

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 17, 1979

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Mr. John C. Macon, executive director of the Eastern Association of Christian Schools, formerly pastor of the Bible Baptist Church, Upper Marlboro, Md., offered the following prayer:

Our dear heavenly Father, we want to pause and thank Thee for the thrill of living in America. We thank Thee for the founders of this great Nation who gave us the freedom to live, study, work, and worship in the place of our own choosing. We thank Thee for the great accomplishments of our Nation. And we thank Thee that in spite of our sins as individuals and failures as a nation that Thy love for us is with us still.

Many confusing and frustrating conditions have made us sense our renewed need of Thy help. May we turn back to Thee for guidance, knowing Thou hast not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.

We pray for the President and the Members of the Senate and of the House that Thou wilt direct these our representatives in Government and give them discernment and wisdom for the tasks that are before them this day.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 3875. An act to amend and extend certain Federal laws relating to housing, community and neighborhood development and preservation, and related programs, and for other purposes.

THE REVEREND MR. JOHN C. MACON

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

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to welcome the Reverend Mr. John C. Macon and thank him for his inspiring opening prayer this morning.

Mr. Macon is a graduate of Bob Jones University of Greenville, S.C. Upon graduation Mr. Macon worked at the Miracle Hills School for Underprivi-

leged Children for 5 years and then served for 1 year as director of the Washington Christian Businessmen's Committee.

In 1964, he became pastor of the Bible Baptist Church of Upper Marlboro, Md. From an initial congregation of 7 people, this church has now grown to over 350 under Mr. Macon's leadership. In 1966 he founded the Clinton Christian School with 9 pupils and nurtured its growth to its current size of 1,000 students.

Most recently, Mr. Macon has left the Bible Baptist Church to accept the position of executive director of the Eastern Association of Christian Schools.

I am pleased to welcome Mr. Macon and his wife Twila Faith and three children—April, Angel, and John—who are with us here today.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

OBSOLETE VESSEL SALE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3094) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell five obsolete vessels to the Inter-Ocean Management Co., a California corporation, and for other purposes.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

U.S.-U.S.S.R. MILITARY BALANCE—MYTHS AND FACTS IV

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I mentioned four criteria for comparing Warsaw Pact and NATO tank capabilities. I pointed out that NATO's advantage in preparing for a defensive war with tanks of superior quality offset the pact's numerical advantage. Today I will look at the other two factors: The quality of the tank crews and antitank weaponry.

Experts have noted glaring deficiencies in pact training techniques and command procedures. Pact crews are not trained on the type of tanks they would operate in combat, they have to use a small number of training tanks on a ro-

tating basis. Thus, in the event of war pact tank crews will have to operate tanks with which they have had little real experience. NATO, by contrast, trains its crews on the same type of tanks they would use if war breaks out. Further, Warsaw Pact troops are trained to follow a rigid command structure which allows little room for deviations from attack plans to deal with inevitable unforeseen tactical developments. In contrast, tactical flexibility is stressed by NATO.

NATO antitank superiority is unquestioned. NATO antitank weapons are capable of penetrating up to 20 inches of armor. One hit is sufficient to knock out any tank currently used by the Warsaw Pact. NATO forces have 193,000 antitank missiles, more than nine times the number of tanks in the pact's arsenal. Many of these antitank missiles are accurate from distances of over 3 kilometers, well outside the cannon range of virtually all pact tanks. The fact that NATO will be fighting a defensive war means that its antitank weapons can remain hidden from exposed pact tanks.

I submit, therefore, that NATO's superior equipment, troops, and defensive weaponry, coupled with the tactical advantages of fighting a defensive war, offset the Warsaw Pact's numerical advantage in tanks.

SARAH MOORE GRIMKE

(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, throughout America's history women have fought for those basic freedoms for which our country was founded. Yet women were not given the basic right to vote until 1920 and still await passage of the equal rights amendment.

In 1837 Sarah Moore Grimke wrote the first tract on women's rights in America, "Letters on the Equality of the Sexes and the Condition of Woman," which proposed political, economic, educational, and religious equality for all women.

A Quaker and ardent abolitionist, Sarah Grimke had a profound understanding of theology and Biblical analysis. Her vision of human equality was based upon Scripture but seemed totally outside the official moral code of her time. She offered the radical idea that God had created man and woman in absolute equality.

With her sister, Angelina, Sarah Grimke demonstrated a new reality where women might travel, speak out against oppression, and learn about a larger world. Although a storm of opposition and censure confronted her, Sarah Grimke held her ground.

□ 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.

**PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE
ON CRIME OF COMMITTEE ON THE
JUDICIARY TO SIT DURING 5-
MINUTE RULE TOMORROW**

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary be allowed to sit during the 5-minute rule tomorrow for the purpose of marking up S. 961, amendments to the Speedy Trial Act of 1974.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICANS NEED A TAX CUT NOW

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

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy's Chief Economic Adviser, Dr. Walter Heller, testified before our House Budget Committee this morning that Congress should cut taxes by at least \$30 billion to help get our country out of the impending economic recession.

Republican leaders of the House have also called for such tax relief for the American people and their productive enterprises in order to bolster the economy.

Also endorsing this proposal, and action by Congress to cut the Government deficit by reducing Federal spending, was Lief Olsen, economic policy chairman for Citibank.

I hope that the leadership of Congress will get behind this call to reduce the time that American citizens have to work each day just to satisfy the Federal tax collector.

In the President's words the other evening, this is "a call to patriotism" for elected representatives of our people.

A \$30 to \$40 billion tax cut now will give all our working people and their productive enterprises a larger share of their income for job-producing economic expansion that we need right now in the private sector to help avert a major recession.

□ 1210

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to make a statement.

In recent days the Congress has undertaken measures to comply with the President's Executive order implementing thermostat controls for nonresidential buildings, most particularly by raising the temperature in the Capitol and congressional office buildings to 78 degrees. This effort to conserve energy has undoubtedly resulted in some discomfort for Members, staff, and visitors to the Capitol. As a result, some questions have arisen concerning proper dress for Members when they are in the House Chamber. Over many years and during some uncomfortable seasons, Members have respected an unwritten standard. Historically, a coat and tie has always been required for male Members and appropriate attire for female Members. The

Chair believes that the House should continue to adhere to this practice. The Chair certainly intends to. Perhaps the Chair reflects the views of his own generation but he feels that this is one of the ways in which he shows his respect for this institution.

The Chair does not believe he should become an arbiter of style. What color a person wears or the manner in which he or she combs his hair is certainly a matter for individual determination.

But the older Members will recall previous occasions when this Chamber has been uncomfortable. We have now had about 3 days of seasonal temperatures and humidity, and the Chair has had various parts of the Chamber monitored for temperature readings. On occasion, those readings have indicated temperatures in the high eighties. The Chair does not believe those temperatures are conducive to efficiency. It makes it more difficult for Members to carry out their legislative duties, particularly when we are facing many weeks of hard legislative work and long hours in this Chamber.

While adhering to the President's guidelines, and while maintaining the energy conservation steps which have been undertaken by the Architect, at the Chair's direction, the Chair does intend to see that steps are taken to provide for a better circulation of air in the Chamber. The Architect informs us that some large circulating fans can be installed which should significantly improve the situation. Some have been installed. The Chair would hope that these measures would permit us to maintain our present standards of dress and, thus, some degree of formality.

If any Member would desire to offer a resolution raising a question of privilege of the House to the effect that Members may relax their dress, such Member may so offer the resolution and the Chair would recognize him for such purposes.

Through the years, Members in this Chamber, long before air-conditioning, wore wigs and swallow-tailed coats and high muffers. The Chair thinks this history shows the respect for the Congress. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Texas if he would kindly remove himself from the floor and appear in the customary attire that the Members of the Congress wear.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the ruling by the distinguished Speaker of the House, in the future would it be in order, under clause 2 of rule I, which grants the Speaker power to preserve order and decorum, to make a point of order against any Members of the House who do not accede to the dress code that the Speaker has described?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Maryland that the

Chair hopes not to have to rule on a point of order concerning a dress code for Members and would prefer that the standards of dress be voluntarily maintained and accepted by the Members.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair entertain such a point of order if it were made?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not foreclose that at this time.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Texas to remove himself from the floor, and the gentleman can address the House at such time as he is in the proper attire.

Mr. MATTOX. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not recognizing the gentleman. The Chair has made his statement.

If any Member desires to offer a resolution to change the customs and attire with regard to dress, as a point of privilege of the House, the Chair would recognize the Member.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) rise?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Chair. I think what the Chair has done today is certainly in line and upholds the dignity and decorum of the House. I would hope that the gentleman from Texas would remove himself and come back in proper attire, and that at a later date a resolution could be offered if some Member disagrees with the Chair's ruling.

I commend the Speaker. I think you are standing tall, sir. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that he knows the gentleman from Texas is embarrassing the Chair. Maybe the gentleman does not feel this embarrassment himself, but the Chair would be more than happy to recognize the gentleman if he will put on the proper attire. He may then make the statement he desires to make.

HEATING OIL

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

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the Chair for its ruling in this matter concerning the dignity of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the matter that I would like to bring to the attention of the Speaker and the Members of the House is a very serious one. It concerns heating oil for our homes next winter.

The Department of Energy has said, quite happily, that they expect to have 240 or perhaps 249 million barrels in storage by October 1. That, in my opinion, is a totally insufficient response to the problem we are faced with, because, in order to make those primary storage facilities full with 249 million barrels, the companies are now being ordered to stop filling their distributors' storage

tanks, the secondary storage level; and distributors, therefore, will have to stop filling their consumers' tanks—the tertiary storage level. We then have a situation in which the home heating oil tank is not full, as it was last year, and neither are the local distributors' tanks full, as they were last year. So we are fooling ourselves.

In order to meet DOE's goal of 249 million barrels in primary storage by October 1, the companies will have to cut back on deliveries to local dealers, and they—as I have said—will have to cut back in turn on deliveries to the homeowners. For example, one company which reports 10 million barrels of home heating oil in stock now, will have to cut deliveries to local dealers to meet their 18 million barrel quota as their share of the 249 million DOE has set as the target.

Two hundred forty-nine million barrels in primary storage by October 1 is totally unrealistic. It is not good enough when homeowners' tanks are not full, as they usually are by that time, and neither are the distributors' storage tanks, which usually are also full. We are facing the possibility of a serious shortage unless refining of middle distillates increases sharply. We need more information on this subject and an open consideration of the total reserves now in stock and planned for October 1—in primary, secondary, and tertiary storage.

□ 1220

THE HIGH COST OF AN ENERGY PROGRAM

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, with his job approval rating having sunk to an alltime record low of 21 percent, it is easy to understand why the President's energy speech on Sunday dealt with a "crisis of confidence." What is more difficult to understand, impossible in fact, is the logic behind his proposal to spend \$142 billion out of the U.S. Treasury between now and 1990 for energy independence when the job can be done far more effectively for far less money by private enterprise.

Consider, for a moment, two key cornerstones of the President's program—the 4.5-million-barrel-a-day reduction in oil imports by 1990 and the creation of an \$88 billion Energy Security Corporation. No one argues with the need to become less dependent on foreign oil; that is not the point. The point is—there are a lot cheaper ways to go about it. Take the development of shale oil for example. Reliable estimates indicate there are at least 1.8 billion barrels of high grade shale oil just waiting to be tapped in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah. Even if one assumes only a third of that is recoverable, we could add 4.5 million barrels a day to our oil supplies for the

next 400 years before running out. Taking this example one step further, if we were to give a \$3 a barrel tax credit for every barrel of shale oil produced, something this distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JENKINS) has recommended, the cost to the Federal Government, assuming the entire \$3 credit was granted, would come to \$4.927 billion per year or \$49.27 billion by 1990. That is a whole lot less than \$142 billion, to say nothing of the fact that there would be a whole lot less Federal bureaucracy and redtape.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who would like us to believe that our current shortages justify the reincarnation of the New Deal. But just as greater Federal intervention in, and control over, the economy then did not produce prosperity, neither will greater intervention in, and control over energy, produce self-sufficiency now. The key to energy self-sufficiency is production and the fastest, cheapest, and best way to produce is to give private enterprise the incentive. If there is any doubt, the \$49.27 billion in tax credits for 4.5 million barrels of shale oil as compared to a \$142 billion plan designed to reduce imports by 4.5 million barrels a day, should resolve them for once and for all.

WASHINGTON SHOULD GET ITS GREEDY FINGERS OUT OF ENERGY BUSINESS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the American people have not lost confidence in freedom, in their country, or in themselves, despite what the President says. But they have lost faith in Government, and rightly so, because it is Government that has brought us all our problems.

The President's \$142 billion program will cost each taxpayer at least \$1,400. But when did a Government program ever cost what the Government said it would? The price tag is bound to be much higher. And let us not be fooled by talk of the cost being paid by "windfall profits" taxes. Companies do not pay taxes; only consumers pay taxes.

A minimum of \$1,400 is a high price to pay to avoid OPEC "rip-offs." In fact, the rip-offs of the Federal Government through taxes and inflation make OPEC look like the Salvation Army.

Despite his rhetoric and grandiose Big Brother plans, the President did quietly take one action that will help: yesterday he deregulated the price of heavy crude oil, and exempted it from the "windfall profits" tax. This will indeed stimulate production, as the administration claims.

If this is true, as I believe it is, why not apply this principle to all energy? We can have economic growth and all the energy we need, if we get Washington's greedy fingers out of the energy business. My bill, H.R. 4639, would do just that. Plentiful energy exists within our borders. Let us free the market to do the job of getting it.

MR. CARTER'S FEDERAL ENERGY CORPORATION

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, we have disagreed from time to time on issues, but I think we have never disagreed on the way that this House should be operated and in the decorum which would be expected of Members. I certainly do not disagree with the Speaker now. I congratulate the Speaker now on the ruling that he has made and I agree with it completely.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it necessary to point out a glaring contradiction in President Carter's energy proposals.

The President went to great lengths to describe how the American people are dissatisfied with Government, with the inability of Federal agencies to solve problems, or handle functions.

Then he turns around and proposes that a massive Government energy corporation be established to handle our vital energy challenge. He proposes to take \$142 billion out of the private sector and turn it over to an as yet non-existent corporation. He proposes to ignore the expertise of energy firms that have spent this century developing ways to find, recover, process, and deliver energy to the American people.

There is not one shred of evidence that the Federal Government is capable of handling development of energy. There is plenty of evidence that the Government has succeeded so far in fouling up our present energy industry. I submit to all of those who have sat in the gasoline lines, created by the misallocation of supplies by the Federal Department of Energy, that in the words of a great entertainer they "ain't seen nothing yet" compared with the snafus that a lavishly financed Federal energy corporation would produce.

RESOLUTION ON PRESIDENT'S POWER TO BREAK TREATIES

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

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I would first say that the Speaker has this Member's respect and admiration in his expressed views on the dress code of the House. I think that such slight discomfort as we might feel from wearing a coat and tie, which this Member has not yet felt, is far outweighed by the dignity of the House and the respect that we should have for it.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution stating that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that approval of the Congress is required to terminate any mutual defense treaty between the United States and another nation. This legislation stems from the President's abrupt cancellation of our treaty with Taiwan. I believe the Carter administration far overstepped its authority when it ignored the constitutional provision that treaties are made,

and presumably broken, only with the Senate's consent.

Passage of this resolution would clarify beyond any doubt that Congress must give explicit approval before a President may terminate any future treaty. It is primarily designed to protect other existing treaties such as NATO and the United States-Japan Defense Treaty. Arbitrarily allowing a President to kill a treaty will damage our foreign policy as our friends and our adversaries doubt the credibility of our treaty commitments. A treaty is a nation's word, and we must work hard to keep our promises, not disregard them at a convenient moment. I encourage you to cosponsor this resolution.

□ 1230

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER AND ELECTION AS MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Joint Committee on the Library:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 26, 1979.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been elected Chairman of the Republican Conference, and pursuant to the rules of said Conference, I hereby resign, effective this date, as a Member of the Joint Committee on the Library.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
Representative to U.S. Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation was accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 361) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 361

Resolved, That Bill Frenzel, of Minnesota, be, and he is hereby elected a member of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4289, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1979

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4289) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEDEZI). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 11, 1979.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), will be recognized for 30 minutes, and

the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 4289, as well as the Senate amendments reported in disagreement, and that I may insert extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I bring to you today the first conference report on an appropriation bill in the 96th Congress. This is a supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending September 30 which passed the House on June 6. This bill contains over 450 individual appropriation accounts. It involves 12 of the 13 appropriation subcommittees and affects virtually every department and agency.

I believe that we have done a good job on this bill. May I here say that I find it most enjoyable to deal with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, and particularly with the ranking members and the chairmen of the various subcommittees. Of course, the hearings and the decisions are almost exactly as the subcommittees have determined. A few minor changes were made in the full committee when we met, but I wish to call to the Members' attention the fact that after going over the bill very carefully as the budget requests came in from the President, the bill before you is \$3.1 billion under the total requested by the President. This is the largest percentage reduction for such a bill in recent memory. Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill shows our commitment toward achieving greater fiscal responsibility and ultimately a balanced budget while still providing for essential government.

In summary, the conference agreement provides a total of \$13.6 billion in budget authority in response to the \$16.8 billion of budget estimates submitted by the President and considered in connection with the bill.

The bill, as it passed the House, contained \$11.4 billion. Subsequent to House consideration some \$1.6 billion in additional budget requests were submitted by the President, the largest being for advances to the unemployment trust fund, the food stamp program and the black lung disability program which come under the head of entitlements.

The other body, Mr. Speaker, amended the bill in 182 instances. I am really proud to say our conferees met with the Senate and worked out these differences in a short period of time. I could add that we worked through the lunch hour,

but that was what we were there for, and we were glad to work this matter out.

The conference agreement which we bring back to the House is \$243 million below the Senate bill and, as I indicated, \$3.1 billion below the requests of the President. It is under the revised ceiling contained in the current resolution on the budget by \$462 million in budget authority and \$221 million in outlays.

While there appears to be this relatively small amount of room remaining under the ceilings for possible additional supplementals during the 2½ months remaining in this fiscal year, I would point out that last Thursday the so-called midsession review of the budget was transmitted to Congress. This document which is required by law updates certain estimates and assumptions for both fiscal years 1979 and 1980. The updated figures from the Office of Management and Budget show fiscal year 1979 spending at \$496.2 billion which is \$1.2 billion over the previous estimates and \$1.7 billion over the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget. I am advised that the Budget Committee in concert with the Congressional Budget Office is in the process of analyzing the fiscal 1979 figures in the mid-session review. Should there be agreement with updated figures or substantial agreement with estimated increase in spending, we would assume that the Budget Committee would file reestimates for fiscal year 1979 which would exceed the ceilings in the budget resolution. As Members will recall, such reestimates were filed earlier this year for fiscal 1979 which had the same effect. Under the rules then, Mr. Speaker, no further supplementals would be in order unless the Congress agreed to adjust the current budget resolution which would amount to a fourth concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1979.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated there are over 450 accounts in this supplement and there were 182 Senate amendments. It is not possible in the time available to address each item but I shall include in my remarks a detailed table showing the action taken on all appropriation items in title I and summary of title II, which contains increased pay costs.

The largest category in the bill is increased pay costs; \$2,389,000,000. Other large items of expenditure include:

Middle East Peace Treaty	\$1,470,000,000
Purchase of 4 Iranian ships	1,353,000,000
Veterans compensation and pensions	1,129,000,000
Veterans readjustment benefits	301,000,000
SBA disaster loans	1,018,000,000
Food stamp program	900,000,000
Medicaid	554,000,000
Unemployment trust fund	500,000,000
Civil service retirement	335,000,000
Black lung program	300,000,000
Student loan insurance fund	243,000,000
ConRail	239,000,000
Elderly funding	27,000,000

Mr. Speaker, while this bill is of importance to the entire Nation in a wide variety of ways, it is of particular importance to my own State of Mississippi.

It will provide immediate disaster relief assistance for the heavily damaged flood and tornado areas of Mississippi, as well as the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, North Dakota, and others that have these tragedies. Some \$1,018,000,000 is provided for the Small Business Administration to accomplish this purpose.

Under the terms of the conference report, residential or personal property owners shall be eligible to borrow up to \$55,000 at 3 percent interest and business owners, if they cannot obtain help from private sources, shall be eligible for loans not to exceed 5 percent interest.

Additionally, the conferees agreed on \$106 million for an emergency fund for the Corps of Engineers for use in repairing and preventing flood damages across the Nation.

Another major item affecting Mississippi includes full funding for the continuation of construction of four destroyers at the Ingalls Shipyard in Pascagoula. These ships were originally contracted for by the Government of Iran. They will now be used by the U.S. Navy and will provide valuable additions to our fleet. It is stated this action will result in a savings of \$800 million in the cost of these ships.

Mr. Speaker, in connection to amendment No. 1 which is in disagreement, I plan to offer an amendment which provides for cost increases for two research facilities. My amendment will provide an additional \$720,000 for the soil erosion facility at Purdue University and an additional \$300,000 for the feed mill at El Reno, Okla.

Mr. Speaker, the House conferees are of the opinion that when the \$1,500,000 was appropriated for the El Reno facility and the \$3,600,000 appropriated for the Purdue facility, it was the intent of the Congress that construction costs were to be kept within those limitations respectively. However, since this fact was not made clear at that time, the House conferees agreed to the increase.

The conferees have agreed that hereafter all construction or construction bids, in order to be considered, would have to be within the sum appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it was further agreed that the soil erosion facility at Purdue University was to work in cooperation with the National Sedimentation Laboratory at Oxford, Miss., the mission for which is spelled out in its charter which reads as follows:

The USDA Sedimentation Laboratory seeks solutions to erosion and sedimentation problems of our country with emphasis on those associated with the agricultural use of lands. These problems involve: the mechanics of erosion; sediment production; the delivery of sediment by streams; hydraulic relationships of alluvial streams; sediment transport ca-

capacity, sediment deposition in stream channels, on flood plains, and in reservoirs; stream channel stability; the chemical, physical, and biological attributes of the complex of water and sediments in streams and impoundments; and hydrology. Of primary importance is the concept of sediment as a pollutant and as a carrier of pollutants including agricultural chemicals. The mission is to seek, through research, better methods, practices, and techniques for control of sediment and the effect of sediment on the quality of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, in the conference report on the Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1978, which is dated July 21, 1978, we first approved the funds for the Purdue facility. At that time, the conferees spelled out that they would:

... expect this laboratory (Purdue) to coordinate its activities with the National Soil Sedimentation Laboratory at Oxford, Mississippi. The conferees will also expect the Department to maintain a regularly scheduled flow of work through the National Soil Sedimentation Laboratory rather than scheduling work on an intermittent basis.

Mr. Speaker, digressing from my remarks in explanation of this bill, I would like to point out that this is the first year that I have had the honor to head the Committee on Appropriations. I was on the special committee that studied the congressional budget control. I was on the preliminary committee that made a study and made recommendations to the Rules Committee.

Subsequent to that I served on the Committee on the Budget and I would just like to point out to the Members some of the problems that I see that we must deal with. We have heard the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee many times express himself publicly in our hearings before the Rules Committee, about certain problems which have arisen in operating under the Budget Act. First let me say that the Budget Act provides only a target in the first budget resolution. But in the process of the deliberations on fixing the budgetary target, where individual items were debated, it went out to the country and perhaps some Members thought that it was a matter of final discussions on individual items. That, of course, was not the fact, but that is the way it was taken.

But the matter I call to the Members' attention is that under this new rule that we have imposed upon ourselves, and I agree that something had to be done, the legislative committees are required to report their authorizing legislation by May 15—not enacted but reported. Not only that, but the timetable envisioned in the Budgeting Act mandates that the Appropriations Committee have its appropriations before the House by early or mid-June.

Our Committee on Appropriations was about 1 week later than previous years in reporting bills by reason of facts beyond our control. But we did get our bills reported, with the exception of two,

within a week of the time that we were supposed to. But we are finding now that the May 15 date for reporting authorizing legislation means in many cases that the Committee on Appropriations has to ask for a rule from the Rules Committee waiving points of order due to the lack of enacted authorizing legislation.

It happens that the subcommittee that I continue to chair and two others I believe did not ask for a rule. That means that bills contain items which one objection will knock out. That is not good legislating.

I wish I could suggest an answer at this time. Maybe a delay in the dates would be worthwhile. But I am agreeing with statements that were made publicly by the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. BOLLING, that it is evident that changes will have to be made in the Congressional Budgeting Act to adjust these deadlines if for no other purpose.

I repeat again that I shall not go into further detail here about the bill that is before us. This conference report was filed last Wednesday and the Members have had a chance to go over it. It reflects the action of 12 or 13 subcommittees and I believe that each of those subcommittees is headed by as able a Member as we have in Congress. It represents many days of hearings, and after all of those hearings I repeat again, your Committee on Appropriations brings up a supplemental, the first supplemental I have had the honor to handle, and the first one of the year. It is \$3.1 billion below the budgetary requests of the President and it is within the ceiling contained in the recent budget resolution.

I am glad to say too that all 11 of the appropriation bills which our Committee on Appropriations has reported out are below the budget. It appears that one of the two remaining bills will be over the budget, but I do submit to the Members that this supplemental appropriation bill, reflects the combined judgment of the 54 members of the Appropriations Committee. In its formulation we have had the cooperation of our good friend, SILVIO CONTE the ranking minority member of the full committee and the ranking Republican members of the subcommittees.

