soviet intervention, Soviet intervention. Brezhnev says them, instead. And Kania, too. Publicly.

A. Oh, oh, oh, how often people raise their voices in order to scare. Don't we do the same in the opposition? I don't think that a violent confrontation would serve them, and they know it. So they will not do it. Or, better . . . Listen, somebody once said to me that everything would start in Poland and that we would obtain all or almost all, and that then we would suddenly lose all, to be resurrected one day and be men again. Well, I don't accept such prophecies, yet I admit that they might contain some truth. Just because of that possible truth I tell you that we don't want to pay such a price. Here is why we follow this tortuous path, and why I fight those who would like to change the moderate line of Solidarity, and why I keep

talking of political patience, and why I yell at the intellectuals and at the peasants. And why I remain so vague in speaking with you.

Q. Come on, Lech. Do you really believe that Brezhnev cares about the way we talk? It is not the words that count it is the facts. And when Kania has to deal with you, when Jaruzelski has to deal with you, when . . .

A. How many times have you seen the Soviet tanks in Poland? How many times have the Soviet tanks come here from August on?

Q. In Czechoslovakia they waited almost eight months.

A. But that solution has never been applied to Poland. Four times at least, Poland has found itself in a tragic situation during the last 25 years, yet we overcame it without the Soviet tanks. This time it will be the same. Besides, Czechoslovakia is not Poland.

Q. It isn't Hungary, either. Yet in Hungary too the Soviet tanks intervened. It is not Afghanistan either, yet Afghanistan is invaded by the Soviets.

A. Poland is different, Poland is different. Q. Then let me say this: Isn't it true that the Polish students have asked and obtained, at least on paper, abolition of the obligatory teaching of Marxism and of the Russian language in their universities?

A. It's true. Q. Isn't it true that, if the agreement is not respected and the students' strikes are not taken into consideration, the workers will strike for them?

A. Yes, it's true. Solidarity approves what the students are doing on that matter and it will fully support them in that struggle. We are with them, I am with them. The only reason why I did not go to the Lodz university during the students' strike is that I had to stay with the peasants in Rzeszow. The peasant strike's problem was more urgent. But I sent my advisers to Lodz, and they remained there all the time, and every two hours I called to tell them what should be done. Finally, I am the one who arranged the meeting of the students with the deputy premier, [Mieczyslaw] Rakowski.

Q. Well, do you expect the Soviets to accept such a national refusal of their ideology and of their language? Do you really believe that such heresy will go unpunished forever?

A. Nie, nie, nie, and what do you expect from us, then? That we give up? That we stop everything, that we go back to what we were and we say, sorry, it was a joke, we did not mean it, because we don't want to be punished? Should we give up the duty of being men and forget? What other solution do we have but to do what we are doing? I said it and I repeat it: We don't want to pay the price of a violent confrontation, we really don't. But if it will be necessary to pay that price, we will. Nobody will say that we are cowards. Personally I am more than ready to die. I am not as ready to kill: I am not able to kill, not even a chicken to make soup; my stomach gets upset when I see people killing a chicken. Yet if I were attacked, if I had to defend my country, my house, my children, my friends, my fellow workers, I wouldn't hesitate. Oh, why do you make me say these things? Why? You give me a headache again. Now I have a headache again.

Q. I do too, now. I have it too, Lech. So let's keep our headache, both of us, and let's face the last difficult question: But are the Soviet tanks indispensable? Aren't, wouldn't the Polish tanks be enough?

A. Nie, nie, nie, nie. I shall not consider that, no. Not even for a second. I refuse to

believe that our bonzes [literally, Buddhist monks] are unable to find a bloodless solution. I refuse to believe that our soldiers will kill our workers. We will solve everything without pain, profitably for the two sides. Why do you ask such a thing?

Q. Because that very important member of the government also said to me: "The Polish army is devoted to the party one thousand percent." A lie?