□ 1240

So, we submit to the Members our best effort. We think it is a good effort. We also recommend to the Members that we find out some way to provide relief to the Appropriations Committee and the legislative committees from problems we are having in operating under the Congressional Budget Act. Some adjustments must be made but the whole matter needs careful study.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD at this point a comparative table showing House, Senate, and conference action on the bill:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS							
CHAPTER I							
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE							
Agricultural Research Service (buildings and facilities)			\$3,400,000	\$1,020,000	+\$1,020,000	+\$1,020,000	-\$2,380,000
Food Safety and Quality Service		\$750,000		750,000	+750,000		+750,000
Extension Service			4,973,000				-4,973,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—Dairy and beekeeper indemnity programs			1,943,000				-1,943,000
Farmers Home Administration							
Rural Housing Insurance Fund:							
Home ownership assistance (authority to borrow)	\$954,960,000				-954,960,000		
Home ownership assistance payments	30,000,000				-30,000,000		
Total, Rural housing insurance fund	984,960,000				-984,960,000		
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund: Operating loans		(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+100,000,000)		
Food and Nutrition Service							
96-132 Child nutrition programs	133,000,000	100,000,000	133,000,000	116,500,000	-16,500,000	+16,500,000	-16,500,000
96-132 Food stamp program	1,038,786,000	379,700,000	988,786,000	900,000,000	-138,786,000	+520,300,000	-88,786,000
Food donations programs:							
Needy family programs	24,901,000				-24,901,000		
96-132 Elderly feeding program	27,000,000	27,000,000		27,000,000			+27,000,000
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	1,223,687,000	506,700,000	1,121,786,000	1,043,500,000	-180,187,000	+536,800,000	-78,286,000
Total, chapter I:							
New budget (obligational) authority	2,208,647,000	507,450,000	1,132,102,000	1,045,270,000	-1,163,377,000	+537,820,000	-86,832,000
Appropriations	(1,253,687,000)	(507,450,000)	(1,132,102,000)	(1,045,270,000)	(-208,417,000)	(+537,820,000)	(-86,832,000)
Authority to borrow	(954,960,000)				(-954,960,000)		
CHAPTER II							
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY							
Military Personnel							
96-64 Military personnel, Army	76,200,000	76,200,000	56,200,000	56,200,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	
96-64 Military personnel, Navy	29,200,000	29,200,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	-1,200,000	-1,200,000	
96-64 Military personnel, Marine Corps	5,800,000	5,800,000	900,000	900,000	-4,900,000	-4,900,000	
96-64 Military personnel, Air Force	14,500,000	14,500,000	42,400,000	42,400,000	+27,900,000	+27,900,000	
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	500,000	500,000			-500,000	-500,000	
96-64 Reserve personnel, Air Force	4,100,000	4,100,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	-1,300,000	-1,300,000	
96-64 National Guard personnel, Army	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000			
Total, Military personnel	132,300,000	132,300,000	132,300,000	132,300,000			
Retired Military Personnel							
Retired pay, Defense	178,662,000	133,662,000	128,662,000	128,662,000	-50,000,000	-5,000,000	
Operation and Maintenance							
96-64 Operation and maintenance, Army	27,200,000		10,000,000	10,000,000	-17,200,000	+10,000,000	
96-64 Operation and maintenance, Navy	36,000,000		36,000,000		-36,000,000		-36,000,000
96-64 Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps			10,500,000				-10,500,000
96-64 Operation and maintenance, Air Force	22,200,000		21,700,000	5,900,000	-16,300,000	+5,900,000	-15,800,000
Transfer from other account			(50,000,000)				(-50,000,000)
96-64 Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies	2,000,000		600,000	600,000	-1,400,000	+600,000	
Total, Operation and maintenance	87,400,000		78,800,000	16,500,000	-70,900,000	+16,500,000	-62,300,000
Transfer from other account			(50,000,000)				(-50,000,000)
Procurement							
96-64 Missile procurement, Army	25,000,000				-25,000,000		
96-64 Other procurement, Army	16,900,000		16,900,000	8,600,000	-8,300,000	+8,600,000	-8,300,000
96-64 Weapons procurement, Navy	219,900,000				-219,900,000		
96-64 Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	725,700,000	628,000,000	1,450,700,000	1,353,000,000	+627,300,000	+725,000,000	-97,700,000
96-64 Aircraft procurement, Air Force	566,100,000		20,000,000		-566,100,000		-20,000,000
Transfer from other account		(80,100,000)	(80,100,000)	(80,100,000)	(+80,100,000)		
96-64 Other procurement, Air Force	2,100,000				-2,100,000		
96-64 Procurement, Defense agencies	800,000		800,000	800,000		+800,000	
Total, Procurement	1,556,500,000	628,000,000	1,488,400,000	1,362,400,000	-194,100,000	+734,400,000	-126,000,000
Transfer from other account		(80,100,000)	(80,100,000)	(80,100,000)	(+80,100,000)		
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation							
96-64 Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army	60,700,000		43,700,000	5,000,000	-55,700,000	+5,000,000	-38,700,000
96-64 Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy	23,000,000	20,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	-20,000,000	-17,000,000	
96-64 Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force	357,800,000	190,000,000	233,000,000	190,000,000	-167,800,000		-43,000,000
96-64 Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies	24,000,000				-24,000,000		
Total, Research, development, test, and evaluation	465,500,000	210,000,000	279,700,000	198,000,000	-267,500,000	-12,000,000	-81,700,000
Total, chapter II:							
New budget (obligational) authority	2,420,362,000	1,103,962,000	2,107,862,000	1,837,862,000	-582,500,000	+733,900,000	-270,000,000
Transfer from other account		(80,100,000)	(130,100,000)	(80,100,000)	(+80,100,000)		(-50,000,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Con.							
CHAPTER III							
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy, Science, and Defense Activities							
96-82 Operating expenses.....	\$45,350,000	\$12,800,000	\$12,800,000	\$12,800,000	-\$32,550,000		
96-82 Plant and capital equipment.....	42,000,000	23,500,000	23,500,000	23,500,000	-18,500,000		
Total, Energy, science, and defense activities.....	87,350,000	36,300,000	36,300,000	36,300,000	-51,050,000		
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.....	10,600,000		2,700,000	2,700,000	-7,900,000	+\$2,700,000	
Total, Department of Energy.....	97,950,000	36,300,000	39,000,000	39,000,000	-58,950,000	+2,700,000	
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers—Civil							
96-132 Operation and maintenance, general.....	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000			
96-132 Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	106,000,000	106,000,000	106,000,000	106,000,000			
Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil.....	127,000,000	127,000,000	127,000,000	127,000,000			
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
96-108 Colorado River Basin project (by transfer).....	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)			
96-108 General administrative expenses (by transfer).....	(1,900,000)	(1,900,000)	(1,900,000)	(1,900,000)			
Total, Department of the Interior (by transfer).....	(21,900,000)	(21,900,000)	(21,900,000)	(21,900,000)			
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Funds Appropriated to the President							
Appalachian regional development programs (by transfer).....		(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(+10,000,000)		
Water Resources Council							
Water resources planning.....	49,186,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-47,186,000		
Total, chapter III: New budget (obligational) authority.....	274,136,000	165,300,000	168,000,000	168,000,000	-106,136,000	+2,700,000	
By transfer.....	(21,900,000)	(31,900,000)	(31,900,000)	(31,900,000)	(+10,000,000)		
CHAPTER IV							
FOREIGN OPERATIONS							
Funds Appropriated to the President							
Payment to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund.....							
96-96 Economic support fund (Turkey).....	856,000	856,000	856,000	856,000			
96-96 Military assistance program (reappropriation).....	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000			
96-92 Economic support fund (Egypt).....	33,000,000	22,500,000	27,500,000	25,000,000	-8,000,000	+2,500,000	-\$2,500,000
96-92 Assistance for relocation of facilities in Israel.....	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000			
96-92 Foreign military credit sales.....	800,000,000	800,000,000	800,000,000	800,000,000			
96-92 Foreign military credit sales.....	370,000,000	370,000,000	370,000,000	370,000,000			
Total, Funds appropriated to the President.....	1,603,856,000	1,593,356,000	1,598,356,000	1,595,856,000	-8,000,000	+2,500,000	-2,500,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCY							
ACTION—International Programs							
Peace Corps.....	4,400,000	3,221,000	3,480,000	3,221,000	-1,179,000		-259,000
DEPARTMENT OF STATE							
96-85 Migration and refugee assistance.....	104,910,000	104,910,000	108,910,000	108,910,000	+4,000,000	+4,000,000	
U.S. emergency refugee and migration assistance fund.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	17,200,000	17,200,000	+7,200,000	+7,200,000	
Total, Department of State.....	114,910,000	114,910,000	126,110,000	126,110,000	+11,200,000	+11,200,000	
Total, chapter IV: New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,723,166,000	1,711,487,000	1,727,946,000	1,725,187,000	+2,021,000	+13,700,000	-2,759,000
Appropriations.....	(1,690,166,000)	(1,688,987,000)	(1,700,446,000)	(1,700,187,000)	(+10,021,000)	(+11,200,000)	(-259,000)
Reappropriation.....	(33,000,000)	(22,500,000)	(27,500,000)	(25,000,000)	(-8,000,000)	(+2,500,000)	(-2,500,000)
CHAPTER V							
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT							
Neighborhoods, Voluntary Associations and Consumer Protection							
Neighborhood self-help development program.....	15,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-10,000,000		
Livable cities program.....	5,000,000				-5,000,000		
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	20,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-15,000,000		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested in H. Doc. 96-41 as amended by—		New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
		Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
	TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Con.							
	CHAPTER V—Continued							
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT							
96-113	Disaster relief.....	\$200,000,000	\$194,000,000	\$194,000,000	\$194,000,000	—\$6,000,000		
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
	CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION							
	Salaries and expenses.....	2,190,000	2,190,000	2,190,000	2,190,000			
	NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION							
	Research and development.....	185,000,000	185,000,000	185,000,000	185,000,000			
	NATIONAL COMMISSION ON AIR QUALITY							
96-130	Salaries and expenses (Increase in limitation).....	(45,000)	(35,000)	(45,000)	(40,000)	(—5,000)	(+\$5,000)	(—\$5,000)
	NATIONAL CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK							
	Salaries and expenses.....	4,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	—2,500,000		
	Self-help development.....	10,000,000	3,000,000		1,000,000	—9,000,000	—2,000,000	+1,000,000
	Total, National Consumer Cooperative Bank.....	14,000,000	4,500,000	1,500,000	2,500,000	—11,500,000	—2,000,000	+1,000,000
	SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM							
	Salaries and expenses.....	1,735,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	—1,135,000		
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY							
	Investment in National Consumer Cooperative Bank.....	40,000,000	8,000,000		1,000,000	—39,000,000	—7,000,000	+1,000,000
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION							
	Compensation and pensions.....	1,129,400,000	1,129,400,000	1,129,400,000	1,129,400,000			
	Readjustment benefits.....	301,700,000	301,700,000	301,700,000	301,700,000			
96-130	General operating expenses.....	3,091,000	3,091,000	3,091,000	3,091,000			
	Assistance for health manpower training institu- tions.....	57,468,000	57,468,000	57,468,000	57,468,000			
96-130	Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000			
	Total, Veterans Administration.....	1,492,159,000	1,492,159,000	1,492,159,000	1,492,159,000			
	CORPORATIONS							
	Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(313,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(—263,000)		
	Total, Chapter V: New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,955,084,000	1,891,449,000	1,880,449,000	1,882,449,000	—72,635,000	—9,000,000	+2,000,000
	Limitation.....	(358,000)	(85,000)	(95,000)	(90,000)	(—268,000)	(+5,000)	(—5,000)
	CHAPTER VI							
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
	Bureau of Land Management							
96-145	Management of lands and resources.....	55,850,000	44,850,000	55,850,000	52,603,000	—3,247,000	+7,753,000	—3,247,000
	Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service							
	Urban park and recreation fund.....	37,500,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	—17,500,000		
	National Park Service							
	Operation of the National Park System.....	1,727,000	1,727,000	1,727,000	1,727,000			
	Geological Survey							
	Surveys, investigations, and research.....	1,700,000				—1,700,000		
	Office of Surface Mining—Reclamation and Enforcement							
	Regulation and technology.....	2,241,000				—2,241,000		
	Bureau of Indian Affairs							
	Operation of Indian programs.....	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000			
	Office of Territorial Affairs							
	Administration of territories.....	1,419,000	1,419,000	23,312,000	3,312,000	+1,893,000	+1,893,000	—20,000,000
	Secretarial Offices							
	Office of the Secretary							
	Departmental management.....	200,000				—200,000		
	Total, Department of the Interior.....	107,637,000	74,996,000	107,889,000	84,642,000	—22,995,000	+9,646,000	—23,247,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Con.							
CHAPTER VI—Continued							
RELATED AGENCIES							
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE							
Forest Service							
Forest protection and utilization.....	\$60,000,000	\$60,000,000	\$57,245,000	\$57,245,000	-\$2,755,000	-\$2,755,000	
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy production, demonstration, and distribution.....	3,000,000				-3,000,000		
Energy conservation.....	43,025,000		1,200,000	1,200,000	-41,825,000	+1,200,000	
Economic Regulatory Administration.....	42,100,000	5,600,000	10,900,000	8,600,000	-33,500,000	+3,000,000	-\$2,300,000
Energy information administration.....	14,780,000		2,000,000	1,000,000	-13,780,000	+1,000,000	-1,000,000
Total, Department of Energy.....	102,905,000	5,600,000	14,100,000	10,800,000	-92,105,000	+5,200,000	-3,300,000
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION							
Salaries and expenses.....	350,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	-150,000		
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	300,000				-300,000		
Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	1,000,000				-1,000,000		
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	1,650,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	-1,450,000		
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES							
National Endowment for the Arts							
Salaries and expenses.....	1,400,000				-1,400,000		
National Endowment for the Humanities							
Salaries and expenses.....	1,400,000				-1,400,000		
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	2,800,000				-2,800,000		
PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION							
Land acquisition and development fund (authority to borrow).....	19,600,000	19,600,000	19,600,000	19,600,000			
Public development.....	17,900,000	17,900,000	17,900,000	17,900,000			
Total, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.....	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000			
Total, Related agencies.....	204,855,000	103,300,000	109,045,000	105,745,000	-99,110,000	+2,445,000	-3,300,000
Total, chapter VI:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	312,492,000	178,296,000	216,934,000	190,387,000	-122,105,000	+12,091,000	-26,547,000
Appropriations.....	(292,892,000)	(158,696,000)	(197,334,000)	(170,787,000)	(-122,105,000)	(+12,091,000)	(-26,547,000)
Authority to borrow.....	(19,600,000)	(19,600,000)	(19,600,000)	(19,600,000)			
CHAPTER VII							
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR							
Employment and Training Administration							
Employment and training assistance.....	400,000,000				-400,000,000		
Community service employment for older Americans.....	8,900,000	8,900,000	8,900,000	8,900,000			
96-145 Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds.....	500,000,000		500,000,000	500,000,000		+500,000,000	
Total, Employment and Training Administration.....	908,900,000	8,900,000	508,900,000	508,900,000	-400,000,000	+500,000,000	
Employment Standards Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....	8,218,000	8,218,000	8,218,000	8,218,000			
96-145 Black lung disability trust fund.....	300,000,000		300,000,000	300,000,000		+300,000,000	
Total, Department of Labor.....	1,217,118,000	17,118,000	817,118,000	817,118,000	-400,000,000	+800,000,000	
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE							
Health Services Administration							
Health services.....	100,219,000		14,969,000	4,969,000	-95,250,000	+4,969,000	-10,000,000
Center for Disease Control							
Preventive health services.....	20,600,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	-8,600,000		
National Institutes of Health							
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.....	10,713,000	5,000,000	10,713,000	7,500,000	-3,213,000	+2,500,000	-3,213,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Con.							
CHAPTER VII—Continued							
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued							
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration							
Alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health.....	\$4,118,000		\$2,554,000		\$-4,118,000		-\$2,554,000
Assistant Secretary for Health							
Salaries and expenses.....	23,490,000	\$10,000,000	11,000,000	\$11,000,000	-12,490,000	\$+1,000,000	
Health Care Financing Administration							
Grants to states for Medicaid.....	554,429,000	554,429,000	554,429,000	554,429,000			
Office of Education							
Elementary and secondary education.....	258,000,000	200,000,000		150,000,000	-108,000,000	-50,000,000	+150,000,000
Student loan insurance fund: appropriation.....	243,189,000	243,189,000	243,189,000	243,189,000			
Special projects and training.....	1,000,000		300,000	300,000	-700,000	+300,000	
Educational activities overseas (special foreign-currency program).....	2,000,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-1,500,000		
Total, Office of Education.....	504,189,000	443,689,000	243,989,000	393,989,000	-110,200,000	-49,700,000	+150,000,000
Social Security Administration							
Assistance payments program.....	4,985,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	-3,695,000		
Refugee assistance.....	51,664,000	59,964,000	59,964,000	59,964,000	+8,300,000		
Total, Social Security Administration.....	56,559,000	61,164,000	61,164,000	61,164,000	+4,605,000		
Assistant Secretary for Human Development Services							
Grants to States for social and child welfare services.....	188,548,000	188,548,000	188,548,000	188,548,000			
Human development services.....	129,028,000	151,528,000	149,528,000	151,528,000	+22,500,000		+2,000,000
Research and training activities overseas (special foreign currency program).....	3,490,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-2,490,000		
Total, Assistant Secretary for Human Development Services.....	321,066,000	341,076,000	339,076,000	341,076,000	+20,010,000		+2,000,000
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	1,595,383,000	1,427,358,000	1,249,894,000	1,386,127,000	-209,256,000	-41,231,000	+136,233,000
RELATED AGENCIES							
Action, operating expenses, domestic programs.....	15,313,000				-15,313,000		
Corporation for Public Broadcasting: Advance appropriations for 1981.....	162,000,000	162,000,000	162,000,000	162,000,000			
National Commission on Social Security.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000			
Railroad Retirement Board:							
Regional rail transportation protective account.....	18,870,000	18,870,000	18,870,000	18,870,000			
Reappropriation/extended availability.....	37,646,000		37,646,000	37,646,000		+37,646,000	
Limitation on salaries and expenses.....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)			
National Commission on the International Year of the Child.....	685,000		685,000	685,000		+685,000	
Community Services Administration.....			4,226,000				-4,226,000
Total, Related agencies.....	74,514,000	20,870,000	63,427,000	59,201,000	-15,313,000	+38,331,000	-4,226,000
Limitation on salaries and expenses.....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)			
Total, chapter VII:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	3,049,015,000	1,627,346,000	2,292,439,000	2,424,446,000	-624,569,000	+797,100,000	+132,007,000
Fiscal year 1979.....	(2,349,369,000)	(1,465,346,000)	(2,092,793,000)	(2,224,800,000)	(-624,569,000)	(+759,454,000)	(+132,007,000)
Fiscal year 1981.....	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)			
Reappropriation/extended availability.....	(37,646,000)		(37,646,000)	(37,646,000)		(+37,646,000)	
Limitation.....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)			
CHAPTER VIII							
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH							
Senate							
Salaries, Officers and Employees							
Committee employees.....	664,000		482,000	482,000	-182,000	+482,000	
Administrative, clerical, and legislative assistance to Senators.....	204,000		204,000	204,000		+204,000	
Agency contributions and longevity compensation.....	908,000		908,000	908,000		+908,000	
Total, Salaries, officers and employees.....	1,776,000		1,594,000	1,594,000	-182,000	+1,594,000	
Total, Senate.....	1,776,000		1,594,000	1,594,000	-182,000	+1,594,000	
House of Representatives							
Salaries, Officers and Employees							
Office of the Clerk.....	264,000	264,000	264,000	264,000			
Office of the Sergeant at Arms.....	2,029,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	-579,000		
Total, House of Representatives.....	2,293,000	1,714,000	1,714,000	1,714,000	-579,000		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested in H. Doc. 96-41 as amended by—	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Con.							
CHAPTER VIII—Continued							
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued							
Joint Items							
Contingent Expenses of the Senate							
96-58 Joint Committee on Printing.....	\$95,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	—\$35,000		
Education of Pages							
Education of congressional pages and pages of the Supreme Court.....	27,600				—27,600		
Capitol Guide Service							
Salaries and expenses.....	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000			
Total, Joint items.....	142,600	80,000	80,000	80,000	—62,600		
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL							
Capitol Buildings and Grounds							
96-108 Senate office buildings.....	600,000		600,000	600,000		+\$600,000	
96-82 House office buildings.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000			
Installation of solar collectors in House office buildings.....	3,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	—1,500,000		
Total, Capitol buildings and grounds.....	4,000,000	1,900,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	—1,500,000	+\$600,000	
Library Buildings and Grounds							
Structural and mechanical care.....	425,000	71,000	71,000	71,000	—354,000		
Total, Architect of the Capitol.....	4,425,000	1,971,000	2,571,000	2,571,000	—1,854,000	+\$600,000	
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS							
Salaries and expenses.....	3,360,000				—3,360,000		
Furniture and furnishings.....	500,000				—500,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....	(2,500,000)				(—2,500,000)		
Total, Library of Congress.....	3,860,000				—3,860,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....	(2,500,000)				(—2,500,000)		
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE							
96-58 Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses.....	980,000	413,000	413,000	413,000	—567,000		
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE							
Salaries and expenses.....	5,500,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	—5,350,000		
Total, Chapter VIII: New budget (obligational) authority.....	18,976,600	4,328,000	6,522,000	6,522,000	—12,454,600	+\$2,194,000	
Release of sec. 311 funds.....	(2,500,000)				(—2,500,000)		
CHAPTER IX							
DEPARTMENT OF STATE							
Administration of Foreign Affairs							
Salaries and expenses.....	13,892,000	4,100,000	4,100,000	4,100,000	—9,792,000		
Payment to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund.....	3,462,000	3,462,000	3,462,000	3,462,000			
Total, Administration of foreign affairs.....	17,354,000	7,562,000	7,562,000	7,562,000	—9,792,000		
International Organizations and Conferences							
Contributions to international organizations.....	58,357,000	58,357,000	30,641,000	58,357,000			+\$27,716,000
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities.....	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000			
Missions to international organizations.....	961,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	—211,000		
Total, International organizations and con- ferences.....	99,318,000	99,107,000	71,391,000	99,107,000	—211,000		+\$27,716,000
International Commissions							
International fisheries commissions.....	\$30,000				—\$30,000		
Total, Department of State.....	116,702,000	\$106,669,000	\$78,953,000	\$106,669,000	—10,033,000		+\$27,716,000
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE							
General Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....			250,000	150,000	+\$150,000	+\$150,000	—100,000
96-145 By transfer.....	(490,000)				(—490,000)		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested in H. Doc. 96-41 as amended by—	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Con.							
CHAPTER IX—Continued							
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Continued							
Legal Activities							
96-145 Salaries and expenses, general legal activities			974,000	874,000	+874,000	+874,000	—100,000
By transfer	(974,000)				(—974,000)		
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals	226,000				—226,000		
By transfer		(185,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)	(+185,000)		
Fees and expenses of witnesses	6,464,000	6,464,000	6,464,000	6,464,000			
Total, Legal activities	6,690,000	6,464,000	7,438,000	7,338,000	+648,000	+874,000	—100,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation							
96-145 Salaries and expenses			2,636,000	2,636,000	+2,636,000	+2,636,000	
By transfer	(2,636,000)				(—2,636,000)		
Immigration and Naturalization Service							
96-85 Salaries and expenses	200,000		3,935,000	3,935,000	+3,735,000	+3,935,000	
96-145 By transfer	(3,935,000)				(—3,935,000)		
Total, Department of Justice	6,890,000	6,464,000	14,259,000	14,059,000	+7,169,000	+7,595,000	—200,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE							
General Administration							
Participation in United States expositions	200,000				—200,000		
Economic Development Administration							
Economic Development Assistance Programs: Increase in limitation	(96,000,000)	(96,000,000)	(96,000,000)	(96,000,000)			
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration							
96-132 Construction	52,000,000		60,000,000	60,000,000	+8,000,000	+60,000,000	
Coastal zone management	7,000,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	—500,000		
Fishing vessel and gear damage compensation fund	3,500,000	500,000	2,000,000	1,000,000	—2,500,000	+500,000	—1,000,000
Fishermen's contingency fund	600,000	300,000	600,000	450,000	—150,000	+150,000	—150,000
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	63,100,000	7,300,000	69,100,000	67,950,000	+4,850,000	+60,650,000	—1,150,000
National Telecommunications and Information Administration							
Salaries and expenses	541,000				—541,000		
Total, Department of Commerce	63,841,000	7,300,000	69,100,000	67,950,000	+4,109,000	+60,650,000	—1,150,000
THE JUDICIARY							
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services							
Salaries of judges	3,550,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	—2,350,000		
Salaries of supporting personnel	5,690,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	—3,890,000		
Fees of jurors and commissioners	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	7,229,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	—3,629,000		
Salaries and expenses of magistrates	50,000				—50,000		
Space and facilities	2,377,000				—2,377,000		
Furniture and furnishings	8,505,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	—4,305,000		
Total, Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services	31,401,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	—16,601,000		
Administrative Office of the United States Courts							
Salaries and expenses	338,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	—188,000		
Federal Judicial Center							
Salaries and expenses	300,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	—150,000		
Total, The Judiciary	32,039,000	15,100,000	15,100,000	15,100,000	—16,939,000		
RELATED AGENCIES							
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency							
Arms control and disarmament activities	\$1,010,000	\$850,000	\$1,000,000	\$925,000	—\$85,000	+\$75,000	—\$75,000
Board for International Broadcasting							
Grants and expenses	3,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	—1,000,000		—1,000,000
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission							
Salaries and expenses: Increase in limitation	(3,500,000)				(—3,500,000)		
International Communication Agency							
Salaries and expenses	737,000				—737,000		
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	454,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	—154,000		
Total, International Communication Agency	1,191,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	—891,000		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested in H. Doc. 96-41 as amended by—	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Con.							
CHAPTER IX—Continued							
RELATED AGENCIES—Continued							
Renegotiation Board							
Salaries and expenses.....	1, 103, 000				-1, 103, 000		
Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy							
Salaries and expenses.....	224, 000	224, 000	224, 000	224, 000			
Small Business Administration							
96-128 Salaries and expenses.....	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000			
96-128 Disaster loan fund.....	1, 018, 000, 000	1, 018, 000, 000	1, 018, 000, 000	1, 018, 000, 000			
Total, Small Business Administration.....	1, 020, 000, 000	1, 020, 000, 000	1, 020, 000, 000	1, 020, 000, 000			
Total, Related agencies.....	1, 026, 528, 000	1, 023, 374, 000	1, 024, 524, 000	1, 023, 449, 000	-3, 079, 000	+75, 000	-1, 075, 000
Total, chapter IX:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	1, 246, 000, 000	1, 158, 907, 000	1, 201, 936, 000	1, 227, 227, 000	-18, 773, 000	+68, 320, 000	+25, 291, 000
Limitation.....	(99, 500, 000)	(96, 000, 000)	(96, 000, 000)	(96, 000, 000)	(-3, 500, 000)		
By transfer.....	(8, 035, 000)	(185, 000)	(185, 000)	(185, 000)	(-7, 850, 000)		
CHAPTER X							
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION							
Office of the Secretary							
Transportation planning, research, and development.....	5, 000, 000		5, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	-4, 000, 000	+1, 000, 000	-4, 000, 000
Coast Guard							
96-130 Retired pay.....	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000			
Pollution fund.....	23, 000, 000		13, 000, 000	13, 000, 000	-10, 000, 000	+13, 000, 000	
Offshore oil pollution compensation fund:							
Appropriation.....	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000			
Authority to borrow.....	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000			
Total, Coast Guard.....	35, 000, 000	12, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	-10, 000, 000	+13, 000, 000	
Federal Aviation Administration							
Facilities and equipment (airport and airway trust fund).....	13, 563, 000	10, 850, 000		8, 700, 000	-4, 863, 000	-2, 150, 000	+8, 700, 000
Research, engineering and development (airport and airway trust fund).....	3, 500, 000		3, 500, 000		-3, 500, 000		-3, 500, 000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	17, 063, 000	10, 850, 000	3, 500, 000	8, 700, 000	-8, 363, 000	-2, 150, 000	+5, 200, 000
Federal Highway Administration							
Off-system roads (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization).....	(18, 500, 000)	(18, 500, 000)	(18, 500, 000)	(18, 500, 000)			
Federal Railroad Administration							
Northeast Corridor improvement program.....	35, 000, 000	35, 000, 000	35, 000, 000	35, 000, 000			
Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	119, 000, 000	119, 000, 000	119, 000, 000	119, 000, 000			
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	154, 000, 000	154, 000, 000	154, 000, 000	154, 000, 000			
Urban Mass Transportation Administration							
Urban formula grants (by transfer).....		(40, 000, 000)				(-40, 000, 000)	
Waterborne transportation demonstration project.....		5, 000, 000		5, 000, 000	+5, 000, 000		+5, 000, 000
RELATED AGENCIES							
Civ'l Aeronautics Board							
Payments to air carriers.....	\$4, 000, 000	\$4, 000, 000	\$4, 000, 000	\$4, 000, 000			
The Panama Canal							
Canal Zone Government: Operating expenses.....	4, 934, 000	4, 934, 000	4, 934, 000	4, 934, 000			
Panama Canal Company: Limitation on General and administrative expenses.....	(1, 837, 000)	(1, 837, 000)	(1, 837, 000)	(1, 837, 000)			
U.S. Railway Association							
Administrative expenses.....	4, 200, 000	4, 200, 000	4, 200, 000	4, 200, 000			
Payments for purchase of Conrail securities.....	239, 000, 000	239, 000, 000	239, 000, 000	239, 000, 000			
Total, U.S. Railway Association.....	243, 200, 000	243, 200, 000	243, 200, 000	243, 200, 000			
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority							
Interest payments.....	16, 102, 000	16, 102, 000	23, 201, 000	23, 201, 000	+7, 099, 000	+7, 099, 000	
By transfer.....		(7, 099, 000)				(-7, 099, 000)	
National Alcohol Fuels Commission							
96-156 Salaries and expenses.....	1, 500, 000		1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000		+1, 500, 000	
GENERAL PROVISIONS							
Coast Guard: Offshore oil pollution compensation fund: Limitation on obligations.....	(60, 000, 000)	(60, 000, 000)	(60, 000, 000)	(60, 000, 000)			
Federal Aviation Administration: Loan guarantee program: Limitation on loan guarantees.....	(50, 000, 000)	(100, 000, 000)	(100, 000, 000)	(100, 000, 000)	(+50, 000, 000)		
Total, General provisions.....	(110, 000, 000)	(160, 000, 000)	(160, 000, 000)	(160, 000, 000)	(+50, 000, 000)		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested in H. Doc. 96-41 as amended by—	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Con.							
CHAPTER X—Continued							
GENERAL PROVISIONS—Continued							
Total, chapter X:							
New budget (obligational) authority	480,799,000	450,086,000	464,335,000	470,535,000	-10,264,000	+20,449,000	+6,200,000
Appropriations	(477,799,000)	(447,086,000)	(461,335,000)	(467,535,000)	(-10,264,000)	(+20,449,000)	(+6,200,000)
Authority to borrow	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)			
Appropriation to liquidate contract authorization	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)			
By transfer		(47,099,000)				(-47,099,000)	
Limitation	(1,837,000)	(1,837,000)	(1,837,000)	(1,837,000)			
CHAPTER XI							
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY							
International affairs	5,442,000				-5,442,000		
Bureau of Government Financial Operations:							
Salaries and expenses	9,017,000	9,017,000	9,017,000	9,017,000			
Payment to the Government of Guam	216,000	216,000	216,000	216,000			
Total, Bureau of Government Financial Operations	9,233,000	9,233,000	9,233,000	9,233,000			
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms	1,700,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	-1,300,000		
U.S. Customs Service	2,848,000				-2,848,000		
96-145 Bureau of the Mint	1,600,000	1,531,000			-1,600,000	-1,531,000	
Internal Revenue Service:							
Salaries and expenses	1,492,000	1,362,000	1,362,000	1,362,000	-130,000		
Taxpayer service and returns processing	35,445,000	27,555,000	27,555,000	27,555,000	-7,890,000		
Examinations and appeals	1,721,000				-1,721,000		
Investigations and collections	859,000				-859,000		
Payment where energy credit exceeds liability for tax	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000			
Total, Internal Revenue Service	40,217,000	29,617,000	29,617,000	29,617,000	-10,600,000		
U.S. Secret Service	700,000				-700,000		
Total, Department of the Treasury	61,740,000	40,781,000	39,250,000	39,250,000	-22,490,000	-1,531,000	
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE							
Payment to the Postal Service fund	18,233,000	18,233,000			-18,233,000	-18,233,000	
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT							
96-54 Council on Wage and Price Stability	5,199,000	3,199,000	3,199,000	3,199,000	-2,000,000		
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
General Services Administration:							
Federal buildings fund:							
96-82 Limitation on availability of revenue:							
96-82 Construction of buildings	(\$4,436,205)	(\$36,205)	(\$36,205)	(\$36,205)	(-\$4,400,000)		
Rental of space	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)			
Real property operations		(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)		
Total, Federal buildings fund	(18,436,205)	(7,036,205)	(7,036,205)	(7,036,205)	(-11,400,000)		
Federal Supply Service: General supply fund	81,300,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-71,300,000		
National Archives and Records Service: Records declassification	1,460,000	1,000,000			-1,460,000	-\$1,000,000	
General activities:							
General Management and Agency Operations:							
Salaries and expenses	1,700,000	1,700,000			-1,700,000	-1,700,000	
Office of the Inspector General			1,700,000	1,700,000	+1,700,000	+1,700,000	
Total, General Services Administration	84,460,000	12,700,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	-72,760,000	-1,000,000	
Office of Personnel Management:							
Salaries and expenses:							
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund	440,000		240,000	240,000	-200,000	+240,000	
Total, Office of Personnel Management	335,355,000	335,355,000	335,355,000	335,355,000			
Merit Systems Protection Board:							
Salaries and expenses:							
Office of Special Counsel	842,000	750,000	1,048,000	1,048,000	+1,048,000	+298,000	
		700,000	842,000	842,000		+142,000	
Total, Merit Systems Protection Board	842,000	1,450,000	1,890,000	1,890,000	+1,048,000	+440,000	
Federal Labor Relations Authority: Salaries and expenses							
	1,360,000	1,360,000	1,360,000	1,360,000			
International Commodity Agreements: Investment in international tin buffer stocks	60,000,000				-60,000,000		
Total, Independent agencies	482,457,000	350,865,000	350,545,000	350,545,000	-131,912,000	-320,000	
Total, chapter XI: New budget (obligational) authority	567,629,000	413,078,000	392,994,000	392,994,000	-174,635,000	-20,084,000	
CHAPTER XII							
96-58 Temporary Commission on Financial Oversight of the District of Columbia	4,500,000		4,500,000	4,500,000		+4,500,000	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA							
Federal Funds							
96-138 Federal payment to the District of Columbia	69,465,000		19,465,000	19,465,000	-50,000,000	+19,465,000	
Total, Federal payment to the District of Columbia	73,965,000		23,965,000	23,965,000	-50,000,000	+23,965,000	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Con.							
CHAPTER XII—Continued							
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS							
96-138 General operating expenses.....	(22,637,900)		(15,223,400)	(16,408,100)	(-6,229,800)	(+16,408,100)	(+\$1,184,700)
96-138 Public Safety.....	(14,984,100)		(11,111,000)	(11,111,000)	(-3,873,100)	(+11,111,000)	
96-138 Education.....	(2,387,500)		(1,823,900)	(723,900)	(-1,663,600)	(+723,900)	(-1,100,000)
96-138 Recreation.....	(151,800)		(43,000)	(43,000)	(-108,800)	(+43,000)	
96-138 Human resources.....	(9,435,700)		(5,161,700)	(5,161,700)	(-4,274,000)	(+5,161,700)	
96-138 Transportation.....	(5,277,000)		(4,194,900)	(4,194,900)	(-1,082,100)	(+4,194,900)	
96-138 Environmental services.....	(5,256,400)		(1,144,600)	(1,144,600)	(-4,111,800)	(+1,144,600)	
96-138 Personal services.....	(16,000,000)		(12,000,000)	(9,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	(+9,000,000)	(-3,000,000)
96-138 Settlement of claims and suits.....	(291,500)		(291,500)	(291,500)		(+291,500)	
96-138 Transition expense.....	(71,700)				(-71,700)		
96-138 Demonstration expenses.....	(2,565,000)		(2,656,000)	(2,656,000)		(+2,565,000)	
96-138 Capital outlay.....	(48,728,000)				(-48,728,000)		
Total, District of Columbia Funds.....	(127,786,600)		(53,559,000)	(50,643,700)	(-77,142,900)	(+50,643,700)	(-2,915,300)
Total chapter XII:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	73,965,000		23,965,000	23,965,000	-50,000,000	+23,965,000	
District of Columbia funds.....	(127,786,600)		(53,559,000)	(50,643,700)	(-77,142,900)	(+50,643,700)	(-2,915,300)
Total, title I, General supplementals:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	14,330,271,600	9,211,689,000	11,615,484,000	11,394,844,000	-2,935,427,600	+2,183,155,000	-220,640,000
Appropriations, 1979.....	(13,120,065,600)	(9,004,589,000)	(11,365,738,000)	(11,147,598,000)	(-1,972,467,600)	(+2,143,009,000)	(-218,140,000)
Appropriations, 1981.....	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)			
Authority to borrow, 1979.....	(977,560,000)	(22,600,000)	(22,600,000)	(22,600,000)	(-954,960,000)		
Reappropriations, 1979.....	(70,646,000)	(22,500,000)	(65,146,000)	(62,646,000)	(-8,000,000)	(+40,146,000)	(-2,500,000)
Appropriation to liquidate contract authorization.....	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)			
By transfer.....	(29,935,000)	(159,922,000)	(162,185,000)	(112,185,000)	(+82,250,000)	(-47,099,000)	(-50,000,000)
Increase in limitations.....	(102,695,000)	(98,922,000)	(98,932,000)	(98,927,000)	(-3,768,000)	(+5,000)	(-5,000)
Release of sec. 311 funds.....	(2,500,000)				(-2,500,000)		
District of Columbia funds.....	(127,786,600)		(53,559,000)	(50,643,700)	(-77,142,900)	(+50,643,700)	(-2,915,300)
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS							
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH							
Senate							
Salaries, officers and employees.....	\$6,019,000		\$6,019,000	\$6,019,000		+\$6,019,000	
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate.....	25,000		25,000	25,000		+25,000	
Senate policy committees.....	74,000		74,000	74,000		+74,000	
Inquiries and investigations.....	1,330,000		1,330,000	1,330,000		+1,330,000	
Folding documents.....	6,000		6,000	6,000		+6,000	
Miscellaneous items.....	13,000		13,000	13,000		+13,000	
Total, Senate.....	7,467,000		7,467,000	7,467,000		+7,467,000	
House of Representatives							
House leadership offices.....	75,200	\$75,200	75,200	75,200			
Salaries, officers and employees.....	1,357,700	1,357,700	1,357,700	1,357,700			
Committee on Appropriations (studies and investigations).....	8,900	8,900	8,900	8,900			
Office of the Law Revision Counsel.....	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000			
Office of the Legislative Counsel.....	60,400	60,400	60,400	60,400			
Members' clerk hire.....	5,142,400	5,142,400	5,142,400	5,142,400			
Allowances and expenses.....	773,600	773,600	773,600	773,600			
Special and select committees.....	2,572,000				-\$2,572,000		
Total, House of Representatives.....	10,004,200	7,432,200	7,432,200	7,432,200	-2,572,000		
Joint Items							
Joint Economic Committee.....	70,000				-70,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....		(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(+70,000)		
Joint Committee on Taxation.....	77,100				-77,100		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....		(75,100)	(75,100)	(75,100)	(+75,100)		
Education of pages.....	10,900	10,900	10,900	10,900			
Capitol Guide Service.....	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000			
Total, Joint items.....	187,000	39,900	39,900	39,900	-147,100		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....		(145,100)	(145,100)	(145,100)	(+145,100)		
Office of Technology Assessment							
Salaries and expenses.....	196,000				-196,000		
Congressional Budget Office							
Salaries and expenses.....	261,100				-261,100		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....		(261,100)	(261,100)	(261,100)	(+261,100)		
Architect of the Capitol							
Office of the Architect of the Capitol: Salaries.....	108,000				-108,000		
By transfer of sec. 311 from House office buildings.....		(108,000)	(108,000)	(108,000)	(+108,000)		
Capitol buildings.....	223,000				-223,000		
By transfer of sec. 311 from House office buildings.....		(223,000)	(223,000)	(223,000)	(+223,000)		
Capitol grounds.....	79,000				-79,000		
By transfer of sec. 311 from House office buildings.....		(79,000)	(79,000)	(79,000)	(+79,000)		
Senate office buildings.....	389,000				-389,000		
By release of \$55,000 of sec. 311 funds and transfer of \$273,000 of sec. 311 funds from Capitol Power Plant and \$61,000 from House office buildings.....			(389,000)	(389,000)	(+389,000)	(+389,000)	
Senate garage.....	7,000				-7,000		
By transfer of sec. 311 funds from Capitol Power Plant.....			(7,000)	(7,000)	(+7,000)	(+7,000)	
House office buildings.....	570,000				-570,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....		(570,000)	(570,000)	(570,000)	(+570,000)		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Con.							
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued							
Architect of the Capitol—Continued							
Capitol Power Plant.....	100,000				-100,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....		(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+100,000)		
Structural and mechanical care, Library buildings and grounds.....	95,000				-95,000		
By transfer of sec. 311 from House office buildings.....		(95,000)	(95,000)	(95,000)	(+95,000)		
Total, Architect of the Capitol.....	1,571,000				-1,571,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds and transfers.....		(1,175,000)	(1,571,000)	(1,571,000)	(+1,571,000)	(+396,000)	
Botanic Garden							
Salaries and expenses.....	56,000				-56,000		
By transfer of sec. 311 from House office buildings.....		(56,000)	(56,000)	(56,000)	(+56,000)		
Library of Congress							
Salaries and expenses.....	3,320,000				-3,320,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....		(1,387,000)	(1,387,000)	(1,387,000)	(+1,387,000)		
By transfer of sec. 311 from books for the blind and physically handicapped.....		(1,933,000)	(1,933,000)	(1,933,000)	(+1,933,000)		
Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses.....	561,000				-561,000		
By transfer of sec. 311 from books for the blind and physically handicapped.....		(61,000)	(61,000)	(61,000)	(+61,000)		
Congressional Research Service: Salaries and expenses.....	1,031,000				-1,031,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....		(1,031,000)	(1,031,000)	(1,031,000)	(+1,031,000)		
Books for the blind and physically handicapped: Salaries and expenses.....	\$115,000				-\$115,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....		(\$115,000)	(\$115,000)	(\$115,000)	(+115,000)		
Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program).....	17,000				-17,000		
Total, Library of Congress.....	5,044,000				-5,044,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds and transfers.....		(4,527,000)	(4,527,000)	(4,527,000)	(+4,527,000)		
Government Printing Office							
Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses.....	285,000				-285,000		
General Accounting Office							
Salaries and expenses.....	7,281,000				-7,281,000		
Release of sec. 311 funds.....		(7,281,000)	(7,281,000)	(7,281,000)	(+7,281,000)		
Total, legislative branch.....	32,352,300	7,472,100	14,939,100	14,939,100	-17,413,200	+7,467,000	
Release of sec. 311 funds and transfers.....		(13,445,200)	(13,841,200)	(13,841,200)	(+13,841,200)	(+396,000)	
THE JUDICIARY							
Supreme Court of the United States							
Salaries and expenses.....	400,000				-400,000		
Care of the building and grounds.....	36,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	-11,000		
Total, Supreme Court of the United States.....	436,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	-411,000		
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals							
Salaries and expenses.....	39,000	22,000	22,000	22,000	-17,000		
Customs Court							
Salaries and expenses.....	129,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	-89,000		
Court of Claims							
Salaries and expenses.....	95,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	-45,000		
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services							
Salaries of supporting personnel.....	8,954,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	-1,454,000		
Defender services.....	408,000				-408,000		
Salaries and expenses of magistrates.....	296,000				-296,000		
Salaries and expenses of referees.....	1,358,000	1,358,000	1,358,000	1,358,000			
Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services.....	11,016,000	8,858,000	8,858,000	8,858,000	-2,158,000		
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts							
Salaries and expenses.....	499,000	499,000	499,000	499,000			
Federal Judicial Center							
Salaries and expenses.....	132,000	104,000	104,000	104,000	-28,000		
Total, the judiciary.....	12,346,000	9,598,000	9,598,000	9,598,000	-2,748,000		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Con.							
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT							
The White House Office: Salaries and expenses.....	452,000	452,000	452,000	452,000			
Executive Residence at the White House: Operating expenses.....	108,000	108,000	108,000	108,000			
Special Assistance to the President: Salaries and expenses.....	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000			
Domestic policy staff: Salaries and expenses.....	44,000	44,000	44,000	44,000			
National Security Council: Salaries and expenses.....	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000			
Office of Administration: Salaries and expenses.....	183,000	183,000	183,000	183,000			
Office of Management and Budget: Salaries and expenses.....	844,000	844,000	844,000	844,000			
Office of Science and Technology Policy: Salaries and expenses.....	37,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	-17,000		
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: Salaries and expenses.....	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000			
Total, Executive Office of the President.....	1,870,000	1,853,000	1,853,000	1,853,000	-17,000		
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE							
Office of the Secretary.....	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000			
Departmental administration.....	508,000	508,000	508,000	508,000			
Working capital fund.....	(1,252,000)	(1,252,000)	(1,252,000)	(1,252,000)			
Office of the Inspector General.....	557,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	-407,000		
Transfer from food stamp program.....	(303,000)	(303,000)	(303,000)	(303,000)			
Total, Office of Inspector General.....	(860,000)	(453,000)	(453,000)	(453,000)	(-407,000)		
Office of the General Counsel.....	\$347,000	\$347,000	\$347,000	\$347,000			
Agricultural Research Service.....	10,050,000	2,500,000	7,500,000	5,000,000	-\$5,050,000	+\$2,500,000	-\$2,500,000
National Agricultural Library.....	200,000				-200,000		
Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service.....	2,966,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	-516,000		
World food and agricultural outlook and situation board.....	40,000				-40,000		
Foreign Agricultural Service.....	570,000	570,000	570,000	570,000			
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fund: Increase in limitation.....	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)			
Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and expenses.....	756,000	756,000	256,000	256,000	-500,000	-500,000	
Farmers Home Administration: Salaries and expenses.....	6,813,000	6,813,000	6,813,000	6,813,000			
Soil Conservation Service:							
Conservation operations.....	8,587,000	6,000,000	6,936,000	6,936,000	-1,651,000	+936,000	
River basin surveys and investigations.....	490,000	490,000			-490,000	-490,000	
Watershed planning.....	446,000	446,000			-446,000	-446,000	
Great plains conservation program.....	401,000	401,000	401,000	401,000			
Resource conservation and development.....	441,000	441,000	441,000	441,000			
Total, Soil Conservation Service.....	10,365,000	7,778,000	7,778,000	7,778,000	-2,587,000		
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.....	5,178,000	5,178,000	5,178,000	5,178,000			
Agricultural Marketing Service: Marketing services.....	1,352,000	1,352,000	1,352,000	1,352,000			
Food Safety and Quality Service.....	10,677,000	6,677,000	8,677,000	7,677,000	-3,000,000	+1,000,000	-1,000,000
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (Sec. 32): Increase in limitation.....	(197,000)	(197,000)	(197,000)	(197,000)			
Food and Nutrition Service: Food program administration.....	2,149,000	2,149,000	2,149,000	2,149,000			
Forest Service:							
Forest protection and utilization.....	28,741,000	21,556,000	21,556,000	21,556,000	-7,185,000		
Construction and land acquisition.....	442,000	332,000	332,000	332,000	-110,000		
Forest roads and trails.....	9,489,000	7,117,000	7,117,000	7,117,000	-2,372,000		
Assistance to States for tree improvement.....	18,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	-4,000		
Total, Forest Service.....	38,690,000	29,019,000	29,019,000	29,019,000	-9,671,000		
Total, Department of Agriculture.....	91,323,000	66,352,000	72,852,000	69,352,000	-21,971,000	+3,000,000	-3,500,000
Increase in limitations.....	(757,000)	(757,000)	(757,000)	(757,000)			
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE							
General Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....	780,000	740,000	740,000	740,000	-40,000		
Bureau of the Census							
Salaries and expenses.....	1,837,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	-90,000		
Periodic censuses and programs.....	5,398,000	5,128,000	5,128,000	5,128,000	-270,000		
Total, Bureau of the Census.....	7,235,000	6,875,000	6,875,000	6,875,000	-360,000		
Economic and Statistical Analysis							
Salaries and expenses.....	547,000	547,000	547,000	547,000			
Economic Development Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....	1,301,000	1,236,000	1,236,000	1,236,000	-65,000		
Local Public Works Program.....	387,000	368,000	368,000	368,000	-19,000		
Total, Economic Development Administration.....	1,688,000	1,604,000	1,604,000	1,604,000	-84,000		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates fiscal year 1979	House fiscal year 1979	Senate fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Con.							
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued							
Industry and Trade Administration							
Operations and administration.....	1,888,000	1,798,000	1,798,000	1,798,000	-90,000		
U.S. Travel Service							
Salaries and expenses.....	97,000	97,000	97,000	97,000			
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration							
Operations, research, and facilities.....	16,503,000	15,703,000	15,703,000	15,703,000	-800,000		
Coastal zone management.....	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000			
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.....	16,643,000	15,843,000	15,843,000	15,843,000	-800,000		
Patent and Trademark Office							
Salaries and expenses.....	3,054,000	3,054,000	3,054,000	3,054,000			
Science and Technical Research							
Scientific and technical research and services.....	2,740,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	-140,000		
National Telecommunications and Information Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....	130,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	-10,000		
Maritime Administration							
Operations and training.....	\$1,437,000	\$1,366,000	\$1,366,000	\$1,366,000	-\$71,000		
Total, Department of Commerce.....	36,239,000	34,644,000	34,644,000	34,644,000	-1,595,000		
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY							
Military Personnel							
Military personnel, Army.....	440,375,000	437,448,000	437,448,000	437,448,000	-2,927,000		
Military personnel, Navy.....	306,700,000	297,433,000	297,433,000	297,433,000	-9,267,000		
Military personnel, Marine Corps.....	97,425,000	96,525,000	96,525,000	96,525,000	-900,000		
Military personnel, Air Force.....	366,199,000	362,134,000	366,199,000	362,134,000	-4,065,000		
Reserve personnel, Army.....	18,950,000	9,950,000	13,550,000	13,550,000	-5,400,000	+\$3,600,000	-\$4,065,000
Reserve personnel, Navy.....	8,975,000		4,475,000	4,475,000	-4,500,000	+4,475,000	
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps.....	3,075,000	3,075,000	3,075,000	3,075,000			
Reserve personnel, Air Force.....	7,750,000	7,750,000	7,750,000	7,750,000			
National Guard personnel, Army.....	36,600,000	31,600,000	36,600,000	31,600,000	-5,000,000		
National Guard personnel, Air Force.....	8,123,000	8,123,000	10,023,000	10,023,000	+1,900,000	+1,900,000	-5,000,000
Total, military personnel.....	1,294,172,000	1,254,038,000	1,273,078,000	1,264,013,000	-30,159,000	+9,975,000	-9,065,000
Operation and Maintenance							
Operation and maintenance, Army.....	174,200,000	174,200,000	174,200,000	174,200,000			
Operation and maintenance, Navy.....	128,200,000	128,200,000	128,200,000	128,200,000			
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps.....	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000			
Operation and maintenance, Air Force.....	97,900,000	97,900,000	97,900,000	97,900,000			
Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies.....	102,200,000	82,200,000	102,200,000	90,200,000	-12,000,000	+8,000,000	-12,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve.....	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000			
Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	8,600,000	8,600,000	8,600,000	8,600,000			
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard.....	9,700,000	9,700,000	9,700,000	9,700,000			
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard.....	19,200,000	19,200,000	17,300,000	17,300,000	-1,900,000	-1,900,000	
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army.....	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000			
Court of Military Appeals, Defense.....	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000			
Total, operation and maintenance.....	546,300,000	526,300,000	544,400,000	532,400,000	-13,900,000	+6,100,000	-12,000,000
Family Housing							
Family housing, Defense.....	8,619,000				-8,619,000		
Total, Department of Defense—Military.....	1,849,091,000	1,780,338,000	1,817,478,000	1,796,413,000	-52,678,000	+16,075,000	-21,065,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers—Civil							
Construction, general.....			10,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000	+10,000,000	
General expenses.....	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000			
Operation and maintenance, general.....	16,600,000	16,600,000	16,600,000	16,600,000			
Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil.....	19,000,000	19,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	+10,000,000	+10,000,000	
Soldiers' and Airmen's Home							
Operation and maintenance.....	590,000	590,000	590,000	590,000			
The Panama Canal							
Operating expenses.....	1,234,000	1,048,000	1,048,000	1,048,000	-186,000		
By transfer.....		(186,000)	(186,000)	(186,000)	(+186,000)		
Corporation: Panama Canal Company, increase in limitation.....	(795,000)	(795,000)	(795,000)	(795,000)			
Total, Department of Defense—Civil.....	20,824,000	20,638,000	30,638,000	30,638,000	+9,814,000	+10,000,000	
(Increase in limitations).....	(795,000)	(795,000)	(795,000)	(795,000)			

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates fiscal year 1979	House fiscal year 1979	Senate fiscal year 1979	Conference fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Con.							
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy, science, and defense activities, operating expenses	15,617,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	-617,000		
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, salaries and expenses	1,930,000				-1,930,000		
Power Marketing Administrations	1,457,000	209,000	209,000	209,000	-1,248,000		
Fossil energy research and development	2,154,000	1,301,000	1,571,000	1,301,000	-853,000		-270,000
Energy production, demonstration, and distribution	312,000	234,000	234,000	234,000	-78,000		
Energy conservation	472,000	354,000	354,000	354,000	-118,000		
Strategic petroleum reserve	289,000	217,000	217,000	217,000	-72,000		
Energy information administration, operating expenses	1,258,000	1,258,000	1,258,000	1,258,000			
Total, Department of Energy	23,489,000	18,573,000	18,843,000	18,573,000	-4,916,000		-270,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE							
Food and Drug Administration							
Salaries and expenses	\$8,705,000	\$6,800,000	\$6,800,000	\$6,800,000	\$-1,905,000		
Health Services Administration							
Indian health services		5,664,000	8,364,000	8,364,000	+8,364,000	+\$2,700,000	
By transfer	(11,152,000)	(3,600,000)			(-11,152,000)	(-3,600,000)	
Center for Disease Control							
Preventive health services	2,973,000	2,673,000	2,673,000	2,673,000	-300,000		
National Institutes of Health							
Office of the Director, by transfer	(784,000)	(784,000)	(784,000)	(784,000)			
Assistant Secretary for Health							
Salaries and expenses	1,672,000	1,138,000	1,138,000	1,138,000	-534,000		
National Institute of Education							
National Institute of Education	160,000				-160,000		
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration							
96-54 St. Elizabeths Hospital, by transfer	(3,428,000)	(3,428,000)	(3,428,000)	(3,428,000)			
Health Care Financing Administration							
Quality Care management, research and administration	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000			
96-54 Trust fund transfer	(3,800,000)	(3,800,000)	(3,800,000)	(3,800,000)			
Social Security Administration							
Limitation on salaries and expenses: Increase in limitation	(71,500,000)	(37,500,000)	(37,500,000)	(37,500,000)	(-34,000,000)		
Public assistance	1,105,000	1,105,000	1,105,000	1,105,000			
Assistant Secretary for Human Development Services							
Human development services	2,387,000	2,387,000	2,387,000	2,387,000			
Departmental Management							
Office of Consumer Affairs	32,000	20,000	32,000	32,000		+12,000	
General departmental management	3,545,000	2,265,000	2,265,000	2,265,000	-1,280,000		
Total, departmental management	3,577,000	2,285,000	2,297,000	2,297,000	-1,280,000	+12,000	
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	23,179,000	24,652,000	27,364,000	27,364,000	+4,185,000	+2,712,000	
Increase in limitations	(71,500,000)	(37,500,000)	(37,500,000)	(37,500,000)	(-34,000,000)		
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT							
Management and Administration							
Salaries and expenses, Department of Housing and Urban Development	16,890,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-6,890,000		
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Land Development							
Management of lands and resources	4,418,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	-1,118,000		
Bureau of Reclamation							
Operation and maintenance	2,363,000	2,363,000	2,363,000	2,363,000			
General administrative expenses	760,000	760,000	760,000	760,000			
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	3,123,000	3,123,000	3,123,000	3,123,000			
Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service							
Salaries and expenses	406,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	-106,000		
Land and water conservation fund: Increase in limitation	(258,000)	(188,000)	(188,000)	(188,000)	(-70,000)		
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service							
Resource management	5,410,000	4,500,000	4,310,000	4,310,000	-1,100,000	-190,000	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Con.							
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued							
National Park Service							
Operation of the National Park System.....	\$9,121,000	\$5,000,000	\$7,041,000	\$6,000,000	-\$3,121,000	+\$1,000,000	-\$1,041,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	83,000				-83,000		
Planning, development, and operation of recreation facilities.....	350,000				-350,000		
Total, National Park Service.....	9,554,000	5,000,000	7,041,000	6,000,000	-3,554,000	+1,000,000	-1,041,000
Geological Survey							
Surveys, investigations and research.....	10,414,000	9,511,000	9,511,000	9,511,000	-903,000		
Bureau of Mines							
Mines and minerals.....	2,186,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	-686,000		
Bureau of Indian Affairs							
Operation of Indian programs.....	13,704,000	10,300,000	10,300,000	10,300,000	-3,404,000		
Office of Territorial Affairs							
Administration of territories.....	100,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	-25,000		
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	130,000	98,000	98,000	98,000	-32,000		
Total, Office of Territorial Affairs.....	230,000	173,000	173,000	173,000	-57,000		
Office of the Solicitor							
Salaries and expenses.....	526,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-26,000		
Office of the Secretary							
Departmental management.....	1,217,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	-317,000		
Total, Department of the Interior.....	51,188,000	39,107,000	40,958,000	39,917,000	-11,271,000	+810,000	-1,041,000
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE							
General Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....	967,000				-967,000		
By transfer.....		(1,165,000)	(1,165,000)	(1,165,000)	(+1,165,000)		
Legal Activities							
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities.....	457,000				-457,000		
By transfer.....		(750,000)	(750,000)	(750,000)	(+750,000)		
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division.....	1,131,000				-1,131,000		
By transfer.....		(1,131,000)	(1,131,000)	(1,131,000)	(+1,131,000)		
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals.....	7,293,000				-7,293,000		
By transfer.....		(7,293,000)	(7,293,000)	(7,293,000)	(+7,293,000)		
Total, Legal activities.....	8,881,000				-8,881,000		
Federal Bureau of Investigation							
Salaries and expenses.....	20,506,000	17,293,000	16,593,000	16,593,000	-3,913,000	-700,000	
By transfer.....		(3,213,000)	(3,913,000)	(3,913,000)	(+3,913,000)	(+700,000)	
Immigration and Naturalization Service							
Salaries and expenses.....	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000			
Drug Enforcement Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....	700,000				-700,000		
By transfer.....	(572,000)	(1,272,000)	(772,000)	(772,000)	(+200,000)	(-500,000)	
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....	1,437,000				-1,437,000		
Total, Department of Justice.....	38,491,000	23,293,000	22,593,000	22,593,000	-15,898,000	-700,000	
By transfer.....	(572,000)	(14,824,000)	(15,024,000)	(15,024,000)	(+14,452,000)	(+200,000)	
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR							
Employment and Training Administration							
Program administration.....	676,000	676,000	676,000	676,000			
Trust fund transfer.....	(1,403,000)	(1,403,000)	(1,403,000)	(1,403,000)			
Employment Standards Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....	6,069,000				-6,069,000		
Trust fund transfer.....	(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)			
Occupational Safety and Health Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....	1,810,000	1,810,000	1,810,000	1,810,000			

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested in H. Doc. 96-41 as amended by—	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Con.							
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued							
Mine Safety and Health Administration							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$2,730,000	\$2,480,000	\$2,480,000	\$2,480,000	—\$250,000		
Bureau of Labor Statistics							
Salaries and expenses.....	715,000				—715,000		
Departmental Management							
Salaries and expenses.....	2,442,000	2,167,000	2,167,000	2,167,000	—275,000		
Trust fund transfer.....	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)			
Total, Department of Labor.....	14,442,000	7,133,000	7,133,000	7,133,000	—7,309,000		
Trust fund transfers.....	(1,476,000)	(1,476,000)	(1,476,000)	(1,476,000)			
DEPARTMENT OF STATE							
Administration of Foreign Affairs							
Salaries and expenses.....	13,460,000	11,460,000	11,460,000	11,460,000	—2,000,000		
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of build- ings abroad.....	177,000	177,000	177,000	177,000			
Total, Administration of foreign affairs.....	13,637,000	11,637,000	11,637,000	11,637,000	—2,000,000		
International Organizations and Conferences							
Missions to international organizations.....	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000			
International Commissions							
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, salaries and expenses.....	189,000	189,000	189,000	189,000			
American sections, international commissions.....	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000			
Total, International commissions.....	254,000	254,000	254,000	254,000			
Other							
Migration and refugee assistance.....	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000			
Total, Department of State.....	14,161,000	12,161,000	12,161,000	12,161,000	—2,000,000		
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION							
Office of the Secretary							
Salaries and expenses.....	843,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	—143,000		
By transfer.....	(63,331)	(63,331)	(63,331)	(63,331)			
Coast Guard							
Operating expenses.....	24,470,000	22,670,000	22,670,000	22,670,000	—1,800,000		
Reserve training.....	1,680,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	—80,000		
Total, Coast Guard.....	26,150,000	24,270,000	24,270,000	24,270,000	—1,880,000		
Federal Aviation Administration							
Operations.....	60,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	—6,000,000		
By transfer.....		(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)		
Operation and maintenance, Metropolitan Wash- ington Airports.....	630,000	630,000	630,000	630,000			
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	60,630,000	54,630,000	54,630,000	54,630,000	—6,000,000		
Federal Highway Administration							
Motor carrier safety.....	244,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	—24,000		
Federal-aid highways, trust fund: Increase in limitation.....	(4,770,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(—570,000)		
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration							
Traffic and highway safety.....	1,000,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	—600,000		
Federal Railroad Administration							
Office of the Administrator.....	335,000	335,000	335,000	335,000			
Railroad safety.....	570,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	—70,000		
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	905,000	835,000	835,000	835,000	—70,000		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation:							
Increase in limitation.....	(32,000)	(32,000)	(32,000)	(32,000)			
Total, Department of Transportation.....	89,772,000	81,055,000	81,055,000	81,055,000	—8,717,000		
Increase in limitations.....	(4,802,000)	(4,232,000)	(4,232,000)	(4,232,000)	(—570,000)		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Con.							
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY							
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, by transfer.....	(\$979,000)	(\$979,000)	(\$979,000)	(\$979,000)			
Bureau of Government Financial Operations: Salaries and expenses, by transfer.....	(2,289,000)	(2,289,000)	(2,289,000)	(2,289,000)			
New York City loan guarantee program, by transfer.....	(34,000)				(-\$34,000)		
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms: Salaries and expenses, by transfer.....	(4,900,000)	(4,900,000)	(4,900,000)	(4,900,000)			
U.S. Customs Service: Salaries and expenses.....	9,409,000	13,459,000	10,833,000	13,459,000	+4,050,000		+\$2,626,000
Bureau of the Mint: Salaries and expenses, by transfer.....	(584,000)	(584,000)	(584,000)	(584,000)			
Internal Revenue Service:							
Salaries and expenses.....	5,727,000	5,727,000	5,727,000	5,727,000			
Taxpayer service and returns processing.....	24,133,000	24,133,000	24,133,000	24,133,000			
Examinations and appeals.....	20,609,000	20,609,000	20,609,000	20,609,000			
Investigations and collections.....	19,369,000	19,369,000	19,369,000	19,369,000			
Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	69,838,000	69,838,000	69,838,000	69,838,000			
U.S. Secret Service: Salaries and expenses.....	1,314,000	1,314,000	1,314,000	1,314,000			
By transfer.....	(3,214,000)	(3,214,000)	(3,214,000)	(3,214,000)			
Total, Department of the Treasury.....	80,561,000	84,611,000	81,985,000	84,611,000	+4,050,000		+2,626,000
By transfer.....	(12,000,000)	(11,966,000)	(11,966,000)	(11,966,000)	(-\$34,000)		
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY							
Agency and regional management.....	2,000,000				-2,000,000		
Research and development.....	1,800,000				-1,800,000		
Abatement and control.....	2,600,000				-2,600,000		
Enforcement.....	1,700,000				-1,700,000		
Total, Environmental Protection Agency.....	8,100,000				-8,100,000		
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION							
Federal buildings fund: Limitations on availability of revenue: Increase in limitations:							
Real property operations.....	(9,079,000)	(9,079,000)	(9,079,000)	(9,079,000)			
Program direction and centralized services.....	(2,565,000)	(2,565,000)	(2,565,000)	(2,565,000)			
Total, Federal buildings fund.....	(11,644,000)	(11,644,000)	(11,644,000)	(11,644,000)			
Personal property activities: Federal Supply Service, operating expenses.....	5,116,000	5,116,000	5,116,000	5,116,000			
Records Activities:							
National Archives and Records Service, operating expenses.....	1,938,000	1,938,000	1,938,000	1,938,000			
Records declassification.....	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000			
Total, records activities.....	2,028,000	2,028,000	2,028,000	2,028,000			
Automated Data and Telecommunications Service: Operating expenses.....	386,000	386,000	386,000	386,000			
Federal Property Resources Service: Operating expenses.....	1,279,000	1,279,000	1,279,000	1,279,000			
General activities:							
General management and agency operations:							
Salaries and expenses.....	732,000	732,000	732,000	732,000			
Indian trust accounting.....	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000			
Administrative and staff support services:							
Salaries and expenses.....	3,492,000	3,492,000	3,492,000	3,492,000			
Consumer Information Center.....	26,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	-10,000		
Total, general activities.....	4,365,000	4,355,000	4,355,000	4,355,000	-10,000		
Total, General Services Administration.....	13,174,000	13,164,000	13,164,000	13,164,000	-10,000		
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION							
Research and program management.....	30,969,000	25,969,000	25,969,000	25,969,000	-5,000,000		
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION							
Medical care.....	74,538,000	50,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-34,538,000	-10,000,000	
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	1,266,000				-1,266,000		
General operating expenses.....	20,620,000	12,620,000	12,620,000	12,620,000	-8,000,000		
Construction, minor projects.....	944,000	944,000	944,000	944,000			
Total, Veterans Administration.....	97,368,000	63,564,000	53,564,000	53,564,000	-43,804,000	-10,000,000	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Con.							
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Action:							
Operating expenses, international programs...	\$958,000	\$958,000	\$958,000	\$958,000			
Operating expenses, domestic programs.....	898,000	798,000	798,000	798,000	—\$100,000		
Total, Action.....	1,856,000	1,756,000	1,756,000	1,756,000	—100,000		
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation: Salaries and expenses.....	34,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	—8,000		
96-132 American Battle Monuments Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	1,185,000	873,000	1,185,000	1,185,000		+\$312,000	
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency: Arms control and disarmament activities.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000			
96-130 Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses.....	694,000	694,000	694,000	694,000			
Commission on Civil Rights: Salaries and expenses.....	341,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	—241,000		
Commodity Futures Trading Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	532,000	532,000	532,000	532,000			
Consumer Product Safety Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	1,300,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	—550,000		
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	3,827,000				—3,827,000		
Export-Import Bank of the United States: Increase in limitation.....	(225,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(—50,000)		
Farm Credit Administration: Revolving fund for administrative expenses: Increase in limitation.....	(350,000)	(350,000)	(350,000)	(350,000)			
Federal Election Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	293,000	293,000	293,000	293,000			
Federal Emergency Management Agency:							
Emergency planning, preparedness, and mobilization.....	2,285,000	1,885,000	1,885,000	1,885,000	—400,000		
Hazard mitigation and disaster assistance.....	1,255,000	635,000	635,000	635,000	—620,000		
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	3,540,000	2,520,000	2,520,000	2,520,000	—1,020,000		
Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Increase in limitations:							
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(616,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(—416,000)		
Limitation on nonadministrative expenses.....	(1,161,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(—461,000)		
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Limitation on administrative expenses: Increase in limitation.....	(35,000)				(—35,000)		
Federal Labor Relations Authority: Salaries and expenses.....	429,000	429,000	429,000	429,000			
Federal Maritime Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	330,000	230,000	200,000	200,000	—130,000	—30,000	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Salaries and expenses.....	528,000	528,000	528,000	528,000			
Federal Trade Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	2,000,000	1,750,000	550,000	550,000	—1,450,000	—1,200,000	
Intergovernmental agencies:							
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Salaries and expenses.....	39,000	39,000	39,000	39,000			
Appalachian Regional Commission: Salaries and expenses, by transfer.....	(77,000)	(77,000)	(77,000)	(77,000)			
Delaware River Basin Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000			
Susquehanna River Basin Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000			
Total, Intergovernmental agencies.....	43,000	43,000	43,000	43,000			
By transfer.....	(77,000)	(77,000)	(77,000)	(77,000)			
International Communication Agency: Salaries and expenses.....	6,038,000	5,938,000	5,938,000	5,938,000	—100,000		
International Trade Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	482,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	—182,000		
Interstate Commerce Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	2,750,000	2,475,000	2,475,000	2,475,000	—275,000		
Merit Systems Protection Board:							
Salaries and expenses.....	378,000	378,000	378,000	378,000			
Increase in limitation.....	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)			
Office of Special Counsel.....	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000			
Total, Merit Systems Protection Board.....	392,000	392,000	392,000	392,000			
National Capital Planning Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	74,000	56,000	56,000	56,000	—18,000		
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science: Salaries and expenses.....	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000			
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities:							
National Endowment for the Arts: Salaries and expenses.....	205,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	—55,000		
National Endowment for the Humanities: Salaries and expenses.....	247,000	185,000	185,000	185,000	—62,000		
National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses.....	2,545,000	2,295,000	2,295,000	2,295,000	—250,000		
National Mediation Board: Salaries and expenses.....	64,000	64,000	64,000	64,000			
National Science Foundation: Research and related activities.....	625,000				—625,000		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Con.							
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued							
National Transportation Safety Board: Salaries and expenses.....	\$500,000	\$480,000	\$480,000	\$480,000	—\$20,000		
Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000			
Office of Personnel Management: Salaries and expenses.....	4,248,000	4,248,000	4,248,000	4,248,000			
Increase in limitation.....	(1,164,000)	(1,164,000)	(1,164,000)	(1,164,000)			
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation: Salaries and expenses.....	39,000	29,000	29,000	29,000	—10,000		
Railroad Retirement Board: Increase in limitation.....	(1,386,000)	(1,386,000)	(1,386,000)	(1,386,000)			
Renegotiation Board: Salaries and expenses.....	137,000				—137,000		
Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	2,450,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	2,450,000			
Selective Service System: Salaries and expenses.....	306,000	185,000	185,000	185,000	—121,000		
Smithsonian Institution:							
Salaries and expenses.....	2,316,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	—616,000		
Science Information Exchange.....	84,000	63,000	63,000	63,000	—21,000		
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	317,000	240,000			—317,000	—\$240,000	
Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	28,000	21,000	21,000	21,000	—7,000		
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	2,745,000	2,024,000	1,784,000	1,784,000	—961,000	—240,000	
U.S. Tax Court: Salaries and expenses.....	88,000	88,000	88,000	88,000			
Total, title II—Increased pay costs:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	2,591,408,300	2,360,772,100	2,412,228,100	2,388,978,100	—202,430,200	+28,206,000	—\$23,250,000
By transfer.....	(28,379,331)	(40,231,331)	(36,831,331)	(36,831,331)	(+8,452,000)	(—3,400,000)	
Trust fund transfer.....	(5,276,000)	(5,276,000)	(5,276,000)	(5,276,000)			
Increase in limitations.....	(83,058,000)	(47,456,000)	(47,456,000)	(47,456,000)	(—35,602,000)		
Release of sec. 311 funds and transfers.....		(13,445,200)	(13,841,200)	(13,841,220)	(+13,841,200)	(+396,000)	
SUMMARY							
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTS							
I—Agriculture:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	2,208,647,000	507,450,000	1,132,102,000	1,045,270,000	—1,163,377,000	+537,820,000	—86,832,000
Appropriations.....	(1,253,687,000)	(507,450,000)	(1,132,102,000)	(1,045,270,000)	(—208,417,000)	(+537,820,000)	(—86,832,000)
Authority to borrow.....	(954,960,000)				(—954,960,000)		
II—Defense:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	2,420,362,000	1,103,962,000	2,107,862,000	1,837,862,000	—582,500,000	+733,900,000	—270,000,000
Transfer from other account.....		(80,100,000)	(130,100,000)	(80,100,000)	(+80,100,000)		(—50,000,000)
III—Energy and Water Development:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	274,136,000	165,300,000	168,000,000	168,000,000	—106,136,000	+2,700,000	
By transfer.....	(21,900,000)	(31,900,000)	(31,900,000)	(31,900,000)	(+10,000,000)		
IV—Foreign Operations:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,723,166,000	1,711,487,000	1,727,946,000	1,725,187,000	+2,021,000	+13,700,000	—2,759,000
Appropriations.....	(1,690,166,000)	(1,688,987,000)	(1,700,446,000)	(1,700,187,000)	(+10,021,000)	(+11,200,000)	(—259,000)
Reappropriations, 1979.....	(33,000,000)	(22,500,000)	(27,500,000)	(25,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(+2,500,000)	(—2,500,000)
V—Housing and Urban Development—Independent agencies:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,955,084,000	1,891,449,000	1,880,449,000	1,882,449,000	—72,635,000	—9,000,000	+2,000,000
Increase in limitations.....	(358,000)	(85,000)	(95,000)	(90,000)	(—268,000)	(+5,000)	(—5,000)
VI—Interior and Related Agencies:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	312,942,000	178,296,000	216,934,000	190,387,000	—122,105,000	+12,091,000	—26,547,000
Appropriations.....	(292,892,000)	(158,696,000)	(197,334,000)	(170,787,000)	(—122,105,000)	(+12,091,000)	(—26,547,000)
Authority to borrow.....	(19,600,000)	(19,600,000)	(19,600,000)	(19,600,000)			
VII—Labor and Health, Education and Welfare:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	3,049,015,000	1,627,346,000	2,292,439,000	2,424,446,000	—624,569,000	+797,100,000	+132,007,000
Appropriations, 1979.....	(2,849,369,000)	(1,465,346,000)	(2,092,793,000)	(2,224,800,000)	(—624,569,000)	(+759,454,000)	(+132,007,000)
Appropriations, 1981.....	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)			
Reappropriations, 1979.....	(37,646,000)	(37,646,000)	(37,646,000)	(37,646,000)		(+37,646,000)	
Increase in limitations.....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)			
VIII—Legislative Branch:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	18,976,600	4,328,000	6,522,000	6,522,000	—12,454,600	+2,194,000	
Release of sec. 311 funds.....	(2,500,000)				(—2,500,000)		
Military construction: New budget (obligational) authority.....	(138,861,000)				(—138,861,000)		
IX—State, Justice, Commerce and the Judiciary:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,246,000,000	1,158,907,000	1,201,936,000	1,227,227,000	—18,773,000	+68,320,000	+25,291,000
Increase in limitations.....	(99,500,000)	(96,000,000)	(96,000,000)	(96,000,000)	(—3,500,000)		
By transfer.....	(8,035,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)	(—7,850,000)		
X—Transportation:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	480,799,000	450,086,000	464,335,000	470,535,000	—10,264,000	+20,449,000	+6,200,000
Appropriations.....	(477,799,000)	(447,086,000)	(461,335,000)	(467,535,000)	(—10,264,000)	(+20,449,000)	(+6,200,000)
Authority to borrow.....	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)			
By transfer.....		(47,099,000)				(—47,099,000)	
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization.....	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)			
Increase in limitations.....	(1,837,000)	(1,837,000)	(1,837,000)	(1,837,000)			
XI—Treasury, Postal Service and General Government: New budget (obligational) authority.....	567,629,000	413,078,000	392,994,000	392,994,000	—174,635,000	—20,084,000	
XII—District of Columbia:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	73,965,000		23,965,000	23,965,000	—50,000,000	+23,965,000	
District of Columbia funds.....	(127,786,600)		(53,559,000)	(50,643,700)	(—77,142,900)	(+50,643,700)	(—2,915,300)
Total, title I—General supplements:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	14,330,271,600	9,211,689,000	11,615,484,000	11,394,844,000	—2,935,427,600	+2,183,155,000	—220,640,000
Appropriations, 1979.....	(13,120,065,600)	(9,004,589,000)	(11,365,738,000)	(11,147,598,000)	(—1,972,467,600)	(+2,143,009,000)	(—218,140,000)
Appropriations, 1981.....	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)			
Authority to borrow, 1979.....	(977,560,000)	(22,600,000)	(22,600,000)	(22,600,000)	(—954,960,000)		
Reappropriations, 1979.....	(70,646,000)	(22,500,000)	(65,146,000)	(62,646,000)	(—8,000,000)	(+40,146,000)	(—2,500,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