A. Here is the only question which I cannot answer. This house is filled with microphones. Yes, microphones, and God knows how many there are listening now to this conversation. Yes, since 1972 they have tapped me with their bloody machines, and sometimes I ask myself: How long will it last, how long?

Q. And you, Lech, how long will you last?

A. If they don't kill me, you mean? If everything goes on smoothly? Well, coldly speaking, I would say that from now on I can only descend. Gradually or with a headlong fall. This is because I am not fitted for normal times and I cannot submit myself to the rules and the games. Because I am dead tired and my heart is in bad shape, my health goes to pieces. Because I cannot repeat myself—that is, I cannot repeat what I have done in August and until today. And finally because, if the worst happens, all the rage of the people will turn on me. And the same ones who applauded me, erected altars for me, will throw stones at me, will trample on me, will trample on me. They will even forget that I acted for good, in good faith. You know, if I were selfish and shrewd, I would cut my mustache and go back to some shipyard. But I shall not do it. I cannot do it. From now on, the situation will become more and more complicated, more and more difficult, and we are going to receive many blows. Yes, many blows, I must stay where I am: to struggle, to extinguish the unnecessary fires, like a fireman, to transform the movement into an organization, to . . .

Q. To raise canaries that sing much and well. Thank you, Lech. Good luck, Lech.

A. Good luck to you, and thanks to you, with all my heart. You have been nice to me and it isn't true that you throw the chador into the face of people you interview [a reference to the Persian robe Fallaci removed during her interview with the Ayatollah Khomeini in 1979]. I have enjoyed these hours we spent together so much, though you gave me a headache twice. You offered me so many ideas which I'll think over. I shall never forget you. And, if the Polish censors will permit publication of your book, "A Man," I will read it. And it will be the first book I've read in my life. Anyhow, if I go to paradise, I'll save a seat for you. So we can talk about the wheat that grows on the stones.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EVANS of Iowa (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business as a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. NELSON (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution designating July 17, 1981, as "National P.O.W.-M.I.A. Recognition Day."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today. Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, June 3, 1981.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on Thursday, June 4, 1981.

Mr. FASCELL, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, June 4, 1981.

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

Ms. FIEDLER, for 60 minutes, on June 4.

Mr. DERWINSKI, for 60 minutes, on June 3.

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

Mr. HUTTO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEVITAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EVANS of Georgia, for 60 minutes, on June 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SOLARZ, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,560.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, immediately following the remarks of Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT on H.R. 2156, extension of funds for Veterans' Administration support of State medical schools, today.

Ms. FERRARO, on H.R. 2540, immediately prior to the vote.

Mr. DE LUGO, in support of H.R. 2540, U.S. International Trade Commission and Customs Service Authorization, during general debate in the House today.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio in four instances.

Mr. BENEDICT.

Mr. McDADE in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL in three instances.

Mr. RITTER.

Mr. LEE.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. LeBOUITILLIER.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO in three instances.

Mr. RUDD.

Mr. BERENTER.

Mr. McCLOSKEY in two instances.

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

Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.

Mr. STARK in 10 instances.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. YATES.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. BYRON.

Mr. ALEXANDER in two instances.

Mr. HERTEL.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. GEJDENSON in two instances.

Mr. DE LUGO.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. WEISS in four instances.

Mr. LEVITAS.

Mr. CORRADA in two instances.

Mr. WON PAT.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. MOFFETT.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. ECKART.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 3, 1981, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1490. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting notice of the Army's intention to proceed with the second phase of the Chemical Agent Munitions Disposal System at Tooele Army Depot, Utah, pursuant to section 409(b)(4) of Public Law 91-121, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1491. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, trans-