Requested
in H. Doc.
96-41 as
amended
by—

	New budget authority				Conference compared with—		
	Estimates, fiscal year 1979	House, fiscal year 1979	Senate, fiscal year 1979	Conference, fiscal year 1979	1979 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
SUMMARY—Continued							
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTS—Continued							
Total, title I—General supplements—Continued							
New budget (obligational) authority—Con.							
Appropriation to liquidate contract authori- zation.....	(\$18,500,000)	(\$18,500,000)	(\$18,500,000)	(\$18,500,000)			
By transfer.....	(29,935,000)	(159,284,000)	(162,185,000)	(112,185,000)	(+\$82,250,000)	(-\$47,099,000)	(-\$50,000,000)
Increase in limitations.....	(102,695,000)	(98,922,000)	(98,932,000)	(98,927,000)	(-\$3,768,000)	(+\$5,000)	(-\$5,000)
Release of sec. 311 funds.....	(2,500,000)				(-\$2,500,000)		
District of Columbia funds.....	(127,786,600)		(53,559,000)	(50,643,700)	(-\$77,142,900)	(+\$50,643,700)	(-\$2,915,300)
Total, title II—Increased pay costs:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	2,591,408,300	2,360,772,100	2,412,228,100	2,388,978,100	-202,430,200	+28,206,000	-23,250,000
By transfer.....	(28,379,331)	(40,231,331)	(36,831,331)	(36,831,331)	(+\$82,250,000)	(-\$47,099,000)	(-\$50,000,000)
Trust fund transfer.....	(5,276,000)	(5,276,000)	(5,276,000)	(5,276,000)			
Increase in limitations.....	(83,058,000)	(47,456,000)	(47,456,000)	(47,456,000)	(-\$35,602,000)		
Release of sec. 311 funds and transfers.....		(13,445,200)	(13,841,200)	(13,841,200)	(+\$13,841,200)	(+\$396,000)	
Grand total—titles I and II:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	16,921,679,900	11,572,461,100	14,027,712,100	13,783,822,100	-3,137,857,800	+2,211,361,000	-243,890,000
Appropriations, 1979.....	(15,711,473,900)	(11,365,351,100)	(13,777,966,100)	(13,536,576,100)	(-\$2,174,897,800)	(+\$2,171,215,000)	(-\$241,390,000)
Appropriations, 1981.....	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)	(162,000,000)			
Authority to borrow, 1979.....	(977,560,000)	(22,600,000)	(22,600,000)	(22,600,000)	(-\$954,960,000)		
Reappropriations, 1979.....	(70,646,000)	(22,500,000)	(65,146,000)	(62,646,000)	(-\$8,000,000)	(+\$40,146,000)	(-\$2,500,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) au- thority, 1979.....	(16,759,679,900)	(11,410,461,100)	(13,865,712,100)	(13,621,822,100)	(-\$3,137,857,800)	(+\$2,211,361,000)	(-\$243,890,000)
Appropriation to liquidate contract authori- zation.....	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)	(18,500,000)			
By transfer.....	(58,314,331)	(199,515,331)	(199,016,331)	(149,016,331)	(+\$90,702,000)	(-\$50,499,000)	(-\$50,000,000)
Trust fund transfer.....	(5,276,000)	(5,276,000)	(5,276,000)	(5,276,000)			
Increase in limitations.....	(185,753,000)	(146,378,000)	(146,388,000)	(146,383,000)	(-\$39,370,000)	(+\$5,000)	(-\$5,000)
Release of sec. 311 funds and transfers.....	(2,500,000)	(13,445,200)	(13,841,200)	(13,841,200)	(-\$11,341,200)	(+\$396,000)	
District of Columbia funds.....	(127,786,600)		(53,559,000)	(50,643,700)	(-\$77,142,900)	(+\$50,643,700)	(-\$2,915,300)

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would just like to state to the House that this is a good conference report. It is due mainly to the fact that the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Appropriations, Mr. WHITTEN of Mississippi, held firm in all matters pertaining to the bill as it applied to our body. It was a distinct privilege and an honor for me to go to conference with our chairman on this, his first supplemental bill. I want the Members to know that the way the conference was held brings credit to the House and to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the Labor-HEW chapter (chapter VII) of this supplemental conference report includes \$2,124,446,000 in new budget authority. This is a reduction of \$617,556,000 from the President's budget request, and an increase of \$497,100,000 over the House bill.

The increase over the House bill is accounted for by agreeing to a Senate amendment of \$500 million in the Labor Department for making advances as required to the black lung disability trust fund and to the Federal unemployment benefits and allowances account. The budget request for this purpose was transmitted too late for House consideration. There were no other conference items in the Labor Department.

There were a number of conference items in HEW.

The conferees agreed to the Senate figure of \$4,969,000 for the National Health Service Corps. The House bill

had included no additional funds for the corps. The conference agreement is the same as the budget request.

The conferees deleted the \$10,000,000 proposed by the Senate for family planning. The House bill contained no funds for this.

For population research at the National Institutes of Health, the conference agreement includes \$7,500,000. This is a compromise between the \$5,000,000 proposed by the House and the \$10,713,000 proposed by the Senate.

The conferees dropped the \$2,554,000 proposed by the Senate for training of mental health researchers. The House bill included no funds for this.

The conference agreement includes \$1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, to initiate an adolescent pregnancy program. There were no funds in the House bill for this. The budget request was for \$7,000,000.

The conferees agreed to earmark \$1,500,000 to initiate a new management training and technical assistance program for health maintenance organizations (HMO's).

The conference agreement includes \$150 million for a new program of concentration grants under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is \$50 million less than the House bill and \$108 million under the budget request. The Senate bill included no funds for this program.

For the push for excellence program, the conferees agreed to the Senate figure of \$300,000.

The conferees retained the \$2,000,000 in the House bill for a new rehabilitation program for independent living. The Senate bill included no funds for it.

With respect to nutrition services for the elderly, the conferees restored the

bill language proposed by the House concerning the distribution of \$22,500,000 for meeting shortfalls. Both Houses had the same dollar amount. The only issue was the distribution of the funds among the States.

The conference agreement includes bill language proposed by the Senate to extend the availability of certain funds appropriated in fiscal year 1976 for the Railroad Retirement Board. These funds, amounting to \$37,646,000, will be paid to ConRail and other railroads as reimbursement for payments made to employees who are protected under the provisions of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973.

With respect to the National Commission on the International Year of the Child, the conferees agreed to the Senate figure of \$685,000, the amount of the budget request. The House bill included no funds for this item.

The conferees deleted language proposed by the Senate which would have made available an additional \$4,226,000 for the Community Services Administration for emergency energy conservation services. This was not requested in the budget and there was nothing in the House bill.

The conferees agreed to Senate language to transfer the National Mine Health and Safety Academy from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Labor.

Finally, the conferees agreed to bill language modifying section 201 of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Act for 1979, the so-called Michel amendment. The Michel amendment specified a \$1 billion reduction in HEW for fraud, abuse and waste. The modification contained in this conference agreement changes the amount of the reduction to

\$301,500,000 and provides that HEW may borrow, to the extent necessary, from 1980 appropriations to achieve the reduction. The conferees also direct the

Secretary to issue regulations requiring that all States must reduce their AFDC and medicaid erroneous excess payment rates to 4 percent by September 30, 1982.

Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks a detailed table showing the programs in chapter VII and the amounts agreed to for each one:

H.R. 4289, CH. VII—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1979

	NEW EA enacted law, fiscal year 1979	President's supplemental request	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
SUMMARY					
Department of Labor: Federal funds.....	440,409,000	917,118,000	17,118,000	517,118,000	517,118,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Federal funds.....	17,240,042,000	1,603,683,000	1,427,358,000	1,249,894,000	1,386,127,000
Related agencies:					
Federal funds.....	25,500,000	221,201,000	182,870,000	221,201,000	221,201,000
Trust funds.....	34,317,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Unauthorized, not considered: Federal funds.....	(56,377,000)	(15,313,000)	(***)	(***)	(***)
Grand total:					
Federal funds.....	17,705,951,000	2,742,002,000	1,627,346,000	1,988,213,000	2,124,446,000
Trust funds.....	(34,317,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)
Unauthorized, not considered: Federal funds.....	(56,377,000)	(15,313,000)	(***)	(***)	(***)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION					
CETA, private sector programs.....		400,000,000			
Community services employment for older Americans.....	211,700,000	8,900,000	8,900,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
Advances to unemployment trust fund and other funds.....	200,000,000	500,000,000		500,000,000	500,000,000
Subtotal, Employment and Training Administration.....	411,700,000	908,900,000	8,900,000	508,900,000	508,900,000
EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses: Workers' compensation.....	28,709,000	8,218,000	8,218,000	8,218,000	8,218,000
Black lung disability trust fund (nonadd).....	(422,265,000)	(300,000,000)		(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)
Total, Labor Department.....	440,409,000	917,118,000	17,118,000	517,118,000	517,118,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Community health services:					
Community health centers.....	258,936,000	81,500,000			
Genetic information and counseling.....	10,567,000	3,567,000			
Family planning.....	135,000,000	10,000,000		10,000,000	
National Health Service Corps.....	57,000,000	4,969,000		4,969,000	4,969,000
Program support.....	30,046,000	183,000			
Subtotal, Health Services Administration.....	491,549,000	100,219,000		14,969,000	4,969,000
CENTER FOR DISEASE CONTROL					
Disease control:					
Childhood immunization.....	23,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Influenza immunization.....	6,400,000	8,600,000			
Subtotal, preventive health.....	29,400,000	20,600,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH					
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.....	190,130,000	10,713,000	5,000,000	10,713,000	7,500,000
ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION					
General mental health:					
Research.....	130,807,000	1,564,000			
Training.....	90,400,000	2,554,000		2,554,000	
Subtotal, mental health.....	221,207,000	4,118,000		2,554,000	
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH					
Health maintenance organizations:					
Grants and contracts.....	16,717,000	14,490,000	10,000,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Program support.....	6,090,000	2,000,000		1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal.....	22,807,000	16,490,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Adolescent pregnancy services.....		7,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Assistant Secretary for Health.....	22,807,000	23,490,000	10,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Total, Public Health Service.....	955,093,000	159,140,000	27,000,000	51,236,000	35,469,000
HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION					
Grants to States for medicaid:					
Medical vendor payments.....	10,576,000,000	453,958,000	453,958,000	453,958,000	453,958,000
State and local administration.....	674,000,000	100,471,000	100,471,000	100,471,000	100,471,000
Subtotal, Health Care Financing Administration.....	11,250,000,000	554,429,000	554,429,000	554,429,000	554,429,000
EDUCATION DIVISION—OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION					
Grants for disadvantaged children (Title I): Concentration grants:					
Grants to local educational agencies.....		252,916,000	196,000,000		147,050,000
State administration.....		3,794,000	3,000,000		2,200,000
Evaluation and studies.....		1,290,000	1,000,000		750,000
Subtotal.....		258,000,000	200,000,000		150,000,000

H.R. 4289, CH. VII—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1979—Continued

	NEW EA enacted law, fiscal year 1979	President's supplemental request	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
STUDENT ASSISTANCE					
Guaranteed student loan program: Interest subsidies.....	517,206,000	243,189,000	243,189,000	243,189,000	243,189,000
SPECIAL PROJECTS AND TRAINING					
PUSH for excellence.....		1,000,000		300,000	300,000
EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS					
Special foreign currency program.....		2,000,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Total, Education Division.....	517,206,000	504,189,000	443,689,000	243,989,000	393,989,000
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (FEDERAL FUNDS)					
Assistance payments programs: Administrative expenses.....	30,000,000	4,895,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Refugee assistance:					
Indochinese assistance.....	96,487,000	51,464,000	51,464,000	51,464,000	51,464,000
Soviet and other refugees.....	20,000,000	8,300,000	8,300,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
Federal administration.....	2,232,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, refugee assistance.....	118,719,000	59,964,000	59,964,000	59,964,000	59,964,000
Subtotal, Social Security Administration: Federal funds.....	148,719,000	64,859,000	61,164,000	61,164,000	61,164,000
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT					
Grants to States for social and child welfare services:					
Grants to States for social services.....	2,450,000,000	170,100,000	170,100,000	170,100,000	170,100,000
States and local training.....	71,552,000	18,448,000	18,448,000	18,448,000	18,448,000
Subtotal.....	2,521,552,000	188,548,000	188,548,000	188,548,000	188,548,000
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES					
Child development: Head Start.....	625,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000
Aging programs:					
State agency activities.....	19,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Area agency services and centers.....	193,000,000	3,970,000	3,970,000	3,970,000	3,970,000
Nutrition.....	250,000,000	4,546,000	27,046,000	27,046,000	27,046,000
Subtotal, aging programs.....	462,000,000	12,016,000	34,516,000	34,516,000	34,516,000
Rehabilitation service and facilities:					
Basic State grants.....	760,472,000	57,012,000	57,012,000	57,012,000	57,012,000
Independent living.....		2,000,000	2,000,000		2,000,000
White House Conference on Aging.....		3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, human development services.....	1,847,472,000	129,028,000	151,528,000	149,528,000	151,528,000
Research and training activities overseas.....		3,490,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare.....	17,240,042,000	1,603,683,000	1,427,358,000	1,249,894,000	1,386,127,000
RELATED AGENCIES					
Action (domestic programs) (unauthorized):					
Volunteers in Service to America.....	(30,804,000)	(4,931,000)	(***)	(***)	(***)
Urban Volunteer Programs.....		(4,680,000)	(***)	(***)	(***)
Demonstration Programs.....	(2,500,000)	(4,086,000)	(***)	(***)	(***)
Program Support.....	(23,073,000)	(1,616,000)	(***)	(***)	(***)
Subtotal, Action.....	(56,377,000)	(15,313,000)	(***)	(***)	(***)
Corporation for Public Broadcasting: Fiscal year 1981 (advance in fiscal year 1979).....		162,000,000	162,000,000	162,000,000	162,000,000
National Commission on the International Year of the Child.....		685,000		685,000	685,000
National Commission on Social Security.....	500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Railroad Retirement Board:					
Railroad Transportation Protective Account.....	25,000,000	18,870,000	18,870,000	18,870,000	18,870,000
Reappropriation.....		37,646,000		37,646,000	37,646,000
Limitation on salaries and expenses.....	(34,317,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)
Total, related agencies:					
Federal funds.....	25,500,000	221,201,000	182,870,000	221,201,000	221,201,000
Unauthorized, not considered.....	(56,377,000)	(15,313,000)	(***)	(***)	(***)
Trust funds.....	(34,317,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report and urge its passage by my colleagues. I would like to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. WHITTEN, and his fellow committee member, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, for their efforts to include the supplemental funding needed for Small Business Administration disaster loans. This supplemental funding is very much needed by the people of Mississippi so they can be about the business of repairing their damaged homes.

I also commend the two gentlemen and other conferees for accepting Sen-

ate language which clears the way for low-interest disaster loans. I am very pleased that this conference report will finally authorize the 3-percent disaster loan for repairs to homes and 5-percent loans for businesses who are unable to find credit elsewhere. This provision is also extremely important to the people of Mississippi.

I urge adoption of the conference report and hope the President will sign the legislation as soon as possible.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the first completed appropriation bill under the leadership of our good friend and chairman of the committee, JAMIE WHITTEN, and myself

as the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 4289, the first Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1979.

As reported from conference, H.R. 4289 provides supplemental appropriations and other budget authority of \$13.8 billion for 1979 and future years.

This conference agreement is \$2.2 billion over the House passed bill, but \$3.1 billion under the President's budget request. That \$2.2 billion figure is very misleading, and I would like to take a moment to discuss it with my colleagues.

Of the \$2.2 billion difference between the conference agreement and the House bill, \$1.4 billion consists of budget estimates which were not considered by

the House because they had not been transmitted to the House, or because they were not authorized at the time: \$500 million for advances to the unemployment trust fund; \$300 million for the black lung disability trust fund; \$60 million for NOAA construction at Sand Point, Wash.; and \$520 million for food stamps.

If these items are excluded from the comparison, the conference agreement is \$831 million over the House bill, and \$244.9 million under the Senate bill. And of this \$831 million over the House bill, \$725 million represents the amount agreed upon by the conferees, over the House bill, for the purchase of four DD-993 guided missile destroyers as proposed by the Senate, instead of two such ships as proposed by the House.

Looked at in this light, the total conference agreement does in fact correspond very closely to the House totals, and I believe that the recommendations of the House conferees deserve the support of my colleagues.

Fifty amendments are reported by the conferees in disagreement. Only two are in true disagreement: Amendment No. 1, relating to construction of buildings and facilities for the Agricultural Research Service, and amendment No. 82, relating to pay increases for Senate staff.

The remaining 48 amendments are reported in technical disagreement, in accord with rule XX clause 2 which provides for a separate vote in the House on any Senate amendment reported from conference which provides an unauthorized appropriation, or which constitutes legislation in a general appropriation bill.

Of the 48 amendments reported in technical disagreement, 30 will be considered separately, and 18 which relate to housekeeping items of the other body will be considered, by unanimous consent, en bloc.

Mr. Speaker, at a later time I will discuss several of the individual conference agreements. However, at this time I would like to list the major conference recommendations for the benefit of my colleagues: \$900 million for the food stamp program; \$116.5 million for child nutrition programs; \$27 million for elderly feeding programs; \$1.353 billion for four DD-993 guided missile destroyers terminated by Iran; \$208.9 million for migration and refugee assistance; \$500 million for advances to the unemployment trust fund; \$300 million for the black lung disability trust fund; \$150 million for elementary and secondary education; \$56.5 million for the Railroad Retirement Board; \$58.4 million for contributions to international organization; \$60 million for construction of a NOAA facility at Sand Point, Wash.; and \$19.5 million for the Federal payment to the District of Columbia.

Language in the act reduces the interest rate on SBA loans for disasters occurring between October 1, 1978, and October 1, 1982, to 3 percent on the first \$55,000 on loans for primary residences and personal property, and also provides that the interest rate on loans for business concerns which are unable to ob-

tain sufficient credit elsewhere shall be set by the SBA, but shall not exceed 5 percent.

Language in the act allows HEW to reduce from \$1 billion to \$301.5 million the amount required to be withheld by reductions in fraud, abuse, and waste, if 75 percent of the \$1 billion reduction has not been achieved during the first three quarters of fiscal 1979, and allows HEW to borrow from future appropriations if necessary to pay entitlements. The conferees direct "that under no circumstances are payments to legitimate recipients to be curtailed or even delayed."

Language in the conference report directs the Secretary of HEW to issue regulations requiring that by September 30, 1982, all States reduce to 4 percent their erroneous excess payments rates for AFDC and Medicaid.

Here again, because of the hard work and the forceful arguments and stalwart stand of our good friend, Mr. MICHEL, of Peoria, Ill., this was inserted, and we owe plaudits and compliments to his leadership in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend the adoption of the conference report.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1250

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Members of the House it is a distinct honor for those of us on this side to serve with the distinguished gentleman in the well from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE). This is the first year, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman has served as the ranking minority member of our committee. He serves well. The gentleman as the ranking member joined with our chairman and the other members of the committee to make it possible to bring back to the House a good conference report.

Our friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) not only serves on the Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare, but as the ranking minority member on the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has done a fine job and I think he should be commended.

Mr. CONTE. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky from the bottom of my heart for those kind words.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise to ask a question regarding the shipbuilding appropriation provided in this report of \$1,353 million for the purchase of the four destroyers which have been discussed before the House on a previous occasion.

This is my concern, Mr. Speaker: To whom will this appropriation of \$1,353 million be paid?

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman from Alabama would like to address himself to this.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What we are actually doing is buying the Iranian position in the four destroyers. The money that has been paid out of the trust fund for the partial completion of the destroyers will be put back into the trust fund. The balance of the money will be paid directly to the shipbuilder as any other normal purchase of a ship would call for.

The money that is put into the trust fund would then be available to settle other military-type claims as a result of cancelled purchases. Once that is done, if any money is still in the trust fund in the Iranian account, it would then be available to be used to settle any other nonmilitary claims that we may have against Iran.

If you want to look far enough down the road to perhaps 10 years from now when all these claims have been settled, if there is anything left it would then be available to turn over the Iranian Government.

The chances are very likely there will be nothing left in the trust fund at that time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CONTE. I will yield further for a question.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Will the \$1,353,000,000 appropriated today be enough to completely purchase and complete the construction of the four destroyers?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. That will be enough to complete the four destroyers.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York for further comment.

Mr. ADDABBO. According to the Department of Defense that will be sufficient to purchase the four ships. However, there is a provision in the contract. Ships Nos. 3 and 4 are not completed. Ships Nos. 1 and 2 are completed. Nos. 3 and 4 are under construction. There is a provision in the contract, if there are additional costs because of inflation we will have to pay that but at the present time this buys out the entire contract on the four ships.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. As the experience has been, there will be possibly a cost overrun on the construction of these four destroyers. In that event, would the shipbuilding company go back against the trust first for that overrun and then come back to us or will they come to Congress first for the overruns?

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

Mr. CONTE. I will be glad to yield to my good friend from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. We are purchasing the contract. We now become the purchaser of those ships and if there is any additional cost we will be paying that out of the Department of Defense budget.

The House conferees worked hard to hold the supplemental appropriations for the Defense Department to the minimum amount required. At a time when inflation is a major problem and a time in which there are not enough funds to provide fully for all of the needs of our people, we felt that only those funds of an urgent or emergency nature should be added to the huge sums already provided for defense in the current fiscal year.

We were not entirely successful but we did as well as was possible considering the position taken by the Senate. The total budget request for the Defense Department in both titles I and II is \$4.3 billion. The House provided \$2.9 billion and the Senate \$3.9 billion. The conference agreed on \$3.6 billion, \$700 million more than the House amount and \$300 million less than the Senate provided.

The major item of difference was the number of DD-993 destroyers funded. The House funded two in the supplemental and planned to consider two more in fiscal year 1980 as requested in the budget. The Senate funded all four in the supplemental. The Senate was adamant and the House receded.

In order to keep the total as low as reasonably possible, many other programs were deferred.

I had hoped that the supplemental total would be lower than the final sum agreed to, but considering the addition of \$725 million for two unbudgeted destroyers, we were able to achieve a reasonably satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. What the gentleman says is correct. We are buying the position of the Iranian Government in those four ships. This is at a savings of approximately \$200 million per ship so there is a lot of leeway in there and a great savings. If, in fact, there is an overrun we are now the contracting party and we would be responsible.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague would yield one more time.

Mr. CONTE. I yield one more time to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. As everyone is aware my concern here is not that I do think we need the four destroyers. I congratulate the committee for seeing fit to purchase the equity in these four destroyers.

What does concern me, in the dialogue I had 3 or 4 weeks ago with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE), he gave assurance that day that the Iranian Government would not receive any funds from the trust account.

Mr. CONTE. That is right.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I do not believe the American taxpayers want to pay the Iranian Government today, who puts a bounty on certain people's heads because they are not in political favor with that particular government today, that we as taxpayers should pay the Iranian

Government. If there is cost overrun I think that should be paid from the trust account. There should be some assurance today that the Iranian Government will not be benefited here through not completing the contract. We did not cancel the contract, they canceled it. I do not believe we should allow any of that trust money ever to be paid to the Iranian Government. I think every claim including cost overrun should be paid out of that trust account before there is any distribution made beyond that point.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. That point was raised during the debate on this supplemental. An amendment was offered to prohibit any funds from going to the Iranian Government. That amendment was defeated, primarily for this reason, if I may refresh the gentleman's memory, that there would be no payments in any case to the Iranian Government, as I said a moment ago, for 10 or 15 years.

We have no earthly idea what kind of government the Iranians will have 10 or 15 years from now, No. 1, and No. 2, whether any money will be due that government.

My argument then, and it still is, is that that would be the time to decide whether, in fact, we are going to refund any money to the Iranian Government. Then, if there is money available, we can then look 10 years or so down the road and say: Is this the kind of government to which we want to refund money?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield one more time?

Mr. CONTE. I will yield again to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. My concern here is, who terminated this contract? We did not. Iran did. Are we going to reward those who cancel contracts? That is regardless of whether you favor the present Iranian Government. We are rewarding people who renege on their contracts. I do not think that should be a policy this country should follow.

Mr. CONTE. I think the gentleman from Alabama convinced me on this. This is a really good buy. You are getting four destroyers through an old contract. If you were to go out and contract for those four destroyers now they would cost a great deal more money than the four destroyers that you are going to get under the old contract.

Going back to the gentleman's point, if we did not take the contract right now the Iranians would have a hull perhaps on one or two ships. They could drag them out there and possibly could make homing places for fish out of them on the shores of Iran. We are getting a good buy here through an old contract for four destroyers.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is my understanding that Iran just walked away from this contract. It is not a situation where we are buying out Iran. We are paying the shipbuilding companies in

this country and I think that is who we should protect. That is the purpose of the trust account.

Mr. CONTE. We are getting those destroyers under the old price.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I do not disagree with that but I disagree about any remainder in that trust account being paid to the country that terminated the contract, canceled it out. I see no reason why we should reward them for this cancellation.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I personally would like to see us go out and buy those airplanes back at the old price, too. We would save a lot of money.

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

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Actually, there was no true termination by the Iranian Government. There was a memorandum of agreement between the Navy and the Iranian Government. The Iranian Government could have kept the ships and they could have sold them to other governments and, thereby, possibly have made a profit.

The Navy felt we needed the ships, we could get them at a bargain price at this time. If there is going to be any additional cost we have to make certain changes to accommodate those ships into our Navy and our systems and everything else. It may be an additional cost as far as that is concerned by the chances of any moneys going back to the Iranian Government by the purchase of these four ships are nil.

Mr. CONTE. Let me make this observation. If we will get support from the gentleman from New York, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of our Committee on Appropriations, it must be a good buy.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the highly respected ranking member of the committee for yielding. Perhaps the question I have is for the distinguished chairman with regard to the conference report.

This conference report includes an additional \$600 million for food stamps and \$24 million for the District of Columbia. Is that correct?

□ 1300

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I understood the gentleman.

Mr. RUDD. I say, I think that the conference report coming back from the conference has an additional \$600 million in it for food stamps and an additional \$24 million in it for the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITTEN. The conference agreement is \$520 million over the House level for food stamps, which is less than the estimate which came down. It is \$139 million less than the projected amounts that were requested in the budget estimate.

Now, under the regular bill for fiscal year 1980 we provide for a reserve of 5 percent in an effort to put a squeeze on

some of the waste that we are told goes on in this program. We have provided the funds in this bill subject to authorization, which I understand is in the process of being worked out at the present time. We provided funds in there in line with the best estimates we had as to what the needs might be for the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, this had not been previously considered in the House or in the committee at all.

Mr. CONTE. No, because it had not been authorized by the time when it came through the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. When it passed through the House, the higher level had not been authorized.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DAVIS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I notice amendment No. 11 appropriates \$27 million for the elderly feeding program. My question is was the \$27 million a compromise between the Senate and the House or is that the amount that the House had in the bill that the Senate bought?

Mr. CONTE. That was the amount, if the gentleman will recall, I had in the bill here on the floor and it was adopted, so that is our figure.

Mr. DAVIS of Michigan. Is that supposedly enough money to keep the programs going around the country without a loss of funds?

Mr. CONTE. Definitely. That was the reason for the amendment, that a lot of States were meeting deficits and there were a lot of meals that were not being served. As a result, myself and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) offered an amendment which will take care of the deficit of those States that fell short of the money for the elderly and the nutrition program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and congratulate the entire leadership of the Appropriations Committee for the remarkable job it has done.

I have two questions I would like to pose to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), who has clearly demonstrated his concern for the elderly and his compassion over the years.

My questions, obviously, are for the RECORD and for the purpose of reaffirming the colloquy that we engaged in under the deliberation of H.R. 4289.

Is my understanding correct that the first priority for the distribution of the \$22.5 million will be the 21 States identified by the Administration on Aging as the so-called deficit States?

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, before answering the gentleman's question, I

would like to commend the gentleman, along with the ranking minority member on our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), and also one of the members of the subcommittee, one of the distinguished subcommittee members, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL), for offering the amendment on the floor that corrected the matter that the gentleman from New York is now directing to the attention of the House.

In answer to the gentleman's question, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI), the answer is yes.

Mr. BIAGGI. It is my further understanding that the intent of this new allocation plan is not to change that original list; is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BIAGGI. It is my understanding that the remaining funds after the distribution to the 21 States can go to States which have incurred actual service reductions during this fiscal year to avert a deficit; is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct.

I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that as the gentleman knows, when we went to conference under the leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), we requested the other body to restore to the bill our language which protected the matter that the gentleman is now pointing out to the Members of the House. Also the language that we carry in the statement on the part of the managers protects the matter that the gentleman is now asking about.

The answer to the gentleman's question again is yes.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the final question. Is the definition of "have made during the fiscal year" apply to those reductions incurred between October 1, 1978, and September 30, 1979?

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I would be pleased to yield.

Mr. NATCHER. In answer to the gentleman's question, the answer to that question again is yes.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. RATCHFORD).

Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question through the gentleman to the chairman of the subcommittee who has been so responsive to the needs of the elderly in this country and especially responsive from the perspective of Connecticut to the needs of Connecticut's 460,000 very important people over the age of 60.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the intent of the conference committee was that the Administration on Aging would conduct a survey within the next 20 days and prior to making an allocation would report back to the Appropriations Committee on two questions: The question of the deficit level of

the States based on figures as of June 1; and second, the question of decreases in operating levels which have or will occur during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979; is that correct?

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

Mr. RATCHFORD. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, before answering the gentleman's question, I would like to commend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. RATCHFORD) for the gentleman's interest in this matter. All during the time that the supplemental appropriations bill was before the House, while it was in the conference and now when we bring it back, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. RATCHFORD) has shown his interest in this particular matter not only as far as Connecticut is concerned, but also the other States that are involved.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman on a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, on page 27 of the bill we placed in the bill the following language:

\$22,500,000 shall be for meeting state requirements to maintain operating levels for activities under part (c) of title III of the Older Americans Act during fiscal year 1979.

On the other side, they removed this language, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. RATCHFORD). They never bothered the money. They removed the language.

In the conference, we insisted upon the language. The conference report shows that the language was restored. In addition to that, I say to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. RATCHFORD) the statement of the managers on page 19, the paragraph under Human Development Services says:

The conferees direct the Commissioner on Aging to determine the exact level of deficit spending among the States as of June 1, 1979 in the nutrition for the elderly program, to develop standard criteria for allocating the \$22,500,000 increase over the budget provided in this bill. The conferees further direct the Commissioner to submit an allocation plan within 20 days and prior to making the allocation, to both House and Senate Appropriations Committees as to the amounts necessary to cover deficits and decreases in operating levels which have occurred during the fiscal year. The intent of the conferees is that these funds be used to cover the increased costs of actual service levels in 1979, not to undertake program increases at this late point in the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, in further answer to the gentleman from Connecticut, I would like to say that if the State of Connecticut requires money to maintain their operating level, the State would be covered under the language in the bill and under the language in the report. It is mainly due to the gentleman's concern and the action that the gentlemen has taken, and I say that to the gentleman frankly.

Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, because the Department on Aging in the State of Connecticut believes that it can demon-

strate and prove that based upon June 1 figures it has an actual deficit of \$118,000, and based upon the second category, namely, reduction in services, it can demonstrate in this area that it has an additional shortfall of \$180,000.

It is my understanding, I say to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, that if Connecticut can verify these figures, the intent of what we do today is to give to a State like Connecticut the opportunity to do so, and to qualify for this supplemental funding, so that it can continue quality services for nutrition programs for its 460,000 aged.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RATCHFORD. I certainly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a question to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) if possible in reference to amendment No. 116.

□ 1310

This amendment deletes the appropriation of over \$18 million for payment to the Postal Service fund for reduced mailings on national and State political party committees. In amendment No. 116, the language directs that the Postal Service adjust the applicable rates of mailings of these committees accordingly.

I am in accord with that statement, and I would like to ask the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED), this question: Does he have assurance from the Postal Service that the Postal Service has, under 39 United States Code, 3627, the authority and discretion to in fact do this?

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. I will be glad to yield to the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I think that the letter we have from Postmaster General Bolger will clarify this, and I will ask permission to make this letter a part of the RECORD. He cites a case in which this same matter was decided by the courts in favor of doing exactly what we are doing here.

What the other body and the conferees were trying to do is this: Since the Attorney General's ruling had changed this whole thing from the original action by the Congress in starting this program, we felt by doing it this way, the Post Office Department would be able to protect itself.

As the Members know, in the regular appropriation bill—and it is my understanding the other body will accept it—we have a new version, and the new program can start October 1 and do what we intend it to do, so we can open it up without these abuses that we were concerned we were going to get into.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr.

STEED). I hope the gentleman will be successful in seeing to it that no funds are available in next year's appropriation bill either for this purpose, and I appreciate the gentleman's response.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation and the conference report.

I am particularly pleased that the wording was put in here in such a manner that it helps people who have had disasters. I am pleased with this area of the legislation.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to describe what the conference did with respect to the amendment we adopted last year cutting waste, fraud, and abuse in HEW by a billion dollars.

As you know, Secretary Califano took the position that the amendment did not require such a reduction, and so for most of this fiscal year he made no effort to comply with its provisions only after receiving two legal opinions stating that the Department was wrong did the Secretary last month reverse himself and belatedly seek to obey the law. By then, however, it was discovered that only \$169 million of the \$1 billion had been saved, so the Secretary then acted to impose the entire burden for making the remainder of the reductions on the States in the fourth quarter.

This was clearly an unfair action, and the conference has acted to alleviate the burden on the States by lowering the mandated reduction in the law from \$1 billion to \$301.5 million. Of this amount, \$169 million has already been saved, so the net effect will be to require an additional \$132.5 million in fourth quarter savings. If these additional savings cannot be made, either by HEW or the States, and I would certainly hope that every effort will be made to make the savings, then HEW would be permitted to borrow against 1980 funds to prevent any legitimate recipients from being denied their rightful benefits.

The result, then, is that no State would be denied the necessary funds in 1979 to make their legal entitlement payments, and beneficiaries legally entitled to such benefits would not have them either reduced or eliminated.

Unquestionably, this action for the most part lets both HEW and the States off the hook as far as compliance with the Michel amendment this year is concerned. From a practical standpoint, there was little else we could do, because it is obvious that the required reductions in waste, fraud, and abuse are not going to be made by September 30. This action also avoids large-scale borrowing against 1980 funds, and thus the necessity for an excessively large supplemental next year to repay those accounts.

The key element in all this, however, is the language we included in the con-

ference report directing HEW to issue regulations requiring all States to reduce their AFDC and medicaid error rates to 4 percent by September 30, 1982. This is designed to insure that the relaxation of fiscal constraints does not have the unintended effect of reducing the effort against waste, fraud, and abuse. What we have in effect done, is loosen the immediate requirements for reduced waste, fraud, and abuse in exchange for greater assurances of long-run progress in this regard through the imposition of tighter quality control standards on the States.

At present, HEW has quality control regulations in effect, but they are so weak as to be almost meaningless. For instance, there is no specific nationwide error-rate standard for the States to meet, but instead a floating target called a weighted average mean. For AFDC, that mean has been at a very high 8.7 percent, with only 14 States exceeding it. When nearly three-quarters of the States are in compliance with a standard in a program that is still losing over 500 million Federal dollars a year, you know it is not a standard designed to make much of a reduction in waste, fraud, and abuse.

By requiring that all States reduce their error rates to 4 percent in 3 years, and, holding to that figure in succeeding years, we would be insuring that solid progress will have to be made if the States wish to avoid incurring a penalty. At the same time, we would be giving them a specific target to shoot for, and we would be giving them sufficient time to achieve the target.

The report language requires that the States achieve at least one-third of the reduction each year from the beginning of fiscal year 1980 until the 4 percent target date of September 30, 1982. This is designed to assure that the States make a continual effort each year and that we realize a reduction in waste each year.

The practical application of this reduction is that if a State currently has an error rate of 10 percent, it would have to reduce it by 2 percent each year, so that it would have to be down to 8 percent next year, 6 percent in 1981, and then 4 percent in 1982.

If these targets are not met, the report requires application of a penalty equal to the difference between the State's existing rate that year and the target rate. So, in this example, if the State's total Federal AFDC payment is \$100 million, and it only reduces its error rate in the first year to 9 percent, rather than to the required 8 percent, the penalty would be the difference between 8 percent and 9 percent, or 1 percent of the Federal payment. One percent of \$100 million represents a penalty of \$1 million, and the State's Federal payment would be reduced by that amount.

We use the figure of 4 percent because that is a figure already written in the law. The Social Security Amendments of 1977 established a program of bonus payments for those States who have reduced their AFDC error rates below 4 percent. That is a benchmark established by Congress, in other words, and if we

are going to reward States below it, we should be penalizing those above it.

A number of States, of course, particularly those with high error rates, are unhappy with the 4 percent figure and the time frame in which they have to achieve it. We have, however, had an AFDC quality control program in effect since 1973 and a somewhat lesser period for medicaid, so the States have had a number of years to get their programs moving in the right direction, during which they have had considerable technical assistance from the Federal Government. It is thus not as though we are asking them to undertake a new effort from scratch that requires a lengthy period for implementation.

A number of States, in fact, have already improved their programs to the levels we are mandating. Based on the latest figures available, some 14 States have reduced their AFDC error rates to 4 percent or below, so that indicates we are not asking for something beyond the realm of the possible. Among those 14 States are California, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, which also shows that large industrial States with big cities can do the job.

There are a number of things the States can do to reduce waste in their programs. They can implement monthly retrospective accounting systems, which produce substantial savings in most areas where they have been instituted. They can simplify their eligibility standards and standardize their forms. They can retrain their employees and give them clear and simple instructions.

If changes in Federal laws and regulations are needed to give the States better tools to do the job, then they ought to tell us what they need and we should act accordingly.

Some States have expressed concern that the audit samples used to determine error rates vary by States and thus may give some States better rates than others, even though there may be little difference in actual program performance. Accordingly, we have included report language requiring the Department to "establish a system for determining error rates that insures equal treatment for all States." The intent is to insure that we have in effect a standardized system for measuring error rates which does not permit States making only perfunctory efforts to detect errors to end up with better rates than those States making more diligent efforts. The system should require uniform and diligent efforts on the part of all States to detect errors, and should contain safeguards designed to prevent States from manipulating the error rate sampling process to produce lower rates, in order to avoid penalties, than what the actual program performance would warrant.

The report language specifies the error rate base periods to be used in determining the yearly reductions for each State, in order to eliminate any doubt on the part of the Department. These are the same base periods provided in the current quality control regulations.

In conclusion, we have mandated specific levels of performance because, with

current Federal losses due to waste, fraud, and abuse ranging between \$1 and \$2 billion a year in just the AFDC and medicaid programs alone, it is clear that specific action must be taken to bring these losses down. Achievement of the standards we are requiring would cut these losses approximately in half.

We have also acted because there is currently a void in the law in the area of quality control standards. HEW has sought over the years to establish such standards through regulation, but because of the absence of any specific congressional direction, the Department has been on very weak ground in this regard.

It has been reluctant to establish strong standards because of a fear that such standards would be struck down in the courts, as did happen in 1976. Because of this, HEW has sought to negotiate standards with the States and the special interest groups, in order to avoid a court challenge, but the result has been development of the very weak, almost meaningless, standards I referred to earlier.

The congressional direction we provide leaves no doubt as to HEW's authority, and will place the Department in a much better position in both working with the States and in dealing with any court challenge. The effort against waste, fraud, and abuse in these areas will no longer be dependent on negotiations and backscratching with those who want no standards, and this can only work to the benefit of those who have to foot the bill for all these losses—the American taxpayers.

One final note. The action of the conference committee in no way negates the amendment we adopted as part of the 1980 Labor-HEW appropriation bill cutting waste, fraud, and abuse by \$500 million. In fact, that amendment was offered precisely because of the expectation that HEW would not be making the billion dollar savings in 1979. If the amendment ultimately clears Congress, we will still in effect be mandating a billion dollar savings, but by the end of 1980 rather than 1979. The quality control standards provided here complement that amendment and will help the Department achieve those required reductions.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this supplemental appropriation bill includes \$1,018 million for the disaster loan fund.

So often the American taxpayer is pushed to the end of the line when his own Government starts handing out his own hard-earned tax dollars. It seems that while we deny or delay help for our citizens in our own country, we turn right around and provide those same services to people in other countries with no delay at all.

Let me tell the Members about a specific situation. On May 8 of this year, in several areas of Florida we had a severe storm which left flood water up to the rooftops in some places. At the same time we suffered loss of life, tornadoes, and

millions of dollars worth of property damage.

We asked the Governor to request a disaster declaration, and he did within days. We asked the President to make a disaster declaration, and he did within an hour or so.

But now, more than 2 months later, there are still hundreds of people who have filled out all the forms and seen all the adjusters and estimators, but most of them, despite the efforts of their Congressman, still have not gotten the promised help from their own Government because the money supply is "not available." Maybe it is not available for Americans, but in contrast, let me read from page 202 of the presentation by the Agency for International Development for this fiscal year where they say, "The U.S. Government is capable of responding within hours to unexpected disaster occurring throughout the world." Not days or months, Mr. Speaker, but hours.

Look at last year's list: \$5 million for a cyclone in India; \$3 million for a drought in Mauritania; and \$4.7 million for displaced persons in Lebanon. The list goes on to a total of \$20 million. For the last 5 years it has amounted to \$148,500,000.

To some that might appear to be small change, but try explaining it to an American taxpayer who has been sleeping on a musty, soggy sofa for 2 months waiting for Congress to appropriate the money for him.

□ 1320

At the same time, his government is telling how, using his tax money, it can respond to foreign disasters within hours.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will, finally, make available those funds necessary to meet our commitment to our own people.

Mr. Speaker, another portion of this bill provides funding for our refugee program, a program which I support and most of the Members of the Congress support. It appropriates a lot of money, much of which will be used for the so-called boat people and the Indochinese refugees, those people who are being pushed out of Vietnam by people who are the most vicious government rulers that I think history will ever record.

In fiscal year 1979, this Congress appropriated \$9 million for the United Nations High Commission for Refugees. This bill includes an additional \$34 million for the UNHCR, for a total of \$43 million.

For fiscal year 1980, the bill that we will take up later today, there is another \$41,500,000.

For direct bilateral aid for these Indochinese refugees last year we appropriated \$29,391,000.

This supplement that we consider today includes an additional \$34,176,000, for a total of \$63,567,000, or a total for the 2 years of \$97,344,000.

We are talking about, Mr. Speaker, in 2 years a quarter of a billion dollars mostly for refugees who are being pushed out of Vietnam. I want to help those refugees, and I believe that my col-

leagues do too. As the ranking minority Member on the subcommittee with that jurisdiction, I supported the funding in this supplemental bill for that account.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this: That the bill that we take up later today is not only going to provide additional funds for these Indochinese refugees, the so-called boat people, those who have been set adrift on the seas, those who have been murdered, those who have had to resort to cannibalism to survive, the bill we are going to take up this afternoon is going to reward the very government that is responsible for these boat people being in the boats, for these refugees dying and suffering, and for the American economy to have to take in 14,000 refugees per month.

Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong when, on the one hand, we are paying to solve the problem and, on the other hand, we are rewarding the very vicious government that is causing the problem.

Through our foreign assistance bills, one of which we will consider this afternoon, we are providing funding for international organizations and international financial institutions that will, in turn, be providing some of those American tax dollars to Vietnam.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, and I do this to call attention to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), who is a veteran member of our Committee on Appropriations. He is also chairman of the Committee on Small Business. His work not only in that area, but in this conference, has been of great value.

The other body, may I say, added a complete legislative act as an amendment to the Small Business Administration section of the supplemental bill.

Through the efforts of my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), who knew that subject and who deals with it, the language in the supplemental bill has been kept to a level where we can meet the needs of the country but at the same time not usurp the right of the legislative committees.

I want to say that, prior to yielding 5 minutes at this time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the committee, and also the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE), and others who have worked on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 4289, making supplemental appropriations, fiscal year 1979.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

As was indicated earlier, this bill contains \$1,018 million for the disaster loan fund.

Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 103 inserted amendments to the Small Business Act concerning the SBA administered program of loan assistance to disaster victims. This Senate amendment included most of the disaster re-

lated provisions which were agreed to by House and Senate conferees on a bill now in conference (S. 918), the 1979 omnibus small business bill.

Prior to the expiration of Public Law 95-89 last year, victims of natural disasters occurring prior to October 1, 1978, could receive loans under the SBA administered program for their net losses at lower interest rates: For loans due to loss or damage to a primary residence or personal property, the interest rate was 1 percent on the first \$10,000 of the loan and 3 percent on the next \$30,000; and for losses to businesses and other victims, the rate was 3 percent on the first \$250,000 of such loans. With the expiration of that law, however, these rates under the SBA administered program reverted to a formula based on the cost of money to the Federal Government and these borrowers are now paying 7½ percent.

Under the provisions agreed to by the conferees for H.R. 4289, a reduction in interest rates is provided for victims of disasters occurring since last October 1 to two major categories of disaster victims.

First, homeowners or tenants may borrow from SBA at an interest rate of 3 percent on the first \$55,000 of loans made to repair or replace primary residences; on loan amounts to refinance existing mortgages, an additional \$50,000 is available under existing law to qualified applicants at an interest rate based on the cost of money to the Federal Government.

Second, businesses which are not able to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere may borrow from SBA to repair or replace damaged or destroyed property at an interest rate of 5 percent; although there is no statutory maximum on these loans, SBA has administratively limited them to a \$500,000 maximum unless the Administrator approves a higher amount.

As I stated, these provisions are retroactive and cover disasters occurring since last October 1. Victims who have already received loans in this period will have the interest rate on their loans reduced as provided in this bill.

All other disaster victims who borrow from SBA will continue to be eligible for loans based on a formula involving cost of money to the Federal Government. They are in no way adversely affected by this act. These victims include those who have incurred a loss to a secondary residence, businesses which are unable to prove they could not obtain sufficient credit elsewhere, and other disaster victims such as churches and schools. The interest rate to these victims at the present time is 7½ percent.

The conferees for the 1979 omnibus small business bill (S. 918) have also agreed to these provisions. In addition, the conferees have agreed that those businesses which can obtain sufficient credit elsewhere should be able to obtain disaster loan assistance from the Farmers Home Administration or SBA for a shorter period of time, up to 3 years initially, and at an interest rate based on the cost of money to the Federal Government for comparable periods of

time. This new formula could result, at the present time, in an interest rate of over 10 percent. They also agreed to shift more farm disaster victims to FmHA by requiring farm businesses to go to FmHA unless they are or would be declined for substantially similar emergency loan assistance from FmHA.

The administration and some others have objected to the inclusion of the words "substantially similar" in the SBA statute, although they maintain that it is their intent to provide substantially similar assistance through the FmHA program. These words insure that farm businesses which incur net disaster loss will not be relegated to what might again be changed into an inferior FmHA program. Until or unless that conference report or subsequent legislation is passed, all such borrowers will continue to be eligible under permanent laws under a formula which at the present time results in a 7½-percent interest rate. Also, all businesses, including agricultural related borrowers, will have a right to choose the SBA administered program and need not be declined by FmHA.

I urge the adoption of the conference report now under consideration.

● Mr. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the disaster relief provisions of the conference report on supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1979, H.R. 4289. Families in Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and several other States are living in damaged homes and are unable to begin repairs because the Small Business Administration has no funds to loan. It is no small irony that on this very day when we are considering this overdue appropriation of \$1,018,000,000 for our own citizens stricken by disasters we will also consider a \$7.9 billion appropriation for foreign aid. It would be a slander to argue that charity begins at home; the aid to disaster victims which this bill offers is not charity but is a significant contribution to the economic well being of the entire Nation, its terms are equal to or less than those which Americans have been able to expect for many years, and it should have been available, and would have been at the time of disaster but for last year's vetoed authorizations bill.

The disaster appropriations are for loans. There is every reason to believe that prompt passage will not cost American taxpayers one dime. We are not discussing funds which will be taken out of American control and used to maintain the tyranny of people like General Torrijos of Panama.

We are talking about government at its most responsible, at its very best; a fiscally sound response to alleviate the human distress and economic interruptions resulting from natural disasters.

Surely, when we can consider appropriations like the ones submitted today for foreign aid, we cannot turn our backs on our obligations to our own people. I strongly urge passage of the disaster relief provisions of H.R. 4289. ●

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my full support to the pending

conference report. Especially worthy of support is the inclusion of \$27 million in vitally needed funds to insure the continuation of the older Americans nutrition program.

The House's passage of this conference report will culminate an effort which began some 3 months ago when the supplemental appropriations bill first began to be considered in committee. I testified in my capacity as a member of the House Select Committee on Aging that unless at supplemental appropriations above that proposed by the President were approved, upwards of 9,000 senior citizens would be turned away from meal sites by the end of this fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee responded by providing an additional \$7.5 million aimed at coping with the problems of 14 States identified by the Administration on Aging as so-called deficit States.

When the House considered this legislation, it was apparent that the information provided to the committee by the Administration on Aging was to say the least incomplete and inaccurate. First, the calculation was done on the basis of an inflation rate of 8 percent. Second the designation of 14 States prompted an outcry from other States claiming

that they, too, were deficit States. The result was a modification of the original AOA list to increase it to 21 deficit States and a recalculation of the inflation rate to a more realistic 12 percent. Consequently, I joined with my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) in offering an amendment increasing the appropriation by \$15 million. At that time I made it clear that the first priority for the use of these funds would be those 21 States identified as deficits. I wish to insert those States into the Record at this time.

In earlier colloquy with the chairman it was reaffirmed that the funds were to be used for the deficit States followed by those States who were forced to make service reductions during this fiscal year to avert a deficit.

We have come to the rescue of a fine program which really never should have been subjected to this problem. Under the older Americans nutrition program more than 560,000 seniors are provided with one hot meal a day 5 days a week. For some it is the sole source of nutrition they receive daily, especially if they are homebound. For others, it is an opportunity for them to associate with friends at a nutrition center.

When Congress enacted into law the

Comprehensive 1978 Older Americans Act Amendments, it did so by voting for a major increase in the authorization level for the nutrition program. As an original cosponsor of the bill, it provided for a combined \$430 million authorization level both for the existing congregate program and the new national home-delivered meals program provided under the act. Even with this supplemental we have brought the appropriation level only to \$277 million but at least this amount is sufficient to avert the trauma of having to send senior citizens home from nutrition centers hungry.

At this time I commend my colleague Mr. NATCHER who has been an instrumental leader in this effort. Also my colleague Mr. CONTE who I joined in sponsoring the \$15 million amendment, Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER of the House Select Committee on Aging for his support and finally Mr. RATCHFORD of Connecticut whom I worked with closely on this issue.

It is important for us to recognize that we can respond to those most in need and still keep our commitment to fiscal responsibility. To achieve economy without compassion is no virtue.

The table follows:

TABLE 2A.—INCREASED

	Fiscal year 1979 operating level	Fiscal year 1978 unli- quidated obligations	Balance required	1979 allotment	Balance, end of 1979		Fiscal year 1979 operating level	Fiscal year 1978 unli- quidated obligations	Balance required	1979 allotment	Balance, end of 1979
Alabama.....	\$5,726,368	\$797,927	\$4,928,441	\$4,046,672	(\$881,769)	Missouri.....	\$9,053,021	\$303,287	\$8,749,734	\$6,072,533	(\$2,677,201)
Arizona.....	2,786,991	46,974	2,740,017	2,536,791	(203,226)	Montana.....	1,645,063	328,619	1,316,444	1,260,000	(56,444)
Delaware.....	1,838,262	497,518	1,340,744	1,260,000	(80,744)	New York.....	33,246,145	11,642,751	21,603,394	21,349,605	(253,789)
District of Columbia.....	1,748,849	394,380	1,354,469	1,260,000	(94,469)	Rhode Island.....	1,495,781	208,705	1,287,076	1,260,000	(27,076)
Idaho.....	1,405,262	26,800	1,378,462	1,260,000	(118,462)	Vermont.....	1,578,521	160,678	1,417,843	1,260,000	(157,843)
Iowa.....	5,027,699	224,897	4,802,802	3,674,378	(1,128,424)	West Virginia.....	2,868,947	337,629	2,531,318	2,275,094	(256,224)
Kansas.....	3,756,414	301,321	3,455,093	2,890,068	(565,025)	Wisconsin.....	7,238,569	1,383,411	5,855,158	5,375,883	(479,275)
Louisiana.....	4,979,098	673,034	4,306,064	3,713,853	(592,211)	American Samoa.....	683,102	10,575	672,527	618,750	(53,777)
Maine.....	1,830,403	251,246	1,579,157	1,301,427	(277,730)	Gum.....	1,088,535	17,650	1,070,885	630,000	(440,885)
Massachusetts.....	10,712,000	1,870,491	8,841,509	6,953,329	(1,888,180)	Northern Marianas Islands.....	163,800		163,800	157,500	(6,300)
Michigan.....	11,876,818	3,046,029	8,830,789	8,825,445	(5,344)						

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) that all of his time has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT).

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the House and Senate conferees have recognized the immediate need to complete the land acquisition program on the Buffalo National River and have included in this conference agreement under the land and water conservation fund \$3 million to be reprogrammed from National Park Service inholdings for land acquisition. I appreciate Senator BUMPERS initiative in the other body to make sure that these funds were included even though they were not in the President's budget request.

As the original sponsor in the House of Representatives, of legislation to preserve the Buffalo River for the enjoyment of future generations, I have a long-standing commitment to the protection and

maintenance of this area. This reprogramming of \$3 million is urgently needed because as of March 31, 1979, only \$86,386 remained in the land acquisition fund. Presently, over 14,000 acres of private land remain to be acquired and these lands must be obtained as soon as possible since any further delays could cause a substantial increase in project costs to the Federal Government due to continuing price escalation. Lands which sold for \$450 per acre in early 1975 are now selling for \$850 per acre. Moreover, I have witnessed the hardships of many landowners due to the delays in acquisition. The Government's inability to acquire their land leaves the owners with no feasible alternative to disposing of their property.

This additional funding will provide for continuity in the land acquisition program on the Buffalo National River and will permit the National Park Service to initiate immediate action to complete the land acquisition program while paying landowners a fair price for their lands. The beauty of the Buffalo National River is unsurpassed and it is indeed fitting that it should be preserved. In the master plan for the Buffalo Na-

tional River, by the Department of Interior in 1977, the river was described in the following manner:

Take pure, clear, flowing water: send it down a 148-mile meandering course; pour it over rapids; strain it through gravel bars; drift it through long pools; let it caress tree-covered banks. Then dot a valley bottom with open grassy meadows; punctuate the shores with frequent tall bluffs; and fill the countryside with steep, wooded hills. Now interject an occasional turtle sunning on a log in the water; slide in a snake searching for a frog; add a bass breaking the water surface; and stand a heron stalking at the river edge. Accent the whole with birds warbling in the trees and insects buzzing close above the water. Finally, place yourself in a canoe drifting down the river surrounded by the peaceful and inspiring mood of these natural elements.

But on the land there is even more: caves with hidden formations and untrodden passageways; solution pits and sinks and underground waterways; tall cliffs on side-stream courses that force long waterfall leaps; ancient Indian dwelling sites; abandoned pioneer farmsteads on ridgetops hidden in regrowing forests; a wildflower unexpected. Now you have the essence of the Buffalo National River."