mitting a report on the impact on U.S. readiness of the Army's proposed sale of certain defense equipment to Jordan (Transmittal No. 81-49), pursuant to section 813 of Public Law 94-106; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1492. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report on the impact on U.S. readiness of the Army's proposed sale of certain defense equipment to Jordan (Transmittal No. 81-53), pursuant to section 813 of Public Law 94-106; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1493. A letter from the Mayor of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for improvements in the local planning process in the District of Columbia, a transfer authority over certain purely local planning activities to the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1494. A letter from the Mayor of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act with respect to the National Capital Service Area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1495. A letter from the Mayor of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of the District of Columbia Employment Security Building to the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1496. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a report by the National Center for Education Statistics on the condition of education pursuant to section 406(d)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1497. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1980 on programs under the Women's Educational Equity Act, pursuant to section 937 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1498. A letter from the Chairperson, National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, transmitting the fifth annual report of the Council, pursuant to section 732(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1499. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Army's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment to Jordan (Transmittal No. 81-49), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1500. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Navy's intention to offer to sell certain defense articles to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. 81-51), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1501. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Air Force's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment and services to Oman (Transmittal No. 81-52), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1502. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Army's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment to

Jordan (Transmittal No. 81-53), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1503. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the semiannual report of the Department's Inspector General, covering the period ended March 31, 1981, pursuant to section 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1504. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting various prospectuses proposing the lease of space, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1505. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the 25th annual report on the financial condition and results of the operations of the highway trust fund, pursuant to section 209(e)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, as amended (H. Doc. No. 97-56); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1506. A letter from the Mayor of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act and section 7324 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize the Council of the District of Columbia to regulate political activities of employees of the District of Columbia government; jointly, to the Committees on the District of Columbia and Post Office and Civil Service.

1507. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on opportunities to reduce expenditures related to airport traffic control towers operated by the Federal Aviation Administration (CED-81-100, June 1, 1981); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Public Works and Transportation.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A BILL INITIALLY REFERRED UNDER TIME LIMITATIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

the Committee on Science and Technology consideration of the bill (H.R. 2330) for a period ending not later than June 5, 1981, for consideration only of such portions of the bill and amendment authorizing funds for the development of a long-term nuclear powerplant safety systems plan pursuant to subsection 205(f) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, as fall within that committee's jurisdiction over energy research and development pursuant to clause 1(r)(11), rule X.

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. RODINO:

H.R. 3748. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, 37, and 38 of the United States Code, to codify recent law, and to improve the Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. HOLLEN-

BECK, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. DYMALLY):

H.R. 3749. A bill to advance the national prosperity and welfare, to establish a National Technology Foundation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Science and Technology and the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 3750. A bill to insure that each community in the United States, regardless of size, is provided with the maximum local full time radio broadcasting service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3751. A bill to amend and revise provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the targeted jobs tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3752. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives for the training of skilled labor in labor-short industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3753. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the disposition of investment tax credits earned by basic American industries through transferability, refundability, and carryback and carryforward of earned and future investment tax credits, and to provide certain penalties when taxpayers transfer or receive refunds for such credits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 3754. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 50-percent maximum tax rate on taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BENEDICT, Mr. CORCORAN, and Mr. DANNEMEYER):

H.R. 3755. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a cap on medicaid expenditures beginning with fiscal year 1982, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHN L. BURTON:

H.R. 3756. A bill to provide that no Treasury note which is issued for a term of more than 3 years shall bear interest at a rate which is greater than 8 percent per annum; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD of Tennessee:

H.R. 3757. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care among the items and services for which payment may be made under the supplementary medical insurance program; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANCE:

H.R. 3758. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IRELAND (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 3759. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the penalty for failure to declare articles valued at less than \$50; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CLAUSEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington):

H.R. 3760. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend certain tax provisions to Indian tribal governments on the same basis as such provisions apply to

States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LaFALCE:

H.R. 3761. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to improve productivity and employment by promoting capital investment in small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LeBOUTILLIER:

H.R. 3762. A bill to make State and local governments eligible for negotiable order of withdrawal accounts; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LOWRY of Washington:

H.R. 3763. A bill to amend section 5 of the Uniformed Survivors Benefits Amendments of 1980 to provide the same annuity benefits to the surviving spouses of certain former members of the uniformed services who died before September 21, 1972, but after their discharge or release from active duty, as are provided under such section to the surviving spouses of certain former members who died before such date while serving on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NAPIER (for himself and Mr. EMERSON):