Again, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the confer-

ence, Mr. WHITTEN, along with my colleagues who served as conferees and recognized the essential need for these moneys to give the Buffalo National River the attention that it rightfully deserves, not for any single quality, but for an array of qualities that makes the river an outstanding remnant of early America, worthy of saving.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 284, nays 132, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—284

Addabbo	Dingell	Horton
Akaka	Dixon	Howard
Albosta	Dodd	Huckaby
Alexander	Donnelly	Hutto
Ambro	Dornan	Hyde
Andrews,	Dougherty	Ichord
N. Dak.	Drinan	Ireland
Annunzio	Duncan, Oreg.	Jenkins
Anthony	Duncan, Tenn.	Jenrette
Ashley	Early	Johnson, Calif.
Aspin	Eckhardt	Jones, N.C.
Bailey	Edgar	Jones, Tenn.
Baldus	Edwards, Ala.	Kastenmeier
Barnard	Edwards, Calif.	Kazen
Barnes	Erlenborn	Kildee
Bedell	Ertel	Kogovsek
Bellenson	Evans, Del.	Leach, La.
Benjamin	Evans, Ga.	Leath, Tex.
Bennett	Fary	Lederer
Bereuter	Fasell	Lehman
Bethune	Fazio	Leland
Bevill	Ferraro	Lent
Blaggi	Findley	Livingston
Bingham	Fish	Lloyd
Blanchard	Fisher	Long, La.
Boggs	Fithian	Long, Md.
Boland	Flippo	Lott
Boner	Florio	Lowry
Bonker	Foley	Lukens
Bowen	Ford, Mich.	Lundine
Brademas	Ford, Tenn.	McClary
Breaux	Fowler	McCloskey
Brinkley	Frost	McCormack
Brooks	Fuqua	McDade
Broomfield	Garcia	McEwen
Brown, Calif.	Gaydos	McHugh
Buchanan	Gilman	McKay
Burlison	Ginn	McKinney
Burton, Phillip	Gonzalez	Markey
Butler	Gore	Marks
Byron	Gradison	Mathis
Chappell	Gray	Matsui
Chisholm	Green	Mattox
Clay	Grisham	Mavroules
Cleveland	Guarini	Mazzoli
Clinger	Hagedorn	Mica
Coleman	Hall, Ohio	Michel
Collins, Ill.	Hall, Tex.	Mikulski
Conte	Hamilton	Mikva
Corman	Hammer-	Miller, Calif.
Cotter	schmidt	Mineta
Coughlin	Hanley	Minish
D'Amours	Harris	Mitchell, Md.
Daniel, Dan	Harsha	Mitchell, N.Y.
Danielson	Hawkins	Moakley
Davis, Mich.	Hefner	Moffett
Davis, S.C.	Hefelt	Mollohan
de la Garza	Hightower	Montgomery
Derrick	Hillis	Moore
Dickinson	Hinson	Moorhead, Pa.
Dicks	Holland	Murphy, Ill.
Diggs	Holtzman	Murphy, N.Y.

Murtha
Myers, Pa.
Natcher
Nezdi
Nelson
Nichols
Nolan
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ottinger
Panetta
Patten
Patterson
Pepper
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Pryor
Price
Pritchard
Quayle
Quillen
Rahall
Rallsback
Rangel
Ratchford
Reuss
Rhodes
Richmond
Rinaldo
Roberts

Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Royer
Sabo
Scheuer
Sharp
Shelby
Simon
Skelton
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snowe
Solarz
Spellman
St Germain
Stack
Stangeland
Stanton
Stark
Steed
Stewart
Stokes
Stratton
Synar
Thompson
Traxler
Treen
Trible
Udall

Ullman
Van Deenlin
Vanik
Vento
Walgren
Wampler
Watkins
Waxman
Wells
White
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams, Mont.
Williams, Ohio
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, C. H.
Wilson, Tex.
Winn
Wirth
Wolf
Wolpe
Wright
Wyatt
Wyder
Yates
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Zablocki
Zerfetti

NAYS—132

Abdnor	Frenzel	Moorhead,
Anderson,	Gephardt	Calif.
Calif.	Gingrich	Mott
Applegate	Glickman	Murphy, Pa.
Archer	Goldwater	Myers, Ind.
Ashbrook	Goodling	Neal
Atkinson	Gramm	Pashayan
AuCoin	Grassley	Paul
Badham	Gudger	Pease
Bafalis	Guyer	Petri
Bauman	Hance	Pursell
Beard, R.I.	Hansen	Regula
Beard, Tenn.	Harkin	Ritter
Bonior	Heckler	Roth
Bouquard	Hollenbeck	Roussellot
Brodhead	Holt	Rudd
Broyhill	Hopkins	Runnels
Burgener	Hubbard	Russo
Burton, John	Hughes	Santini
Campbell	Jacobs	Satterfield
Carney	Jeffries	Sawyer
Carr	Johnson, Colo.	Schroeder
Cavanaugh	Jones, Okla.	Schulze
Cheney	Kelly	Sebelius
Clausen	Kemp	Selberling
Collins, Tex.	Kindness	Sensenbrenner
Conable	Kostmayer	Shumway
Corcoran	Kramer	Shuster
Courter	LaFalce	Smith, Nebr.
Crane, Daniel	Lagomarsino	Snyder
Crane, Philip	Latta	Solomon
Daniel, R. W.	Leach, Iowa	Spence
Dannemeyer	Lee	Stenholm
Daschle	Levitas	Stockman
Deckard	Lewis	Studds
Dellums	Loeffler	Stump
Derwinski	Lujan	Symms
Devine	Lungren	Tauke
Downey	McDonald	Thomas
Edwards, Okla.	Madigan	Vander Jagt
Englsh	Maguire	Volkmer
Erdahl	Marlenee	Walker
Evans, Ind.	Marriott	Weaver
Fenwick	Martin	Wylie
Fountain	Miller, Ohio	

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson, Ill.	Conyers	Jeffords
Andrews, N.C.	Emery	Shannon
Bolling	Flood	Staggers
Brown, Ohio	Forsythe	Swift
Carter	Gialmo	Taylor
Coelho	Gibbons	Young, Mo.

□ 1340

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Emery.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Jeffords.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Young of Missouri with Mr. Forsythe.
Mr. Coelho with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Swift.

Mr. Shannon with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, and Messrs. MARLENEE, SNYDER, CAMPBELL, DOWNEY, DELLUMS, and BONIOR changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, after line 5, insert:

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Buildings and Facilities" of the Agricultural Research Service, \$3,400,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,020,000".

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that we were unable to reach a compromise on the first item we had in conference. Amendment No. 1 provides an additional \$1.7 million for each of two agricultural research facilities, the National Soil Erosion Laboratory at Purdue University, and a feedmill at El Reno, Okla. The House conferees felt we could not agree to this. This is not a question of whether or not we need these two facilities, construction funds have already been appropriated. However, the bids for construction came in way over the amount provided by Congress. Not a shovel of dirt has been turned, we are only talking about bids. This Congress is now being asked to fund cost over runs on bids of 47 and 113 percent. I think we would be setting a very bad precedent if we agreed to fund these large over runs. As a compromise we are proposing to allow a 20-percent increase for each facility. We also want to make it clear that this is not to set a precedent for future projects.

I hope that the House will strongly back the conferees on this.

There is one other item in the Agriculture chapter that I would like to comment on briefly. We had a budget request for \$1 billion for food stamps. The bill, as passed the House, included only the \$380 million that is currently authorized. We knew when this bill passed the House that this would not be sufficient, but we felt that the House could only provide what was currently authorized under the cap. Since that time the House has approved additional authorization. The conferees have agreed that additional funds are needed, however, we felt that some program savings could be made, so we approved \$900 million for food

stamps. That is \$89 million under the amount approved by the Senate.

I am very pleased to report to my colleagues that the House conferees prevailed on the Senate conferees to yield on \$1.9 million for indemnity payments to beekeepers. I fought this program for years, and I hope it is finally as dead as the bees we have been paying for.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 15, after "\$100,000,000" insert "": *Provided*, That only claims for reimbursement for meals served during 1979 received by the Secretary of Agriculture before April 1980 shall be eligible for reimbursement".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "": *Provided*, That only claims for reimbursement for meals served during fiscal year 1979 submitted to State agencies prior to January 1, 1980, shall be eligible for reimbursement".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 3, line 18, after "reimbursement" insert "": *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for the purpose of section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended, shall be allocated among the States but the distribution of such funds to an individual State is contingent upon that State's agreement to participate in studies and surveys of programs authorized under the National School Lunch Act, as amended, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended, when such studies and surveys have been directed by the Congress and requested by the Secretary of Agriculture".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 4, line 5, strike out "\$379,700,000" and insert "\$988,786,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "\$900,000,000, of which \$520,300,000 shall be available only upon the enactment of authorizing legislation".

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1350

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 10, line 12, insert:

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

For an additional amount for the "Federal Energy Regulatory Commission", \$2,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That one of these funds or any other funds available to the Commission shall be used to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 and concur therein.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in chapter II, dealing with the Department of Defense, the House agreed to several changes, most notable in connection with the procurement of four destroyers which had been ordered by the Government of Iran.

In the House version of the supplemental, provision had been made for two destroyers at a cost of \$628 million for the payment of shipbuilding claims. The conference wisely settled on all four ships, but deleted funds for the claims.

The procurement of the ships now means the United States can save about \$800 million in total, or \$200 million per ship, below what procurement would cost if construction were beginning today. In addition, procurement in the supplemental means we will not have to look to 1980 shipbuilding funds for these ships.

The money for the destroyers, in fact, was generated when the President vetoed the fiscal year 1979 authorization bill which had contained funds for a nuclear powered aircraft carrier. When that veto was sustained, the House cleared the way for the application of some \$2 billion to other programs in a supplemental.

The conference report before you now is the culmination of that action.

Other changes were made in conference to the House bill.

Funds were provided to reopen certain Army and Air Force installations in Turkey, essential to the U.S. nuclear monitoring missions in that nation.

Cruise missile associated funding is provided to enable the Defense Mapping Agency to support this new mission. In addition, we provided money for the continuing testing program to integrate the cruise missile into the B-52 bomber fleet. The Cruise missile test and integration funds, totaling \$43 million do not represent an increase in dollars over the House bill, however. M-X missile funding was reduced to include the cruise missile funding within the \$190 million in M-X money. This is a prudent cut because it is doubtful the Department of Defense could use all of the M-X money for that purpose in the remaining weeks of the 1979 fiscal year.

Also included in the conference report is \$5 million for TOW antitank missile warhead, and guidance work, and \$3 million for research on a small ship design incorporating new technology in hull design, as well as \$8.6 million for combat support equipment.

In the Defense portion then, the major change is in the Navy's shipbuilding and conversion account with several small changes, in items of dollars, in other accounts. But, this major change represents a huge dollar savings, and at the same time allowing for relatively early deployment of the ships by the Navy.

The Defense portion of the bill is an excellent compromise and should be supported.

Both the House and Senate included the full budget request of \$1,470,000,000 in budget authority for the Middle East peace package, the amount necessary to generate total assistance totals of \$3 billion for Israel and \$1.8 billion for Egypt over the next 3 years. No conference action was needed for this item.

Both Houses also provided the requested \$100 million in economic assistance for Turkey.

The conference report includes a reappropriation of \$25 million for military assistance grants, a split between the \$22.5 million provided by the House and the \$27.5 million provided by the Senate. Most of these funds are for the eastern Mediterranean, including funds previously held up by the Turkish arms embargo.

The conference report provides \$3,221,000 for the Peace Corps as provided by the House. This is a reduction of \$1,179,000 below the budget request, and \$259,000 below the Senate amount.

Due to burgeoning worldwide refugee problems, House conferees receded to higher Senate recommendations for two refugee accounts in the Department of State. The bill includes \$108,910,000 for migration and refugee assistance and \$17,200,000 for the U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund. The additional funds will be used for the care of Indochinese refugees in Southeast Asia, for transportation and initial settlement of these refugees in the United States, and for similar efforts for the increased number of refugees from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 16, line 15, after "\$35,000" insert "": *Provided*, That this increase will be available for the payment of travel expenses incurred by the Commission at any time during the fiscal year."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 19, line 6, after "\$44,850,000" insert ", of which \$11,000,000 shall remain available through September 30, 1980".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named by said amendment insert "\$7,753,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 21, line 7, strike out "\$5,600,000" and insert "\$10,900,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,600,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 21, line 9, insert:

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Energy Information Administration", \$2,000,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named by said amendment insert "\$1,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 22, line 8, insert:

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds", \$500,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1980.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 28, line 22, after "\$18,870,000" insert ": Provided, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the unexpended amount provided for this account in Public Law 94-206 shall remain available until expended".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 75: Page 29, line 23, insert:

GENERAL PROVISION

Section 301(a)(1) of Public Law 95-164 is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, Health and Safety Academy is transferred to the Secretary of Labor."

Paragraph (1) of Section 502(c) of Public Law 91-173 as amended by Section (h) of Public Law 95-164 is amended by striking out: "Department of the Interior" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Labor", and striking out "Secretaries of Labor and Interior" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Labor."

Paragraph (2) of Section 502(c) of Public Law 91-173 as amended by Section 303(h) of Public Law 95-164 is deleted.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the Labor-HEW part of the supplemental. I feel that good compromises have been made in this area, and that the bill provides sufficient money for many key programs. The Senate receded to the House on five amendments, numbers 63, 69, 70, 71, and 74, and the House receded to the Senate on five amendments, numbers 60, 64, 65, 66, and 68. Three amendments were reported in technical disagreement, numbers 59, 72, and 75. The remaining amendments, numbers 61, 62, 67, and 73 are all compromises between the House and Senate appropriation levels and I feel that they are uniformly good ones.

It will be noted that the amount of money in this section has increased significantly. This is due almost entirely to amendments 59 and 60, the amendments which provide a total of \$500 million: \$300 million for the black lung trust fund, and \$200 million for the unemployment trust fund. It is not pleasant to have to appropriate such large sums of money, but I feel that we have a responsibility to provide these funds and keep our obligations to the workers of this country.

The Senate acceded to the House completely on all the appropriations for the Office of Human Development Services. This means that \$2 million will be spent to initiate a very important independent living program, which I believe will prove to be of much benefit to our handicapped. It also means that the \$22.5 million in supplemental appropriations for the elderly nutrition program can now go out to States which have had funding deficits and operating level decreases in this most worthy program.

The House and Senate reached a very good compromise on the matter of supplemental appropriation for the Center for Population Research at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD). The House had recommended \$5 million, the Senate \$10.713 million, and the conferees agreed upon \$7.5 million. I am very happy to accept this higher figure, since the Center for Population Research performs very important work in the areas of research on contraception and population growth, and deserves our highest support.

I am also pleased that the House receded to the Senate in the matter of a \$1 million supplemental to start up the adolescent pregnancy prevention and services program. This is an important initiative for our Government to take to try to deal with the more and more serious problem of the epidemic of teenage pregnancies in our country.

The major compromise which the Senate made to the House was in the area of concentration grants. The House had provided \$200 million for this item, and the Senate completely deleted all funds for this program. The conferees have agreed upon a figure of \$150 million; enough, I feel, to get this program off to the strong start that it deserves.

Most of the other compromises reached in conference are relatively uncontroversial, and have already been explained most ably. In summation, let me just say that I am very happy with the way the Labor-HEW section of this bill was dealt with, and hope that its provisions are accepted smoothly and quickly.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as amendments Nos. 76 through 81 relate solely to housekeeping operations of the other body in which, by practice, the House concurs without intervention, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 76 through 81 be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi can tell us whether there are any controversial items included in the amendments which he is asking en bloc permission to consider.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the group does not include anything controversial.

Mr. BAUMAN. Nothing like a new office building for the other body or anything like that?

Mr. WHITTEN. It does not.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman,

and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will designate the next amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk designated Senate amendments Nos. 76 through 81 as follows:

(76) Page 30, after line 13, insert "SENATE".

(77) Page 30, after line 14, insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES

For an additional amount for "Salaries, officers, and employees", \$1,594,000.

(78) Page 30, after line 17, insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(79) Page 30, after line 18, insert:

SEC. 101. Effective October 1, 1979, the President pro tempore is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as he deems appropriate: *Provided*, That the gross compensation paid to such employees shall not exceed \$123,000 each fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the positions established by the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1977, for the Office of the President pro tempore are abolished effective October 1, 1979.

(80) Page 31, after line 2, insert:

SEC. 102. Effective October 1, 1979, the Secretary of the Conference of the Majority and the Secretary of the Conference of the Minority are each authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as they deem appropriate: *Provided*, That the gross compensation paid to such employees shall not exceed \$70,000 each fiscal year for each Secretary: *Provided further*, That the positions established by the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1977, for the Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority are abolished effective October 1, 1979.

(81) Page 20, after line 13, insert:

SEC. 103. Effective January 15, 1979, the compensation of the Chaplain of the Senate shall be \$34,398 per annum in lieu of \$24,948 per annum, and the Chaplain may appoint and fix the compensation of a secretary at not to exceed \$20,034 per annum in lieu of not to exceed \$16,632 per annum. The Chaplain may authorize such change in the compensation of his secretary on such effective date if certified in writing to the disbursing office of the Senate not later than ten days after the date of the enactment of this Act. During the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, the compensation of the Chaplain and his secretary may be paid out of any funds available in any appropriation under the headings "SENATE", "Salaries, officers and employees" in any appropriation Act.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 76 through 81 inclusive and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 82: Page 32, line 3, insert:

SEC. 104. Effective August 1, 1979, the annual rates of compensation and maximum annual rates of compensation provided in the Order of the President pro tempore of the Senate issued on October 9, 1978, under authority of section 4 of the Federal Pay Com-

parability Act of 1970 shall be payable to employees covered by such Order, notwithstanding any other provision of law. During the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, any increase in compensation payable by reason of the preceding sentence to employees covered by such Order may be paid out of any funds available in any appropriation under the heading "SENATE" in any appropriation Act.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 82.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MURTHA

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MURTHA moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82 and concur therein with an amendment:

Effective August 1, 1979, the annual rates of compensation payable under authority of section 4 of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 shall be payable to employees covered by section 304 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1979, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman desire time to explain his amendment?

Mr. Speaker, I insist on the provisions as reported by the committee. Could we have a vote at this point?

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Would the gentleman from Mississippi or the author of the motion give us some explanation what this is precisely? Is this an extension of pay raises both to top level employees of the House and the other body?

Mr. WHITTEN. I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he cared for time.

Mr. BAUMAN. I am sorry. If the gentleman declined to speak but the House ought to know what it is voting on.

Would the gentleman from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Then what we are doing if we accept the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is giving a \$2,612.50 pay raise to every employee of both Houses of Congress who is now receiving \$47,500, and comparable pay raises to all other top employees, is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Maryland that I did not see the amendment before it was offered. I have not had it explained to me. I personally said that I stood by the position that the conferees had reported to the House. That is as it appears in the conference report.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania can best define his amendment as he intended.

Mr. BAUMAN. Do we know how many employees of the two bodies fall under this category, and what the cost to the taxpayers will be?

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, the number of employees that fall under the category of this amendment will be approximately 540 employees, and the annual cost is about \$1.5 million.

Mr. BAUMAN. Two million dollars?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Let me retract that. The cost on an annual basis would be \$1.5 million. We are talking about a period of 2 months, so consequently, taking one-sixth of that cost, it will be approximately \$250,000.

□ 1400

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, am I correct that I have control of the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi controls the time.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I inquire of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BENJAMIN) am I right that the basic law provides for the automatic increases, based on the 1970 act to offset increases in inflation?

Mr. BENJAMIN. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Am I correct, too, that in that law that the estimated increase in inflation for the foreseeable period, which means through October, is approximately 10.5 percent?

Mr. BENJAMIN. About 10.8 percent.

Mr. WHITTEN. And then am I right, too, that the amendment here provides for a limitation of 5.5 percent; is that correct?

Mr. BENJAMIN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. In the event the provisions take effect, would this allow the employees an additional 5.5 percent as well as 10.8 under the general law?

Mr. BENJAMIN. That is correct.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for further questions?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. I wanted to address a question to the gentleman from Indiana. Do I understand from the questions asked by the chairman of the committee that these employees would receive an automatic pay increase anyway and this motion is in fact a limitation? It was hard to hear what was being said.

Mr. BENJAMIN. If the gentleman will yield, the limitation was placed on the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1979. The Senate, in amendment 82, eliminated the limitation for only the Senate employees. This would allow it for the last 2 months of 1979 and until the legislative branch appropriations bill for 1980 is acted upon there has been no determination made beyond that point.

Mr. BAUMAN. When did this class of top level pay employees in the House and the other body last receive a pay raise?

Mr. BENJAMIN. On March 1, 1977.

Mr. BAUMAN. Does this then mean, based on past experience, that all levels of pay will have to be increased for all employees of both bodies?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Those employees that were frozen, yes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for the purpose of asking questions.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Not for the purpose of making a comment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly I will yield yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding to me for the purpose of comment on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Members of this House to consider very carefully this preferential motion which is being offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). I ask them to do so because its passage will open the door when we have further consideration of legislative appropriations, legislative pay issues not only for Members, but for employees of the House, for the possibility of argument being made that since these few employees received a pay raise in this bill, quite obviously Members of the House ought to have a pay raise, too. We should not open ourselves up to that strategy, because as it is one that is often used very openly in debate to justify pay raises for Congressmen.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Members consider that there is no urgency for the Murtha amendment at this point. The issue the gentleman brings up can be adequately dealt with when we deal with the legislative appropriations bill. The committee will come out with such a bill very shortly. We should not in any way, during a period of high inflation like this, give any excuse to the House or Senate to raise the pay of the Members or the top-level employees of the House and Senate as well as the 15,000 employees in the civil service that will be in here asking for a raise. That adds up to \$50 million.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the motion I made was to insist on the House position. That has been superseded by a preferential motion, with an amendment, which would add the House as well as the Senate.

I ask, and I think I am right about it, that if this preferential motion were to prevail, would it not still leave the existing law where it would provide for the increase up to 10.8 percent? I shall vote against the preferential motion which would add 5.5 percent. Incidentally, I also voted against the 1970 act which provides for these automatic increases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Dicks) there were—ayes 23, noes 26.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 82 is being brought back to the House in true disagreement. The amendment was added by the Senate and would have the effect of giving approximately 200 top Senate staff members last October's 5.5-percent pay raise, effective August 1, 1979. While the House did not address this issue in the supplemental bill, on June 13, 1979, the House defeated the fiscal year 1980 legislative branch appropriations bill which included a similar pay increase for Members of Congress and top legislative, executive, and judicial branch employees by a vote of 186 to 232. A motion will be offered to insist on the House position against this amendment.

The conference report includes no funds for the Hart Senate Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Dicks) there were—ayes 23, noes 26.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as amendments Nos. 83 through 87 relate solely to housekeeping operations of the other body in which, by practice, the House concurs without intervention, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 83 through 87 be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk designated Senate amendments Nos. 83 through 87, as follows:

(83) Page 32, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 105. Effective on the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the maximum annual rate of compensation of the Chief Reporter of Debates, Office of the Secretary of the Senate, shall be the maximum rate prescribed in section 105(f) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968, as amended and modified (2 U.S.C. 61-1(f));

(2) the maximum annual rate of compensation of the Registrar, Office of the Secretary of the Senate, is increased to \$24,948; and

(3) the title of a Reference Assistant, Office of the Secretary of the Senate, is changed to Chief, Bill Status Unit.

(84) Page 33, after line 3, insert:

SEC. 106. Effective on the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the maximum annual rate of compensation of the Deputy Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall be the same as the maximum annual rate of compensation of the Assistant Secretary of the Senate;

(2) the maximum annual rate of compensation of the Administrative Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall be the same as the highest maximum annual rate of compensation that may be paid to an employee in the office of a Senator; and

(3) the maximum annual rate of compensation of the Executive Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall be the same as the second highest maximum annual rate of compensation that may be paid to an employee in the office of a Senator.

During the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, the increases in compensation payable under this section may be paid out of any funds available in any appropriation under the headings "SENATE", "Salaries, officers and employees" in any appropriation Act.

(85) Page 34, after line 2, insert:

SEC. 107. (a) Effective July 1, 1979, there is authorized an expense allowance for the Office of the Secretary of the Senate and the Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate which shall not exceed \$2,000 each fiscal year for each such office. Payments made under this section shall be reimbursements only for actual expenses (including meals and food-related expenses) incurred in the course of conducting orientation seminars for Senators and members of their staffs, and other similar meetings, in the Capitol Building or the Senate Office Buildings. Such payments shall be made upon certification and documentation of such expenses by the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, respectively, and shall be made out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the Secretary and the Sergeant at Arms, respectively. Amounts received as reimbursement of such expenses shall not be reported as income, and the expenses so reimbursed shall not be allowed as a deduction, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(b) Effective July 1, 1979, section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1978 (2 U.S.C. 69a) is repealed.

(86) Page 34, after line 23, insert:

SEC. 108. (a) The first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution relating to the payment of salaries of employees of the Senate", approved April 20, 1960 (2 U.S.C. 60c-1), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In any case in which an officer or employee of the Senate dies during the month of December and the full compensation of such officer or employee for such month has been disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate before he receives notice of such death, no recovery shall be made of any portion of the compensation so disbursed."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1978.

(87) Page 35, after line 10, insert:

SEC. 109. (a) Any funds made available for obligation during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, by section 101 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1979, shall be merged with the funds appropriated for the same purposes by such Act and shall remain available until expended.

(b) Any funds appropriated or made available for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, under the heading "SENATE" in any appropriation Act shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, remain available for obligation through September 30, 1980, for the same purposes for which appropriated or made available, and shall be merged with the funds appropriated for such purposes for the fiscal year ending Sep-

tember 30, 1980, and shall remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83 through 87 inclusive and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 88: Page 36, line 16, insert:

SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For an additional amount for "Senate Office buildings", \$600,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 89: Page 37, line 18, insert:

GENERAL PROVISION

Sec. 101. Any funds appropriated under the heading "JOINT ITEMS", "Official Mail Costs" in any appropriation Act for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, shall remain available until expended, for the same purposes for which appropriated.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 93: Page 39, line 17, after "Prisoners" insert "and repeal of the numerical ceiling provisions of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1979, that pertain to the lease and purchase of vehicles for the U.S. Marshals Service".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 94: Page 40, line 1, insert:

**FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,636,000 to be available only

upon the enactment of all necessary authorizing legislation: Provided, That \$3,500,000 appropriated in the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1979 for the purpose of constructing a forensic science training and research facility at Quantico, Virginia, shall remain available until September 30, 1980.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

**FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,636,000: Provided, That \$3,500,000 appropriated in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1979 for the purpose of constructing a forensic science training and research facility at Quantico, Virginia, shall remain available until September 30, 1980.

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1410

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 95: Page 40, line 10, insert:

**IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$3,935,000: Provided, That \$3,335,000 of this amount shall remain available until September 30, 1980 for the purpose of renovating the former Border Patrol Academy at Port Isabel, Texas, into a Service Processing Center.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 96: Page 41, line 2, insert:

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in chapter IX of the bill the Senate added \$60 million for construction of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Western Regional Center at Sand Point, Seattle, Wash. The conferees decided to approve this request with the clear understanding that this is sufficient to complete the project and that no additional funding would be required. We agree that NOAA needs to consolidate

their Washington facilities, but we do not want to open the door for a run on the Treasury to construct it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 99: Page 42, line 14, after "\$4,000,000" insert "": Provided, That funds under this heading shall be available for refreshments for jurors".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 102: Page 44, line 6, insert:

**ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF RADIO
FACILITIES**

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 801(3) of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as the section applies to funds provided for "Acquisition and construction of radio facilities" in the Departments of State, Justice and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1979, the International Communication Agency is authorized to enter into a lease of up to twenty-five years in duration for the establishment and operation of a radio station in Botswana.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 103: Page 45, line 8, after "limitation" insert "": Provided, That (a) The first undesignated paragraph of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act is amended by inserting after "under subsection (b)" the following "except as provided in subsection (c).";

"(b) Section 7(c) of the Small Business Act is amended by adding the following new paragraphs:

"(3) With respect to a disaster occurring on or after October 1, 1978, and prior to October 1, 1982, on the Administration's share of loans made pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (b)—

"(A) if the loan proceeds are to repair or replace a primary residence and/or repair or replace damaged or destroyed personal property, the interest rate shall be 3 percent on the first \$55,000 of such loan;

"(B) if the loan proceeds are to repair or replace property damaged or destroyed and if the applicant is a business concern which is unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere, the interest rate shall be as determined by the Administration, but not in excess of 5 percent per annum; and

"(C) if the loan proceeds are to repair or replace property damaged or destroyed and if the applicant is a business concern which is able to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere, the interest rate shall not exceed the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States

with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent, and an additional amount as determined by the Administration but not to exceed 1 percent: *Provided*, That three years after such loan is fully disbursed and every two years thereafter for the term of the loan, if the Administration determines that the borrower is able to obtain a loan from non-Federal sources at reasonable rates and terms for loans of similar purposes and periods of time, the borrower shall, upon request by the Administration, apply for and accept such loan in sufficient amount to repay the Administration: *Provided further*, That no loan under subsection (b) (1) shall be made, either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis, if the total amount outstanding and committed to the borrower under such subsection would exceed \$500,000 for each disaster, unless an applicant constitutes a major source of employment in an area suffering a disaster, in which case the Administration, in its discretion, may waive the \$500,000 limitation."

"(c) Section 18 of the Small Business Act is amended by—

"(1) inserting after 'Sec. 18.' '(a)';

"(2) striking the comma after the phrase 'agricultural related industries' and inserting the following: '": *Provided*, That, prior to October 1, 1982 an agricultural enterprise shall not be eligible for loan assistance under paragraph (1) of section 7(b) to repair or replace property other than residences and/or personal property unless it is declined for, or would be declined for emergency loan assistance from the Farmers Home Administration under subchapter III of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act;" and

"(3) inserting a new subsection as follows:

"(b) As used in this Act—

"(1) 'agricultural enterprises' means those businesses engaged in the production of food and fiber, ranching and raising of livestock, aquaculture, and all other farming and agricultural related industries; and

"(2) 'credit elsewhere' means the availability of sufficient credit from non-Federal sources at reasonable terms, taking into consideration prevailing private rates and terms in the community in or near where the concern transacts business for similar purposes and periods of time."

"(d) The amendments made by this section to sections 7(c) (3) (C) and 18 of the Small Business Act shall not apply to any disaster which commenced on or before the effective date of this Act.

"(e) Section 321 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence all that follows after "with the assistance of such loan" through the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

"(f) Section 324(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by—

"(1) striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Loans made or insured under this subtitle shall be at rates of interest as follows:

"(1) with respect to loans or portions of loans up to the amount of the applicant's actual loss caused by the disaster, (A) if the applicant is unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere to finance the applicant's actual needs at reasonable rates and terms taking into consideration prevailing private and cooperative rates and terms in the community in or near which the applicant resides for loans for similar purposes and periods of time, the interest rate shall be a rate prescribed by the Secretary not in excess of 5 per centum per annum, and (B) if the applicant is able to obtain sufficient credit

elsewhere, the interest rates shall be the rate prescribed by the Secretary, but not in excess of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, plus not to exceed 1 per centum, as determined by the Secretary, and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum: *Provided*, That the total amount outstanding and committed to the borrower under this paragraph (1) shall not exceed \$500,000 for each disaster; and

"(2) with respect to loans or portions of loans exceeding the amount of actual loss caused by the disaster, the interest rate shall be that prevailing in the private market for similar loans, as determined by the Secretary;" and

"(2) inserting in the second sentence after 'Provided, That' the following: "for loans approved under subsection (a) (1) (B), three years after such loan is made or insured and every two years thereafter for the terms of the loans, if the Secretary determines that the borrower is able to obtain a loan from non-Federal sources at reasonable rates and terms for loans of similar purposes and periods of time, the borrower shall, upon request by the Secretary, apply for and accept such loan in sufficient amount to repay the Secretary: *Provided further*, That".

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

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "": *Provided*, That (a) The first undesignated paragraph of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act is amended by inserting after "under subsection (b)" the following "": except as provided in subsection (c)";

"(b) Section 7(c) of the Small Business Act is amended by adding the following new paragraphs:

"(3) With respect to a disaster occurring on or after October 1, 1978, and prior to October 1, 1982, on the Administration's share of loans made pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (b)—

"(A) if the loan proceeds are to repair or replace a primary residence and/or repair or replace damaged or destroyed personal property, the interest rate shall be 3 percent on the first \$55,000 of such loan;

"(B) if the loan proceeds are to repair or replace property damaged or destroyed and if the applicant is a business concern which is unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere, the interest rate shall be as determined by the Administration, but not in excess of 5 percent per annum."

"(c) Section 18 of the Small Business Act is amended by—

"(1) inserting after 'Sec. 18.' '(a)';

"(2) inserting a new subsection as follows:

"(b) As used in this Act, 'credit elsewhere' means the availability of sufficient credit from non-Federal sources at reasonable rates and terms, taking into consideration prevailing private rates and terms in the community in or near where the concern

transacts business for similar purposes and periods of time."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in the chapter on transportation, the bill provides \$1 million for transportation planning, research, and development. This amount is intended to fund the waterway user fee study.

Also, in recognition of the increased responsibility of the Coast Guard with respect to oil spills and hazardous substances cleanup, the bill provides \$13 million for the pollution fund.

And finally, the conferees direct that \$50 million of the \$100 million limitation on the aircraft loan guarantee program be used to purchase aircraft within the size limitations prescribed by 3416(b) (4) of the Federal Aviation Act, as amended. This should assure the continued or improved air service to those small local communities that were contemplated by the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 114: Page 57, line 18, insert:

U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the proceeds of customs duties collected in the Virgin Islands less the cost of collecting all said duties shall, effective for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1978, be covered into the Treasury of the Virgin Islands, and shall be available for expenditure as the Legislature of the Virgin Islands may provide.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the conference report deletes the House-approved \$18,233,000 to pay the costs of reduced mail rates for national and State political party committees.

The report also deletes \$1,531,000 for the Bureau of the Mint for the Susan B. Anthony coin. Subsequent to House approval of this amount, adequate funds were reprogrammed within the Department of the Treasury which eliminated the need for additional appropriations.

House conferees receded to a Senate provision setting up a separate independent account for the Inspector General of the General Services Administration to further insulate that office from political pressures.

Items not subject to conference include \$3.2 million for the Council on Wage and Price Stability, which is \$2 million below the budget request, and \$335 million for payments to the civil service retirement and disability fund, a mandatory item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 117: Page 58, line 22, insert:

**SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PRESIDENT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

In addition to the amount made available in the appropriation under this heading in the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Act, 1979, for expenses of travel, \$10,000 more shall be available in that appropriation for such expenses.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 120: Page 61, line 11, insert:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

To establish and fund, "Office of Inspector General", \$1,700,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 129: Page 63, line 5, insert:

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$15,223,400: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$250,000 of this appropriation shall be available for settlement of property damage claims not in excess of \$1,500 each and personal injury claims not in excess of \$5,000 each.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of \$15,223,400 proposed by said amendment, insert "\$16,408,100".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as amendments Nos. 140 through 146 relate solely to housekeeping operations of the other body in which, by practice the House concurs without intervention, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 140 through 146 be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk designated Senate amendments Nos. 140 through 146, as follows:

(140) Page 65, line 2, insert "SENATE".

(141) Page 40, line 3 insert "Salaries, officers and employees", \$6,019,000;".

(142) Page 65, line 4 insert "Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", \$25,000;".

(143) Page 65, after line 6, insert "Senate policy committees", \$74,000;".

(144) Page 65, after line 7, insert "Inquiries and investigations", \$1,330,000;".

(145) Page 65, line 8, insert "Folding documents", \$6,000;".

(146) Page 65, after line 9, insert "Miscellaneous items", \$13,000;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140 through 146 inclusive and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 147: Page 67, line 1, insert: "Senate office buildings", \$389,000, to be derived by release of \$55,000 from "Senate office buildings", withheld from obligation by the Architect of the Capitol pursuant to Section 311 of Public Law 95-391, and by transfer of \$273,000 from "Capitol power plant" and \$61,000 from "House office buildings" by release of those amounts withheld from obligation by the Architect of the Capitol pursuant to Section 311 of Public Law 95-391;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 148: Page 67, line 9, insert: "Senate garage", \$7,000, to be derived by transfer from "Capitol power plant" by release of that amount withheld from obligation by the Architect of the Capitol pursuant to Section 311 of Public Law 95-391;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 180: Page 94, strike out lines 4 and 5.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike the matter stricken by said amend-

ment and insert "Pursuant to the requirements of 31 U.S.C. 638a(b), (e), the Smithsonian Institution is authorized to acquire two aircraft from Federal excess property;".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 181: Page 95, line 1, insert:

Sec. 303. The provisions of sections 491(c) and 491(d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, as amended (2 U.S.C. 88b-1), shall not apply to the pay of pages of the Senate and House of Representatives during the period when the Senate and/or the House of Representatives adjourns or recesses on or after the first of August for a period of at least thirty days but not more than forty-five days, such pay may continue until the end of such period of adjournment or recess.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the last amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 182: Page 95, line 10, insert:

Sec. 304. It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the case may be, shall borrow funds to comply with the provisions of section 201 of the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act, 1979, and that such funds shall be repaid from appropriations made for fiscal year 1980 for the programs assisted by the provisions of this section.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

Sec. 304. Section 201 of Public Law 95-480 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That if by the beginning of the fourth quarter, 75 percent of the reduction required by this section has not been achieved, the aggregate amount of budget authority under this act shall not be reduced by an amount in excess of \$301,500,000: *Provided further*, that if the reduction required by this section results in total budget authority insufficient to pay legal entitlements in the fourth quarter, the Department may borrow from succeeding year funds to pay such entitlements".

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the compromise worked out in conference which amendment No. 182 of section 304 of this bill represents. I feel that HEW has a large responsibility to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse in the bureaucracy. I do not feel, however, that the States should have to pay so heavy

a price for HEW's failure to act to reduce this waste.

As has been pointed out already, HEW let three-fourths of this fiscal year pass before it began to even act as though it had a responsibility to implement Congress mandate to reduce waste by \$1 billion. At this late date, HEW "discovered" that it still had \$831 million in reduced expenditures it was responsible for. In one quarter of the fiscal year then, the States would have to accept a massive reduction in Federal payments for AFDC and Medicaid.

This was clearly not fair. The compromise worked out by the conferees decreases the total amount of money which cannot be spent to \$301 million. Of this new total, \$169 million has already been saved. Thus the amount of reduced payments to States equals only \$132 million, not \$831 million, as had originally been feared.

It is my hope that despite this compromise, HEW, and the States, will know that Congress is very serious in its insistence that expenditures for AFDC and Medicaid be reduced through improved management of these programs. Congress is not backing off on its avowed goal.

I therefore urge acceptance of this compromise proposal. This compromise will relieve the States of an undue financial burden while at the same time it will maintain the congressional commitment to improved management of HEW programs.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

□ 1410

PRINTING OF SECRET SESSION OF PANAMA CANAL DEBATE

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the proceedings of the House and the secret session held on June 20, 1979, be printed in today's edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the revisions and deletions made in that transcript by Members who participated in that debate, and which are mutually agreeable to the chairmen of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

There was no objection.

SECRET SESSION OF THE HOUSE

The secret session of the House met at 12:38 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will take their seats. Officers and employees of the House designated to remain will come to the pages' desk and sign the oath of secrecy. That includes any committee staff designated by the chairman of the committee in writing who are to remain in the Chamber.

The Chair is going to recognize the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) for 1 hour, during which time the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) may yield to such others as he deems desirable.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, are motions in order during the 1 hour in the sense that motions are in order in the Committee of the Whole? Are any motions in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will respond to the gentleman that the House is in the House. This is not the Committee of the Whole House. The House is prepared to take such action as under the rules it might otherwise take.

Mr. BAUMAN. If the gentleman does not yield for any motions, however, then they would not be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the classification which is higher than top secret is the classification that goes to the sources of intelligence. There are many intelligence-collection mechanisms from electronic to personnel. Of course, to compromise personnel is very dangerous; to compromise the source is dangerous because we would then be denied that source.

When we had the confidential or closed session of the committee, there was no reporter present, and only members of the subcommittee. At that time I had asked General McAuliffe, who was the witness, not to disclose the source of his intelligence even at that session, and it was agreed upon amongst the members that the source would not be disclosed but that the information that General McAuliffe corroborated would be sufficient for the purposes of the committee.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) and I have an understanding that we will not disclose those sources because that in effect is the highest classification and why things are classified. If we permit people to know what the collection source is, I think then we are on some dangerous ground.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state her point of order.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the nature of this secret session is to receive material claimed to be secret or confidential. In order for us to determine such for the materials that we receive, it would seem to me to be in order to require the person presenting the material claimed to be secret or confidential to identify the material claimed to be secret or confidential when it is being presented for purposes ultimately for the House to make a decision as to whether in fact these are confidential or secret materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). The Chair would respond that the commentary of the gentleman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN) is not truly in the nature of a point of order and that a point of order will not lie in that regard.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. May I make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAUMAN. From whose time do the gentleman's inquiries come?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BAUMAN. I would like to be heard, and then I am sure there will be many questions to be asked at that point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman decline to yield for a further parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BAUMAN. I do decline at this point for further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) has been recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked for this session is so that the House can intelligently vote on the amendments that might be offered during the debate today and to permit us to judge whether or not our final vote should be for or against this legislation. I have in the past said in general debate on this floor that I feel implementing legislation is necessary, that on October 1 we must have some legislation in place in order to carry out the terms of the treaties in a manner that will be acceptable to the Congress and to the American public and to protect our interests. So I want to again state what I said in the full House.

It is not my intention to bring this information forth or to ask for this session in any way to try to damage the chance of the eventual passage of legislation.

There are two questions that I would like to present to the House. The first one has to do with whether or not there has been a violation of the permanent neutrality treaty that was signed with the Panamanian Government. Let me just read to the Members briefly article II of that treaty:

The Republic of Panama declares the neutrality of the Canal in order that both in time of peace and in time of war it shall remain secure and open to peaceful transit by the vessels of all nations on terms of entire equality, so that there will be no discrimination against any nation, or its citizens or subjects, concerning the conditions or charges of transit, or for any other reason, and so that the Canal, and therefore the Isthmus of Panama, shall not be the target of reprisals in any armed conflict between other nations of the world.

The second point that I want to raise with the Members—and the reason I raise these two at the beginning is so that we can make intelligent judgments—is that we will be voting on amendments later in the day that deal with portions of the bill regarding the neutrality of the canal. For instance,

Mr. BOWEN. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) pointed out, to sit through the top-secret hearings provided to several of us by General McAuliffe. My personal reaction was that I heard very little in that hearing with which I was not al-

ready familiar, which I had not read in newspapers and which had not already been presented in open hearings. I talked with General McAuliffe on the telephone this morning when I learned that this secret session was to be held, and from Panama he reinforced the reactions and recollections which I had from that hearing.

I would like simply to go over a few of the points which I recall that he made to us in that hearing for the Members—and I am sure that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) and others may want to take the opportunity to comment as well, since we did not take notes, and there were not recordings in that meeting room. As I recall, General McAuliffe pointed out to us that certainly there had been some degree of Panamanian Government assistance in several areas regarding the troubles in Nicaragua. First of all, of course, the brigade which was organized of Panamanians was given the time, space, and facilities to organize, to train before they went into Nicaragua. I do not think that that surprised anybody very much. He indicated that there probably had been some weapons which had gone from the Guardia Nacional de Panama into Nicaragua. And there again I do not think that was particularly surprising. He indicated also that there had been some R. & R. facilities provided for some of the Panamanians, and possibly for some of the Nicaraguans who had been fighting with the Sandinista, to come into Panama and to regroup, rest, and then go back into combat.

He indicated that insofar as the issue of aircraft was concerned, an Ilusyn 62 [deleted]

which was in the Cuban Airlines, known as Air Cubana—that plane which was flown into Tocumt airport [deleted] and which apparently flew on to Nicaragua—that information came to him secondhand. He said he could not confirm that there were any Sandinistas or any Cubans on that aircraft. One might presume, he said, that they might contain such personnel, but he did not know that.

Of course, he described the Florida gun transaction, which I am sure others will want to talk about. He simply indicated that in other instances weapons may have flown through Panama.

I found personally very little in these revelations which was in any way different from what I had seen or read in the press. There just was nothing very surprising to me. It was the same sort of thing that Costa Rica is doing and to a similar extent Venezuela. [Deleted]

I want to point out to my colleagues that I regret very deeply that this activity has taken place. I have taken the well of this House on occasion when my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) has had special orders in defense of the government of President Somoza, and I have spoken out on behalf of the Government of Nicaragua and have been extremely critical of the Sandinista. So I regret very

deeply that these activities are taking place and that several Latin American nations have seen fit to intervene in the affairs of Nicaragua.

At the same time I would like to point out to the Members that I feel that these events are totally irrelevant to the matter which is being discussed in the House of Representatives today. It is my feeling that if we are disturbed by the fact that there may have been, and probably was, some Panamanian involvement in support of the Sandinista forces in Nicaragua, then that is all the more reason for us to want to support the legislation which we will be considering today. I feel that the last thing in the world we would want to do, if we are upset about possible Panamanian involvement, is to pack up our bags, give the canal to Panama, and come home.

I think what we need to do is to stay down there for the next 20 years. We need to continue the presence of our 10,000 military personnel and we need to keep our 4,000 civilians there. We need to continue to run the canal and continue to insure its neutrality for the remainder of this century, as the treaties spell out.

On the other hand, if we fail to pass this legislation, or if we amend it in a manner which would lead to violations of the treaty, then quite certainly the United States would have the option only of leaving Panama. So I feel regarding the troubles we are discussing here that I am perfectly prepared to accept the allegations that have been made.

I do not disagree with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) or others who argue that there has been Panamanian involvement. In fact, I feel that is the strongest possible argument for support of this legislation, which is to assure that we will stay in Panama, so that later this year we will not see the canal transferred to Panama and American forces withdrawn. I happen to believe we can exert a great deal more influence over the course of events in Central America if we stay there for the remainder of the century.

Regarding one further matter that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) mentioned, and that was the Neutrality Treaty, I would draw to the attention of the Members article II, if they happen to have copies of the treaties with them—and we will try to provide them if they do not. Article II of the Neutrality Treaty refers to the fact that:

The Republic of Panama declares the neutrality of the Canal in order that both in time of peace and in time of war it shall remain secure . . . so that the Canal, and therefore the Isthmus of Panama, shall not be the target of reprisals in any armed conflict. . . .

I am sure the gentleman fully realizes that Panama cannot have violated this section. It is not yet in force. This treaty will not come into force until the first day of October. Both those treaties will come into force at that time. As a consequence, Panama could not have violated them at this point. After October 1 the language here refers to the fact that Panama and the United States undertake to

insure the neutrality of the canal so that it will not be a target of attack. It does not say that we shall have our foreign policy paralyzed or Panama shall have its foreign policy paralyzed for fear someone might drop a bomb there. Panama might say the United States should not enter into any kind of confrontation with the Soviet Union in Europe or any other place for fear they might bomb the canal. They could say Panama should not support our position on Puerto Rico, which they do, for fear Puerto Rican nationalists might bomb the canal. Or we could say that Panama could say we should not support Israel in the United Nations for fear the PLO might sabotage the canal.

I think the language found right here in the treaty indicates that the neutrality of the canal shall be of such neutrality so that the canal will not be the target of attack. It does not attempt to dictate the foreign policy of Panama or the United States.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry before speaking?

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to direct a question to all three, the gentleman in the well (Mr. BONIOR), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY). Is there anything in any area that is to be brought out in this so-called secret hearing that has not been already addressed? Do the gentlemen have some new areas they want to address, because what we have heard up to this point has not been secret at all. Every one of us knows about it. Is there additional secret material we are going to hear?

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I will yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of New York. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL) is not making a parliamentary inquiry. I have yielded 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. It might not be a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, while I was not present at the briefing on this issue that was privy to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. BOWEN) and others, I have talked to General McAuliffe on many occasions. I was present at his public testimony and have followed this issue with deep interest as a member of the subcommittee dealing with this issue. I have talked to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. BOWEN), with whom I have worked on this piece of legislation, concerning the testimony of General McAuliffe.

There were some comments made by

the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) that [deleted].

Torrijos has been attacked vehemently by the other side in terms of being sympathetic to the Cubans and Soviets; yet we have before us one of the most vociferous opponents of the treaty, Lieutenant General Sumners, retired, who testified to our committee that in discussions with General Torrijos, Torrijos told him that neither black nor Red was right. What he meant by that is that neither the Cubans nor the Soviets are right, nor are the Americans right in terms of the future destiny of Panama, that they want to lead their own destiny. I believe in that firmly.

I think if we look specifically at the makeup of the Panamanian Government, we will find that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) has indicated there are as many conservatives and as many moderates as there are as many people on the left in key positions of the government. It is equally divided. It is not one-sided.

Let me move just quickly, if I can, to the assertion that was laid before the House that somehow the actions are in violation of the neutrality treaty, and I think my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, addressed this quite well.

The argument being made is that this provision prohibits Panama from adopting policies or taking actions which could result in reprisals being taken against the canal. The proponents of this argument assert that by taking sides in the Nicaraguan conflicts, Panama has created a risk that the Nicaraguan Government would take military action against Panama in reprisal. They go on to speculate that if Nicaragua were to take reprisals against Panama, it might well attack or sabotage the canal, since the canal is one of Panama's principal economic assets.

One response made quite well by the gentleman from Mississippi, (Mr. BOWEN) is that, indeed, the treaties are not in effect. But let us look at it as though the treaties were in effect.

It states that Panama declares the canal to be neutral in order that it will remain open to ships of all nations in time of peace and war without discrimination "so that the canal * * * shall not be the target of reprisals. * * *"

To me, the clear meaning of this language is that the canal is to be operated in such a fashion that no nation will be excluded from using it and that therefore no nation will have occasion to take reprisals against the canal by reason of having been excluded from it. Under this reading—which comports with the plain meaning of the treaty text—the phrase about avoiding reprisals is merely an explanatory clause indicating why the parties decided to provide for nondiscriminatory access to the canal.

Let us look at the implications of the

interpretation being advanced by those Members who are grasping for a way to kill the treaties at this late date. They are saying in effect that the treaty imposes an obligation on Panama to avoid any action that might conceivably cause someone to sabotage the canal as a means of getting back at Panama.

If this reading were correct, I would assume that the gentlemen arguing for it would insist that Panama stop its consistent practice of voting in favor of Israel in the U.N. Certainly unneutral activities of this nature threaten reprisals by the PLO. I would assume they would also insist that Panama drop its support for the U.S. position on Puerto Rico, since that position raises the specter of reprisals by the Puerto Rican independence factions and their Cuban Communist supporters.

I would also note that the implications of the proposed interpretation would not affect only Panama. The United States is also charged under the treaty with maintaining the regime of neutrality established in the treaty. Therefore, if avoiding any policy that might lead to reprisals is part of the concept of neutrality, the United States would be obligated to alter its policies significantly.

Are we willing to have Panama insist that we are obligated to ratify the SALT Treaty without amendment to reduce the risk of a war with the Soviet Union?

It seems clear to me that the neutrality treaty was not intended to govern all foreign policy of Panama and the United States. So I think the response to the gentleman from Maryland's (Mr. BAUMAN) argument that it is a violation is that he reads it too closely and that, indeed, it is not a violation. I hope that the Members will keep that in mind as we continue the debate on this issue.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to know that some Members were aware of the content of the briefings we had. I fully expect that some Members would not be as concerned about the information we received as others, but I would think, and I still believe, that the House had a right to know precisely what we were told.

The Members have to understand that the President of the United States, at a dinner that many of us attended only last week, essentially denied that there was any Panamanian involvement in Nicaragua and then dismissed it by saying—I think I recall his remarks—that even if there were, it was a minor matter. We have proven in our hearings and in our private briefings that there has been a systematic policy by the Panamanian Government of engaging in illegal actions, several of which have been the subject of this indictment in Miami. The President of Panama, Mr. Royo, has denied there was any implication; yet we have been told that [deleted]

there was in fact, and that General Torrijos on two occasions in recent months told General Sumner that it is his intention to continue this kind of activity in Central America.

[Paragraphs deleted.]

Now that may or may not be relevant. We will work our will on all kinds of amendments today, many of which will go to the issue of the trust that we place in the other partner to the treaties. It seems to me that this information will have an important impact on the judgments we make on this legislation. I felt, since the House had not had the same access to the information the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. HUBBARD) and I and others had that the Members ought to know that the Panamanian Government officials are lying, that the administration is downgrading their illegal activities, that they have violated the longstanding OAS Charter, and that they have done things which could in the future jeopardize our operation of the canal which, of course, is the central goal in this legislation, to preserve that activity.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman on June 11, along with his colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. HUBBARD), sent out a "Dear Colleague" letter that contained much of this information, which I have read over. What I have heard here, to try to distinguish between what has been said here so far and what is in this "Dear Colleague" letter that went to every Member, I suppose, are the admissions by General Torrijos to General McAuliffe, the two admissions [deleted].

Mr. BAUMAN. I am pleased to know the gentleman has read the letter, because the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. HUBBARD) and I have gone to great detail listing in that letter evidence in the 2 days of hearings. What happened in the private briefing with General McAuliffe is that he confirmed all of our findings that he knew [deleted]. We have to understand the Panamanian Government denied all of this at the hearings.

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes, but the thing is now we have verification. We do have the Dear Colleague letter.

Mr. BAUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. Does the gentleman

also believe that the American people should know that Torrijos is doing what he is doing?

Mr. BAUMAN. Of course.

Mr. VOLKMER. Does the gentleman see anything wrong with the American people knowing that?

Mr. BAUMAN. I have unfortunately been placed, as we all have, under the restrictions of our information-classification system, and I was not able to say on the floor of the House what I will say in this session today.

Mr. VOLKMER. I agree on that.

Mr. BAUMAN. I think they should know that, but I cannot, having taken an oath of this office as we all have, reveal this publicly.

Mr. VOLKMER. I am not saying that. I am going back to where we are. Then General McAuliffe is the one who said it is top secret or confidential, is that correct?

Mr. BAUMAN. Yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. I think it would be up to each of us to decide, then.

Mr. BAUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN).

Ms. HOLTZMAN. I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, for yielding.

I would simply like to ask any of the persons who have spoken whether the substance of the material that has been presented here is in any way classified.

Mr. BAUMAN. I will say in response to the gentleman it is.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. The gentleman said that the session was classified as top secret. Was the substance?

Mr. BAUMAN. Yes, the substance was taken from classified documents which General McAuliffe had in his possession during our briefing.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Everything the gentleman said has been classified?

Mr. BAUMAN. As I understand it, that is correct.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. The material with respect to the trial taking place, the allegations in the trial are classified?

Mr. BAUMAN. Allegations in the case may involve the use of information which is now classified. The indictment is public.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. I see.

Mr. BAUMAN. The fact that some of the facts in the affidavit were confirmed in our classified briefing was not, of course, publicly known.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Was the meeting with the coconspirator also classified?

Mr. BAUMAN. That is not classified, but he has been offered immunity and subpoenaed to testify. I am not sure whether that will be in executive session or not. That is for the committee to determine.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Now that the gentleman has retracted his general statement in two respects, does he still say everything else is classified?

Mr. BAUMAN. I have not retracted any statement, I will say to the gentleman, and I will ask her to allow me to speak for myself.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi whether

he understands that any of this material is classified?

Mr. BOWEN. I would have to say that some of the observations made by General McAuliffe were classified. I would say further, though, that I do not recall his saying anything that I had not already read in newspapers or that there had not been speculation on. However, I would not be in a position at all to make a determination, a personal judgment that it should be declassified. I attended that meeting under personal obligation not to reveal it, although I would be less than frank if I did not tell the gentleman that I heard absolutely nothing in the meeting which I had not heard before and which had not been presumed to be true.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. So the gentleman has answered that the materials have already appeared in public records?

Mr. BOWEN. Not with actual factual certainty. The press has speculated on this and people have generally presumed they were true. General McAuliffe simply indicated that some of them were true.

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CARNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the words of my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, should be echoed again. Speculation of what has been said here has been all around and has been in newsprint. The confirmation from General McAuliffe was given to us at a closed session, and he asked us, because it was of a confidential nature and of a top-secret nature, not to reveal it.

I think what we are attempting to do is to convince the Members of this body that in fact what has been in the paper is real. If General McAuliffe tells us not to repeat that, we have to take this step. If the newspapers speculate, then that is not confidential, but when General McAuliffe says it is confidential, then I think we have taken the right step in holding this secret meeting.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, when it was requested of the Speaker and the leadership that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) should have the opportunity to present information to the Members of the House in a confidential session, it was decided and agreed that he should be given that privilege, notwithstanding the lack of precedents in recent time. I should not want any Member to be in the position of having had any information denied to him or her. I think Members are entitled to have any information that bears directly or indirectly upon legislation we are expected to vote on.

Really, what have we learned today? What we have learned is perhaps classified under the classification of certain individuals in the executive branch of Government, and yet it really is not anything secret. It is information that I had been told on many occasions previously both by our military people and by people I know in Panama.

I do not think it has been any secret

that General Torrijos during his leadership of Panama sympathized with the Sandinistas and had a vendetta against President Somoza. He made no secret of that.

[Deleted.]

I do not know President Royo. I know his predecessor in title, a man named Demetrio Lakas, who was the titular president during the time when General Torrijos actually was the head of state or the head of government. Jimmy Lakas is a man who loves this country. I assure the Members that he is not a Communist, not influenced by Communist ideology. He attended a college and a university, Texas Wesleyan at Fort Worth, my home community, and Texas Tech in Lubbock. He loves this country deeply.

[Deleted.]

I do not sympathize with the Sandinistas. I do not sympathize with them at all. But I do not think there is anything in this treaty which confers upon us the right or the power to require or force Panama to abide by our foreign policy, whatever it may be. And if there were, it would not be right; it would not be the kind of treaty we would impose upon any friend.

The basic question which the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) places before us in his words is, Do we have a reliable partner? Do we have a reliable partner in Panama? That is the reason he says he brought this to our attention.

Let us assume that we do not have a wholly compliant partner. Let us assume that we do not have a subservient partner. I do not think there is anything in the treaty that requires we shall have, and I do not think anything has been presented here today to indicate that we have anything less than a cooperative partner and one who is willing to carry out its part of the treaties that have been signed and agreed to and have become the law of the land.

Now the question comes, Do they have a reliable partner? Do our friends in Latin America have in us a reliable partner? Do they have a partner who will keep its word?

Many years ago—I guess the first time I went to Panama—I met a grizzled, old hand who said to me, almost with tears in his eyes, that when he was a young man working there in the Canal Zone there was a phrase which could be used to seal a bargain. The phrase was la palabra inglesa—the word of an Englishman—the Englishman's word. And if you said to a Latin American, "Si, la palabra inglesa," you were saying, "on my word as a man, as an American." He said for many years that sealed the bargain. There was not any question.

It is as Sam Rayburn said one day when a Member questioned the right of

another Member to have his vote recorded, asking whether that Member had been in the House when his name was called. Back in those days the names were called and verbal responses recorded. Mr. Rayburn banged the gavel, and I thought his face would turn tomato red when he exclaimed, "Why, the Chair always takes the word of a Member."

The word of an American, an American's word, la palabra inglesa. The old man sighed, "Now when you say to them, 'la palabra inglesa,' they laugh at you."

If respect for the United States is to be maintained at all, then respect for la palabra inglesa has got to be restored—the word of the United States—and we have given our word. I happen to believe, and I may be in the minority in this body, that the treaties were fair. I do not think the way we were treating those people was right. We were treating them like second-class citizens. We were treating them in a way we would not put up with if the situation had been reversed.

Let us assume that the French had retained a broad swath of territory on either side of the Mississippi River, right across our country, and that in order to cross from one part of our country to another we had to get permission from France. Would we have put up with that? And in order to gain admission to that territory we would be frisked by the French military guards. And if we committed any violation, a traffic infraction for example, while crossing that territory into another part of our own country, we would be tried before the French military courts, in the French language. No American would be permitted to engage in any business enterprise in that area, while the French preached free enterprise, and any American employed in that zone would be paid about one-third what a Frenchman would be paid to perform the same work in that zone, within our Nation. We would have been outraged. Yet, my friends, every one of those is a condition, unbeknownst to most Americans, that we in derogation of everything we believe as a people have been foisting upon the uncomplaining people of Panama.

The time came when they were not uncomplaining any more. Winds of change are sweeping through Latin America.

Yes, many of those countries sympathize with the Sandinistas. I wish they did not, but they do, and they will do more so if we give to them the impression that we are looking for a way to waltz on our word, that they cannot trust the United States, that its word, formally, solemnly, sacredly given in a treaty which is the law of our land, is not going to be observed. That message allowed to go throughout Latin America would sweep like prairie fire.

To reject this implementing legislation would not be in our national interests. It would not permit us to have any say in how that canal is run for these next 20 years. It would deny us the mechanism by which to create this governing board on which we will have five of the nine representatives. It would deny us the

means to maintain sufficient military strength to defend the canal, as guaranteed by the treaty.

Mr. Speaker, what we have heard here today may be relevant. I do not think it relevant to the central issue. The central issue is, Are we in the United States going to exercise a benign and inspiring influence in Latin America by standing for what we profess to believe and practicing what we preach, or are we going to give the impression that this country has given too often? We know what the Indians said about the white man's word. As we successively abrogated our treaties and solemn agreements with the American Indians we were said to speak with forked tongues. Just because we are big enough, cramming it down their throats does not make it right.

We agreed. Now let us keep our agreement. The only way we can protect that canal and protect those 400,000 barrels of oil that come through there every day to the United States from Alaska is to keep our word. The way we keep our word is not to abrogate the treaty. I know a lot of you are unhappy about the treaty. I am not, but I grant you the right to be. But, for heaven's sake, whatever you think of the treaty, do not do that which will prejudice the rights and the best interests of the United States and blacken our name throughout that great sweep of the continent where live our best customers and our best friends and our closest neighbors, and the most rapidly growing populations in the world. Do not break our nation's word with them. For if we do—if we do—we will live to regret it.

So in fairness to our friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN), I am glad we gave him this opportunity, and I am glad that we have listened. I honestly believe, though, that we have a responsibility. Maybe it is not going to be popular back home if enough folks there do not understand it. I wish every action we took could be fully understood by every citizen of this land. But we know that is not always so.

We took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, not the way we wish it were, but the way it is. Maybe we wish that the House of Representatives had the right to ratify treaties, but it does not. We took an oath to uphold that Constitution and the laws of this country and one of those laws is the Panama Canal Treaty. I have every confidence that we are going to be responsible and look to the future and do the right thing today and prove that we are a nation that keeps its word and a reliable partner for our friends in Latin America.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), as usual, has comported himself admirably with his eloquence. His speech perhaps should be repeated later today so that the public can hear that plea in behalf of the legislation.

Of course, all of us will have to judge whether we should vote for it or against

it. But what is the central question that the information that we have raises? We have a duty under the Constitution—and I do not think the gentleman would disagree with it—to act on this treaty implementing legislation. The Supreme Court has made that clear. We have a right to refuse to implement it; we have a right to refuse to finance it or finance it partially, or place restrictions on the treaties not inconsistent with terms of the treaties.

I felt strongly, and I still feel strongly, that when we have a partner in this arrangement, despite all of the eloquence of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), that is publicly lying about its role in these activities, that is in fact engaged in activities inconsistent with international law, be it our own laws, and several [deleted]

Panamanians have been indicted now by our Department of Justice, we should be aware of these facts when we go to writing the implementing legislation, and that is the reason for asking for this session today. I suggest to the Members also that this treaty, once implemented on October 1, will make available to the Government of Panama approximately \$75 million or \$80 million annually, and we have been told here today [deleted] that General Torrijos has made clear his intention to continue his activities in Latin America in which he is now engaged, and that is overthrowing Somoza's government, and when we are going to make available to him vast amounts of money under the treaties, I think we should know those facts before we proceed to vote on these amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concurrence of the Speaker and the majority leader in this secret session. I am pleased that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) asked for it. I think we have learned some things that we needed to know. I understand, and I can understand, that there are some people who do not think they have learned anything. I suggest that they have. It is not anything that is news if I say thus and so happened in Panama, or that the Panamanian Government believes this or believes that, but if the Commanding General of the American forces in that part of the world says he believes this or believes that, that is news, and that is confidential, and that is classified. We heard that today. I do not think after this session there should be any Member who has any doubt about the possibility, in fact, the probability that the present Government of Panama has been involved in trying to overthrow the regime of the neighboring country. I do not think there is anybody who feels that there is any doubt about the present Government of Panama having actually been a part of a conspiracy, if you will, to bring arms to rebels involved in the overthrow of what is a friendly government.

That being the situation, what is the relevance to this particular discussion? I think the relevance is, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) has said,

"Will we have a reliable partner to this treaty?"

A treaty is a contract, and it is a long-term contract, and it is only as good as the members who are the parties to that treaty make it. For the next 20 years until the year 2000 we will be in partnership with Panama. After that time Panama will be, for all intents and purposes, as far as we know, almost the sole arbiter of everything having to do with that Canal, other than the defense of it, and even that, as far as our ability to defend it, will be somewhat precluded after that particular date.