H.R. 3764. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 5-month waiting period which is presently a prerequisite of eligibility for disability insurance benefits or the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NAPIER (for himself, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. STATON of West Virginia, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, and Mr. BROWN of Colorado):

H.R. 3765. A bill to provide mandatory social security coverage for Members of Congress and certain congressional employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NAPIER (for himself, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. NELLIGAN, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. STATON of West Virginia):

H.R. 3766. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals age 65 and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSO:

H.R. 3767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an annual election to expense \$25,000 of depreciable business assets, to increase the amount of income to which the lower corporate tax rates apply, to provide a zero rate of tax where a small business corporation distributes dividends, to increase the amount of used property to which the investment tax credit applies, to increase the investment tax credit for qualified rehabilitation expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 3768. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the prompt and orderly closure and transfer of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 3769. A bill to establish a Severe Storms Advisory Committee to review, on an annual basis, the severe storms research and operations activities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. PHILLIP BURTON:

H.J. Res. 271. Joint resolution commemorating the centennial of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COELHO:

H.J. Res. 272. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 4 through 10, 1982, "National Medic Alert Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE:

H.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to designate the third Sunday in September 1981 as "National Ministers Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LaFALCE:

H.J. Res. 274. Joint resolution to establish National Volunteer Firefighters' Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MITCHELL of New York:

H.J. Res. 275. Joint resolution designating the week beginning September 25, 1981, as "Battle of West Canada Creek Bicentennial Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 276. Joint resolution to designate June 30, 1981, as "National Drug Standards Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. HAGEDORN and Mr. ERLÉNBERG):

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of the Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact to delete the requirement that laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors in the construction, alteration, or repair of projects undertaken by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RINALDO (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ATKINSON, Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAUSEN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DENARDIS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DUNN, Mr. DWYER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HERTEL, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LeBOUTILLIER, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARKS, Ms. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NELLIGAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. OT-

TINGER, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RITTER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. ZEPERETTI, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO):

H. Res. 145. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the week commencing on June 7, 1981, should be designated as "National Italian-American Heritage Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself and Mr. DERWINSKI):

H. Res. 146. Resolution to offer strong support for current diplomatic efforts to resolve the latest crisis in Lebanon, and to protect the right of Lebanese Christian and other communities to live in freedom and security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FAZIO:

H.R. 3770. A bill for the relief of Divinia Manatad and Jeuerita Manatad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWRY of Washington:

H.R. 3771. A bill to authorize the documentation of the vessel, *Pacific Pride*, as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3772. A bill for the relief of Mee Sau Tse; 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. 52: Mr. COURTER, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 397: Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland.

H.R. 450: Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 654: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. BENEDICT.

H.R. 703: Mr. LUNDINE.

H.R. 713: Mr. WOLF and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 808: Mr. SUNIA, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LEVITAS, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 894: Mr. McDONALD and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 911: Ms. FIEDLER.

H.R. 1005: Mr. WEAVER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. NAPIER, Mr. HARTNETT, and Mr. EVANS of Iowa.

H.R. 1034: Mr. NAPIER.

H.R. 1309: Mr. LELAND.

H.R. 1364: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1464: Mr. HILER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. SIMON, Mr. LEE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. PHILIP CRANE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. O'BRIEN, and Mr. FOWLER.

H.R. 1491: Mr. EMERY.

H.R. 1492: Mr. EMERY.

H.R. 1493: Mr. EMERY.

H.R. 1508: Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. D'AMOURS.

H.R. 1576: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1596: Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 1703: Mr. JOHNSTON.

H.R. 1711: Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1725: Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1890: Mr. DIXON, Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, and Mr. HARKIN.

H.R. 1911: Mr. NAPIER.

H.R. 1918: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 1983: Mr. WEBER of Minnesota.

H.R. 1995: Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. NICHOLS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2067: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 2103: Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. DERWINSKI.

H.R. 2104: Mr. STOKES, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. NAPIER, and Mr. BURGNER.

H.R. 2325: Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. STATION of West Virginia, and Mr. JAMES K. COYNE.

H.R. 2327: Mr. NAPIER.

H.R. 2488: Mr. ERTEL.

H.R. 2548: Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 2556: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 2588: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 2646: Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. NAPIER, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 2773: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. NAPIER.

H.R. 2805: Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE.

H.R. 2883: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BAPALIS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. WINN, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. LENT, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. SMITH of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. COELHO, Mr. WALKER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DYSON, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, Mr. SIMON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2897: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2932: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 2973: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. MITCHELL of MARYLAND.

H.R. 2983: Mr. STOKES, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SMITH of Alabama, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3114: Mr. BUTLER and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 3143: Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ECKART, Mr. STARK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. SABO, Mr. FARY, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 3158: Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3159: Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3204: Mr. MOAKLEY and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 3205: Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 3218: Mr. RODINO, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 3253: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. BEDELL.

H.R. 3436: Mr. BARNES and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 3442: Mr. VENTO and Mr. WON PAT.

H.R. 3666: Mr. HUBBARD and Mr. BLILEY.

H.J. Res. 72: Mr. LeBOUTILLIER, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. STANTON of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 125: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. GRADISON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. D'AMOURS, and Mr. RAILSBACK.

H.J. Res. 225: Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MATTOX, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. HANCE.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 100: Mr. NAPIER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

103. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New England Board of Higher Education, Wenham, Mass., relative to the guaranteed student loan program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

104. Also, petition of the University of Wisconsin Archives Council, Eau Claire, Wis., relative to reauthorization of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

105. Also, petition of the Negroes Occidental Chapter, Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc., Bacolod City, Philippines, relative to veterans benefits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS

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

H.R. 3455

By Mr. BONIOR of Michigan:

—At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BINARY NERVE GAS PRODUCTION FACILITIES

Sec. 906. Notwithstanding section 705(a), the authorization for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of the Army at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, contained in title I of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1981 (94 Stat. 1750), and the authorization of appropriations therefor, are repealed as of the date of the enactment of this Act. If appropriated funds have previously been obligated for construction contracts for such military public works, such contracts shall be canceled and the contractors involved shall be paid the cancellation liability of the United States under such contracts.

By Mr. ERTEL:

—Page 59, after line 11, add the following new section:

REALIGNMENT OF FORT INDIANTOWN GAP

Sec. 906. (a) No funds appropriated pursuant to any authorization contained in this Act may be used to realign, or terminate any component of, Fort Indiantown Gap located in Annville, Pennsylvania, before November 1, 1981.

(b) No funds appropriated pursuant to any authorization contained in this Act may be used to realign, or terminate any component of, Fort Indiantown Gap located in Annville, Pennsylvania, if before November 1, 1981, both the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives pass, by a majority vote of those members

of the committee present and voting, a quorum being present, resolutions disapproving such realignment or termination.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "to realign" includes any action which both reduces and relocates functions and civilian personnel positions, but does not include a reduction in force resulting from workload adjustments, reduced personnel or funding levels, skill imbalances, or other similar causes.

By Mr. SIMON:

—Page 27, strike out lines 10 through 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

MX MISSILE SYSTEM

Sec. 305. No funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization for the MX missile system in section 301 may be obligated or expended with respect to a basing mode for the MX missile until—

(1) the President selects a specific basing mode for the MX missile system and transmits to the Congress in writing a description of the basing mode selected;

(2) the Secretary of Defense submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report in writing (A) justifying the selection

of the President referred to in paragraph (1), and (B) containing a comparison and evaluation of alternative basing modes to the basing mode selected by the President; and

(3) a period of sixty days has elapsed after the certification under paragraph (1) has been received by the Congress and during which both Houses of Congress have not adopted resolutions of their respective Houses expressing disapproval of the development of the basing mode selected by the President.