So is it important? Is it important for us to send a message to the present Government of Panama that, No. 1, we understand what they are doing, and, No. 2, we do not approve of it, and, No. 3, under the words in that treaty—which I think are in effect now, and certainly if they are not in effect, will be in effect after October 1—concerning fitting around, if you will, flitting around the country, around the world, becoming involved in the affairs of other nations, that we regard such activities as being a violation of the treaty, and we regard them as being dangerous to the welfare of that canal. I do not think there is anybody who deprecates or downgrades the importance of that canal to not only the United States, but to the whole hemisphere, the whole world. It is absolutely important that the canal be defended and that we leave no stone unturned to make sure that it will be defended. In order to do this, we need a reliable partner. So what we are doing here today—and, believe me, since we have not done this sort of thing since 1830—the mere fact that we went into secret session will be a sufficient shock to send a message, and I think that the shock which I assume and trust will be received in Panama will be that we do not like it. We expect them to live up to the world which they gave when they signed that treaty. We expect the foundation, the cornerstone of their foreign policy, to be to make sure that there is no danger to that canal.

It has been said, Well, we are not going to base our foreign policy on whether or not the canal is safe. I think that is like comparing horses and rabbits. After all, the canal is not in the United States; it is in Panama. An attack on the United States will not be an attack on the canal, but an attack on Panama will be an attack on the canal, and it is entirely different. In other words, the future of the foreign policy of Panama is something that we have always been worried about and we always will be worried about as long as we have an interest in the operation of this canal. So I think that this has been very healthy and that the time we have spent has been worthwhile. I trust that the Members of this House will, as the day passes, consider the amendments which will be offered in the light of the knowledge which they have gained.

I do not mind telling the Members that when this is all over, I, undoubtedly, will vote for the bill.

I agree with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) that it is important that

we go ahead and pass this bill. I do not agree that I am in favor of a treaty. If I had been a Member of the Senate, I would not have voted for the treaty. I would not have voted for it for lots of reasons, and one of them is the fact that we do have a nation off the flanks of Panama named Cuba which has shown itself very willing and very able to transport troops for the purpose of propagating the Communist ideology.

I am worried. I understand the evidence is not clear as to whether or not Panama actually participated in the transportation of Cuban troops, but I am worried for fear that they might someday, and I think it is absolutely important that this Government go on record right now as being absolutely opposed to any participation by the Government of Panama in the propagation of rebellion, and particularly Communist rebellion, in that part of the world.

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN). I think it has been a useful, if not a blockbuster, session. I also commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY). I trust some of the Members should keep in mind that he was a classmate—in fact, I think a roommate of "Sam" Somoza at West Point—and I think he has suffered personally greatly through this period as he recognized what some people in our Government have done to try to hurt that lot, and it will go down as one of the black marks in the history of United States diplomacy when the full story of what is going on in Nicaragua is told.

I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) for what, in the 20 years I have served here with him, was his most eloquent address and speech. As a partisan Republican, I am pleased he is not always that effective when he addresses the House.

But having just said these pretty nice things, let me just point out the guts of the issue before us. We have had this session to provide information which will supposedly influence our judgment and permit us to vote properly when we are back in the House and when we are voting on amendments and final passage of the bill. The bill that we will have before us later is directed at two things: First, to guarantee that the canal will continue to function, and when the canal functions, it is the United States that benefits because it is our cargo, our commerce, our ships, our traffic to and from the east coast and the west and so on.

There are provisions in the bill by which we provide the necessary support, retirement benefits, and so on, to the Americans, the skilled employees who run that canal. I am sure the Members are going to want to support that phase of the bill and vote against amendments that would in any way affect that.

The second point is the defense of the canal. Again, I am sure you will not be supporting amendments that will legally or otherwise make it difficult for us to defend the canal.

The one other point that has come up is this thing about the reliability of the Government of Panama. The Panamanian Government is never going to look very reliable. Panama is a typical Latin American country, which means that basically it is going to have if not an absolute dictator, a benevolent oligarchy running the country. But a democracy it may never have been, a democracy it may never be, but it is the government we are going to work with for the next 20 years.

The currency of Panama is the dollar. They have a greater investment in the canal than we have. If that canal does not function, Panama collapses immediately. That is going to force them to be reliable.

I would suggest, in just summing up my thoughts this morning, that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) has performed a great service by holding this session which should clear up a lot of doubts. Frankly, I was expecting a lot more information, a lot more information in comparison, a lot more information that would be embarrassing, to listen to the Carter administration and the Government of Panama. The absence of further embarrassing information leads me to believe that my contention is correct that we have got to deal with the realities of this less-than-perfect government in Panama. We have to deal with the reality that our operation of the canal for the next 20 years is the only practical course of action for this Congress to sanction, and that we are not going to take any step that will in any way violate the treaty provisions so that we can continue to maintain our proper, legal position as the defense changes in the next 20 years.

We are going to hear a lot of rhetoric; we are going to have a lot of amendments. But just remember, the Senate has spoken. We are here in the House to pass a solid piece of legislation to protect American interests, and the American interests are protected by the Murphy bill. When we get back to our normal procedure, I urge the Members to keep all of these thoughts in mind, keep this information in mind. But nothing I have heard this afternoon in any way touches upon the validity of our legislative procedure.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself so much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, intelligence is evaluated information and, of course, it is classified into various classifications based on its sensitivity and its effect on operations or on policy. Let me read for the record just why the committee went into an executive session with the executive branch during questioning by the chief counsel of the committee when General McAuliffe was the witness. The chief counsel said:

Could you indicate what the level of classification would be for that type of material?

At the time we were talking about Cuban involvement in the gunrunning in the Americas. General McAuliffe responded, and I quote:

I think the kind I am referring to is what I would call compartmentalized intelligence.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no objection to making the proceedings public in their entirety. My own feeling is that I was restricted by the Rules of the House to discussing this in this manner because the information was classified. But I think the American peo-

ple have the right to know these facts. If I had not been prohibited under the rules from bringing them out, I would have brought them out in debate, but I was restricted. I would make such a motion that the proceedings of these debates today be made public immediately.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BAUMAN

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BAUMAN moves that the proceedings of this Secret Session be made public.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) is recognized for 1 hour. The motion is debatable within narrow limits.

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TREEN).

Mr. TREEN. The motion is, as I understand it—correct me if I am wrong—to make public everything that has been said here during the session, is that correct? I think we would cause very grave harm in our international affairs, because one of the remarks made here was a statement of opinion by an American general that [deleted].

I suggest to the Members that that would do grave damage to us to have that sort of thing revealed. I doubt very much that General McAuliffe would have said that if he had felt that his words would be revealed, and I think that would prejudice the entire proceedings on this legislation today. So, for that very reason, I would urge caution about adopting the pending motion.

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BADHAM).

Mr. BADHAM. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding to me. I would like to commend the gentleman very highly for the exercise which he has caused the House to participate in today. That in my view is simply this, that the gentleman, as is so often the case, was precluded from bringing unclassified information to the American people by a device oft used by the administration, and that is, "I will answer you, but I will only answer you in closed session."

Now we have a situation whereby an action of the House, if agreed to in the gentleman's motion, will allow the American people to know truly what the case is in Panama, and I think that is a splendid thing that we are doing. So I commend the gentleman for his motion. I support the gentleman's motion because this will now allow not only the Congress but the American people to know what the situation is in Panama. For any Member of this House to vote against such a motion would be a vote to gag the Congress and a vote which would gag the American people, and I do not think they want that.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I would like to address a question to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

The gentleman from Maryland's motion is to make public all of the debate

here in this secret session. I would ask the gentleman if he would accept an amendment that would except from his motion the corroboration by General Sumner of his personal conversation with Torrijos and reference to it, as well as his corroboration of General Sumners' testimony, as well as the references to someone who is presently under indictment, who has already had threats made on his life and is a defector from Panama? Those deletions I think should be made for the obvious reasons.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield for amendment. I yield for debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Does the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) yield additional time?

Mr. BAUMAN. I will yield additional time to myself at this point.

I would say that it would not be my intention to accept amendments to the pending motion. If the House has heard this information before—and we have heard a number of Members say that they feel this session has not produced anything they have not heard before; some of us feel it is—I think the American people ought to know that.

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

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

Mr. BADHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will not use the whole time, but I do want to add this point. If the Members on the other side of the aisle are convinced that everything we have discussed in the proceedings this morning has been in the newspapers and has been all over the media, then there is no reason why they should disagree to opening the transcript of this record to the public so that the American people might truly know what is going on in Panama and in here.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. For purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. FENWICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think this is a form of madness. Yes, we would be revealing something to the American people, and what would we be revealing? That we have no sense of honor? That they cannot tell us anything in secret that we are not going to tell the next day? I cannot understand my colleagues taking this point of view. Are we going to be reliable partners in the business of running this country, or are we just going to take everything in secret, when a general comes before us in good faith, and spill it all out the next day because we want to look good in the newspapers? There is a difference between what is said in the newspapers as rumor and what is said on the floor of the House as coming from an official general in our Army in charge of Central America.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. For purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the Speaker.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, we could

very well be setting a precedent here today. When was it—1830—the last time that the House went into a secret session like this? I have seen rules of this House not used for many, many years, and suddenly some bright young luminary discovers one, and it becomes a common practice. I do not say that in criticism. I respect the ability of the gentleman. But it becomes a common practice.

There are those of us who would like to reveal everything that was said or everything that is known about the Panamanian Government. Probably it should be done that way, but how do we receive that information? We receive that information by every type of intelligence means that we have. Interestingly, when we disclose our sources, what happens? Once it is revealed that we have an intelligence source in a country, what do the other countries do? They immediately change their procedures and it takes us days and weeks and sometimes months to again have the intelligence we need.

We are in a very, very sensitive position. Most of this conversation today on this debate was extremely interesting. I would not say it was classified. Certainly the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT's beautiful speech was not classified. But I do think that we ought to table this matter, send it to the Committee on Intelligence, let them look it over, and let the proper authorities from downtown look over what was classified. Let them strike or delete what is classified. Then let us report to this body, and let us again, if necessary in secret session go in and accept it and reveal to the American public that which we know does not hurt the U.S. Government or hurt the individual who may have said it on the floor. I think we are doing something in fairness to our own Government.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with the Speaker. In thinking back over the debate of the last hour, I can think of several things that were said and quotations that were made that could be embarrassing and possibly be deleterious to the relationships of our country with other countries and certainly might be harmful to a very dedicated member of the Armed Forces, General McAuliffe. It would be my hope that a committee of the House, the Intelligence Committee if the Speaker so says, would look at the transcript and expunge whatever matters might be that sensitive or classified, and then at the appropriate time a motion be made for the remainder of the debate to be published and made public to the American people.

Mr. O'NEILL. I thank the gentleman.

The document would be ready in print for the Members of the House, for the committee for their evaluation, for the evaluation of the members of the committee. I think we could very well protect everybody. If there are things that have to be deleted, they would be deleted, and then bring it back to the House and,

if necessary, have a secret session, or if not necessary, if they want to debate something that was stricken from the record, we could go into secret session. If they do not want to go into secret session at that time, we could release it on the floor of the House.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. I thank the Speaker for yielding.

I would like to express the concern expressed by the Speaker and by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES). We are going into uncharted waters. I voted against having the Secret Session. I think it has been productive, and my vote in that sense I think was an ill-advised one. I see no real harm to be done to give us a chance to pause. We have not really done this in the life span of any of us. I would be highly prone to join with my colleagues and dear personal friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN), if we are dissatisfied in that that which is cleared, if you will, does violence to the tone and the flavor and the sense of this important discussion; but I think it useful when we launch into a new area, particularly one of this potentially sensitive nature by precedent as well as perhaps in the individual case, that we go a little slower and kind of make a collective assumption honorably in the national interests and in the interests of this institution, and I strongly lean toward heeding the admonition of our distinguished Speaker and the minority leader. If we override that judgment, it is an irreversible error; if we go along with it, it will give us time to redress it if we find going along with it is in error.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Chair will take cognizance of the fact that when the gentleman's time has expired at the end of the hour, or when he yields his time, I would move to table this motion and would hope to be recognized for that motion.

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD).

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to sincerely commend our distinguished Speaker for his incisive concern and his reasoning in this matter. I think one thing that we passed over too lightly is this: We compare, and we say that we have this information from public sources, the speculation of people who have delved into this on their own without any responsible notion of where they are going to go, but all of the sources that were available to General McAuliffe were confidential sources of the nature of which the distinguished Speaker described. So he was speaking from truly classified material, and I think we should really consider that in agreeing to the motion that the Speaker has made or will make.

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, if I may address a question to the Speaker, to whom do we delegate this authority—

to the Intelligence Committee, or what was the gentleman's suggestion?

Mr. O'NEILL. I would suggest, if the gentleman will yield, that the matter be looked over by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries who has had jurisdiction over this legislation, and the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Those would be the two committees of jurisdiction?

Mr. O'NEILL. The Members, of course, would make an evaluation, but their evaluation, I should think, would be to the Committee on Intelligence, and we should get a report. It would be my opinion that it would go to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and they would refer it to the Intelligence Committee. I see no great problem to that whatsoever.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Then they would report back to the House?

Mr. O'NEILL. They would report back to the House, and at that time each Member would get a report of what was deleted, and if we have to go into a session of this type to debate whether information should be revealed or not I think would be a very simple matter.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the Speaker.

I have another question. Is the information that the country of Panama has basically been found lacking in truthfulness confidential? Does somebody want to comment on that? Is that confidential? I would like to ask the committee. Was the information that the committee received that Panama is greatly lacking in truthfulness confidential, or can we talk about that?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. If the gentleman will yield, I think that that certainly is a question open to judgment as far as the statements made by that Government.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am just wondering if we are in trouble if we talk about that too much.

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN), for purposes of debate only.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, at this moment I do not know how I will vote on this motion, and I would hope that we will not now begin to rush this process to vote too quickly until we have had a chance to deliberate on everything that has taken place today and the total effect of this motion.

In my office yesterday I received a classified briefing on the world's strategic implications on energy. The name of the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK) came up, and words were used like "catastrophic," "disaster," "we have had it," and, "our society is undone." This is by naval officers. They talked of only a 25-percent embargo by OPEC throwing this country into an immediate depression that certainly should require a secret session.

If we take a wrong move today and discredit what has happened here, the press with a pack of bloodhounds will be after every one of us to find out everything that took place here. This motion is critical to whether we will ever do this again.

I would like to go over, if we can, some of the things that were said. It is McCarthyism in the extreme if we [deleted].

[]
[]

However, this administration sent a four-star general to Iran. When Gen. Alex Haig turned down the mission, it went to Bob "Dutch" Heyser who talked to our allies there, including the Commanding General of the Iranian Air Force. They did not take action, and all of those Iranian officers paid with their lives. After Fascist kangaroo court trials, they were executed at dawn.

General McAuliffe testified in that committee meeting, which I attended because I am a subcommittee member. He admitted he was sent on a Department of State mission to Nicaragua where discussions took place as to whether or not Somoza should resign.

I thought we learned in Vietnam that generals do not make good political or diplomatic messenger boys. Is the general's reputation at stake? He is retiring. Does General Sumners have to retire to get his points on record?

I hope we will continue this debate before we vote on this motion. I do not know how I am going to vote yet.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I say when I yield throughout this debate, it is for purposes of debate only.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns of the Speaker and the Minority Leader, but I feel there is one other important thing we have perhaps overlooked at this point. The Speaker has pointed out—and perhaps we do not know—there may be dozens of codes we may be violating with our international neighbors, but I suggest to the Members of this House there is one other thing we are really placing in jeopardy by putting us on public record today, even though it gets out some other way, and that is the integrity of the House and the ability of the House and its committees in the future to get confidential information and classified information that we need. If we do this to General McAuliffe and others, agencies who come down here in confidence and talk to this committee with the understanding that it is not going to be made public, and we make it public by a vote of the House, which apparently we can do, we are not going to get it again, and it may be on some very critical matters where the committees and the House need that information very desperately. They are going to be very reluctant to give it, and they will rightly be reluctant to give it. We place all of that in jeopardy. We need information from time to time that is confidential in our various committees of the House, and we should not place that ability in jeopardy without the due consideration that the Speaker suggests.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, frankly, I made this motion simply because I understood somebody on the other side was going to make it. I do not feel strongly attached to it. Nothing new was said

here but now we are told it must remain secret. Does the gentleman from Maryland require unanimous consent to withdraw the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can withdraw the motion.

Mr. BAUMAN. The gentleman withdraws the motion.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BAUMAN

Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BAUMAN moves that the Secret Session be dissolved.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the procedures followed by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in considering the transcript of the secret session of the House on June 20 are as follows:

Upon receipt of the transcript from the Speaker, the committee identified areas which involved classified intelligence sources and methods and other classified material. The committee then consulted with representatives from the Department of Defense, Central Intelligence Agency, Department of State and the Department of Justice and noted each item suggested by any of the above as involving classified matter. The committee then made recommendations concerning each item so noted to the Speaker.

Thereafter, the committee was called in to resolve the differences between its approach and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to which the transcript had also been referred. The committee did this and prepared a revised transcript embodying the recommendations of both committees and reflective of such other revisions and extensions as were suggested by individual Members involved in the debate.

It is my understanding that the completed transcript which is provided to the House today represents a careful, yet critical, revision of the transcript to exclude only that material which was genuinely sensitive. I believe that the resulting document fairly represents the debate that occurred during the closed session of the House while protecting essential national security information. I want to thank the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) and for all the Members who participated in the debate and whose perusal and agreement was necessary to resolve the matters associated with this transcript and the charge given to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by the House.

TRUTH ABOUT PANAMANIAN INVOLVEMENT IN REVOLUTION NOW OBVIOUS TO ALL

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is most appropriate that the

proceedings of the secret session of the House held on June 20, 1979 are printed in the RECORD today in view of the fact that this is the date on which Fidel Castro, his pro-Communist allies and the U.S. State Department have finally achieved their objective of forcing out of office the duly elected President of Nicaragua, Anastasio Somoza. I would predict that this is only the beginning of a massive Cuban effort to subvert the governments of Central and South America, a policy which our own Government seems powerless to stop and even to encourage with its own blindness.

Mr. Speaker, I asked for the secret session in order to impart to my colleagues the full extent of the involvement of the Government of Panama in the efforts to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua. I would have preferred that the full transcript be made public.

The hearings referred to in the secret session which were held before our Subcommittee on the Panama Canal proved without question the deep involvement of the Panamanian Government, including its actual head, Gen. Omar Torrijos, and other officials, in overthrowing the government of another sovereign nation. It remains to be seen what the final outcome of this insidious enterprise will be, but we have seen that the President of Panama, Ariste Royo lied to the American people when he denied such involvement.

Worse than that, since the secret session was held, a State Department memorandum was leaked to the press which shows that the Carter administration has known about these actions by Panama but covered up the facts in an effort to deceive the American people and get the Panama Canal implementing legislation passed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to burden the House with further comment at this time, but I would urge all Members to read carefully the extension of remarks by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN) which appears on pages 17677-17680 of the RECORD of July 9. There you can read in full the extent of Cuban and Communist expansion in the Caribbean, as well as the fact that the American people have not been told the truth.

The gentleman from Idaho has done the American people the service of reprinting a news article from the Chicago Tribune together with the State Department memorandum which already had been leaked to the press. That the Government of Panama was a willing accomplice in this endeavor is unquestionable, a fact acknowledged only recently by its government officials proudly boasting of their actions. These are the partners President Carter has provided us to carry out the terms of the Panama Canal treaties.

I have no doubt that the American people will live to regret, all too soon, the day these treaties were signed and ratified.

At the very least the House had before it the extent of this Panamanian involvement before they voted on the imple-

menting legislation so that no Members can claim to have not known the truth.

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
APPROPRIATIONS, 1980**

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4580) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4580, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 11, 1979, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLES WILSON) had consumed 14 minutes of general debate, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PURSELL) had consumed 25 minutes of general debate.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLES WILSON).

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I ask that the Clerk do now read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PURSELL).

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time so that we may proceed with the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

□ 1430

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 2, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk commenced the reading of the bill.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr.

Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHARLES WILSON OF TEXAS

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read the first amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas: Page 3, line 4, delete "\$191,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,500,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLES WILSON) that the first amendment reported is to a section already passed. It can be considered under a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered at this time.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas: Page 4, line 2, delete "\$67,399,700" and insert in lieu thereof "\$70,899,700".

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLES WILSON) that the same ruling applies to the amendment just read. Unanimous consent is required for its consideration.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment just read be considered at this time.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will report the third amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas: Page 9, line 5, delete "\$47,354,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$52,854,500".

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to withdraw the last amendment which was read.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is to a portion of the bill that has not yet

been read. It is being considered en bloc under the previous unanimous consent request.

The amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION
Economic development and regulation.
\$13,810,900.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE

Public safety and justice, including purchase of one hundred and thirty-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only (including one hundred and thirty for police-type use and five for fire-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year); \$293,247,700, of which \$5,863,400 shall be payable from the revenue sharing trust fund: *Provided*, That the Police Department is authorized to replace not to exceed twenty-five passenger carrying vehicles, and the Fire Department not to exceed five such vehicles annually whenever the cost of repair to any damaged vehicle exceeds three-fourths the cost of the replacement: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for expenses under the Criminal Justice Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-412) for fiscal year 1980 shall be available for obligations incurred under that Act in each fiscal year since inception in fiscal year 1975: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available from this appropriation for the Chief of Police for the prevention and detection of crime: *Provided further*, That \$50,000 of any appropriations available to the District of Columbia may be used to match financial contributions from the Department of Defense to the District of Columbia Office of Emergency Preparedness for the purchase of civil defense equipment and supplies approved by the Department of Defense, when authorized by the Mayor.

□ 1440

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN: Page 17, after line 2, add the following new section:

"SEC. 220. None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to pay for abortions except to save the life of the mother."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this has a controversial aspect to it, because it involves the District of Columbia, and the distinguished Black Caucus of this House has taken, I believe, a unified position on this issue of abortion.

However, there were 30,000 abortions a year performed in the District of Columbia for residents and nonresidents last year.

For District of Columbia residents alone, we have reached an amazing historical position in the 203-year history of our Nation. There were, in round figures, 10,000 live births and 13,000 abortions. It is 130 percent more than the live birth rate. No American city has ever reached that position. No city in all of Western civilization has reached that position, not even the Communist cities, post-World War II period, when abor-

tion was not only accepted but recommended in those countries before they began a slow reversal of that process over the last 10 years.

The District of Columbia government pays for 5,250 or 40 percent of those abortions.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully like to insist on my point of order and be heard on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has been recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment. He is entitled to finish his 5 minutes. At that time it would be proper for the gentleman from Texas to make his point of order.

Mr. DORNAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I might tell the chairman I will try and be brief, because we have debated this extensively not only in the 95th Congress, but once already in this Congress.

The annual D.C. payment for abortions is \$2 million, almost \$2 million. That money obviously could be used for health and welfare programs and to obtain matching funds of 50 or 90 percent from the Federal Government.

I am well aware of the conservative argument that I hear in my own district and across the country—I underline the words "conservative argument"—that to terminate the lives of so-called unwanted children is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200 an operation, where if these fetuses are allowed to be born and begin a life in our country, it can cost taxpayers upward of \$18,000 if that child remains indigent, or in a rather ugly and tortured use of the word, unwanted, if they remain unwanted for a period of life up through their 18th year.

I am waiting for a call now from Rev. Jesse Jackson. I had hoped to receive the call by now. This distinguished American has clearly stated regarding such an abortion policy that, quoting him:

As a matter of conscience, I must oppose the use of Federal funds for a policy of killing infants. The money would be much better expended to meet human needs.

I hope the debate will be brief today. I will defend any points of order against it, and I would ask for a voice vote on this if it can be handled that way.

I am not intending at this point to ask for a recorded vote if I win the voice vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill since it imposes additional duties on District officials and, as such, is in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI of the House.

Implicit in the language of the amendment is the duty on the part of District officials to ascertain from a physician that the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus is carried to term. This imposes an additional burden on District officials to make new determinations and judgments not required of them by law at the present time.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that this amendment is clearly in violation of clause 2, rule XXI, of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DORNAN. One point, Mr. Chairman, and that is, physicians are already determining this factor in every case across the country, where a birth or an abortion is in progress, and given some of the more infamous and in one case loathsome trials—I refer to the Sherman case in this city—and the Waddell case. I cannot conceive in the wildest stretch of my imagination any doctor being prosecuted or persecuted anywhere in this country in a surgical procedure trying to save the life of a mother. Doctors are already making that determination.

So I do not believe that this puts any burden on any medical authorities anywhere in the country where it could be construed as legislating on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

A paragraph in a general appropriation bill prohibiting the use of funds in the bill to perform abortions except where the mother's life would be in danger if the fetus was carried to term was ruled out of order as legislation since it required Federal officials to make new determinations and judgment not required by law as to the danger to the mother in each individual case.

This ruling was by Chairman BOLLING on June 17, 1977, when the circumstances presented were extremely similar to the circumstances here.

A provision in the general appropriation bill requiring new determinations by Federal officials is legislation and subject to a point of order regardless of whether or not private or State officials who administer the Federal funds in question routinely make such determinations.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN: Page 17, after line 2, add the following new section:

"Sec. 220. None of the funds appropriated herein for the medical expenses necessary to saving the life of a pregnant woman entitled to receive medical benefits under this Act shall be denied."

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, because of the peculiar situation in which the proabortion forces in the House have placed the antiabortion, or prolife forces in the House, where special rules are needed from the Rules Committee to bring about a fair and equitable vote such as the Hyde vote a few weeks ago, we have to proceed in this somewhat constricted manner. I decided to take the D.C. appropriations bill, even though there are, sad to say, still overtones of racism in America, and a vote of indifference might result because it involved the taking of innocent black life in their mothers' wombs.

I decided to go through the procedure just prior, with a previously accepted wording in an antiabortion amendment that has in its language a clause providing that abortion could be performed to save the life of the mother, and go through a two-amendment process, the first amendment being the one that the clerk has just read, where we nailed down in appropriations language that no appropriated medical expenses necessary for saving the life of a pregnant woman who is otherwise entitled to receive her medical benefits, shall ever be denied under this act.

□ 1450

Anticipating a point of order on this procedure, I will cite relevant precedents.

On January 8, 1923, Chairman Frederick C. Hicks of New York put forth some tests whereby such questions may be decided. I will paraphrase them in my explanation.

One, this limitation on the D.C. appropriations bill applies solely to the appropriation under consideration. Two, the limitation operates only in the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made, and three, there is no additional eligibility requirement imposed as a condition of receiving medical assistance under this amendment. Therefore, there are no additional burdens placed on any executive officers of the D.C. Department of Human Resources or the District of Columbia General Hospital. The law already authorizes that persons whose lives are in jeopardy including pregnant women, and who are eligible according to current standards of law will be treated by doctors who will be compensated for their services. My limitation alters none of this.

In addition, I will quote from the previous rulings of the Chair, one of which, by the way, dealt with a District of Columbia appropriations bill.

From Deschler's Procedure 26 11.11:

§ 11.11 It is in order on a general appropriation bill to make the availability of funds therein contingent upon the implementation of a policy already enacted into law, providing the description of that policy is precise and does not impose additional duties on the officials responsible for its implementation. 117 CONG. REC. 41838, 92d Cong. 1st Sess., Nov. 17, 1971 [H.R. 11731], where an amendment prohibiting the use of funds in an appropriations bill after a date certain for military operations in Indochina if all American prisoners of war have been released and missing Americans accounted for by that date was held not to impose additional duties upon executive officials, who were already under the obligation imposed by a law to implement the policy described by the amendment.

Also on that same page of Deschler's Procedure, 11.16:

§ 11.16 Where existing law authorized the availability of funds for the FBI for emergency expenses of a confidential nature when certified by the Attorney General, language in a general appropriation bill containing funds for that purpose to be accounted for solely upon the certificate of the Attorney General was held in order as not constituting a change in existing law. 120 CONG. REC. 19715, 19716, 93d Cong. 2d Sess., June 18, 1974 [H.R. 15405].

Mr. GORE. The Chair advises the gentleman since he is addressing a point of order that the gentleman's remaining time is quite short and the point of order cannot be timely made since debate has occurred on the amendment. In case the gentleman wishes to speak to the merits of the amendment in the time remaining, the gentleman has approximately a minute remaining.

Mr. DORNAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, but given the circumstances that currently surround, and will continue to surround prolife amendments to appropriations bills, I will continue:

From a ruling of the Chair, in the 62d Congress, 2d session, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 8428 on June 21, 1912, which held that—

The law already directs that these transfers shall be made upon the accounts between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government. This paragraph is not, therefore, new . . . the Chair is, as said, of the opinion that this is not new legislation, because no change in the law is made hereby. It is simply a congressional direction to the executive officers to do that which they should have done without it. The Chair therefore, overrules the point of order.

I wanted to get this historical background in because I think events are moving so quickly this year on special rules for special bills for special votes on special departments of Government, including further votes on appropriations bills this year, and an amendment which I hope, God willing, to offer next year on the Treasury bill denying a special "perk" to Congressmen and their families and their staffs through their health plans cutting money used for elective abortion. The Congress should be consistent, and since we have cut tax-funded abortions for certain poor people, and I use the word poor people in quotes, I think a historic background and a body of historicity should be built up concerning what amendments may be offered and under what circumstances.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes beyond the use of Federal funds; it restricts the use of local revenues—revenues generated by local real estate taxes, local sales taxes and local water and sewer payments. It prohibits the city from using these revenues to carry out its policies and programs.

Our committee might disagree with District officials as to how much money should be spent for certain programs, but we do not believe the Congress should completely cut-off the use of local funds for programs which locally elected officials have decided to fund. To cite an example, our subcommittee felt the so-called Speculation Tax Act was not a very good idea as far as trying to increase the city's tax base; however, we have included funds in this bill to implement that act.

It is one thing for the Federal Government to prohibit the use of Federal funds to perform abortions—that does not interfere with the use of local funds—but if we adopt the gentleman's amendment, we would be prohibiting a

local government from using its own funds—funds derived from local sources—for purposes which it has made a conscious decision to fund.

Mr. Chairman, this is wrong and should not be done.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California. This is a matter which I believe would be better considered by the elected officials of the District of Columbia.

More than 85 percent of the funds in this budget will have been raised by the residents of the District of Columbia. It would seem to me only proper that the decision and such a policy as the one which the gentleman seeks to have the House impose upon the citizens of the District of Columbia, who do not vote for him, or for the Members of Congress, should be made by the citizens through their elected government.

While I understand the concern of the gentleman about the number of abortions which have occurred in the District of Columbia, I hasten to point out that very large numbers of those abortions are not performed on District of Columbia residents. The gentleman's amendment simply would not reach those who have ample funds of their own to have an abortion. The amendment, therefore, is fundamentally discriminatory against poor residents of the District of Columbia.

I simply cannot believe we would want to impose a policy such as this without hearings or an investigation into its impact on the District and the surrounding areas.

The gentleman has already had the opportunity to determine the will of the House on this matter in the vote on the HEW appropriation. Here at least Members were voting on a policy to affect those whom they govern with their consent. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the proposer of the amendment, if I may, the gentleman from California, I want to be sure I understand the amendment. As I gather it is to strike all of the monies in the D.C. appropriation for use for abortions; is that correct?

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

Mr. PEYSER. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORNAN. I have not submitted that particular amendment yet. I have two amendments that, if I may loosely describe them as book ends, the first serves the second. There are Members in this House who deeply resent being boxed into a corner by game-playing with the rules of the House, which resulted from a Chair ruling by Congressman BOLLING of last year where they are not entitled to votes against taxpayers' money being used for abortion without being able to say they feel it is perfectly moral and legitimate if it is to save the life of the

mother. Because of that game-playing I have submitted this amendment which simply says in no way can any funds under this bill ever be denied as compensation to a doctor or to anyone who is trying to save the life of a pregnant woman eligible to receive medical treatment under this Appropriations Act.

Once having gotten that very simple, benign and by itself maybe seemingly unnecessary amendment, I will then submit straight antiabortion language, having by a point of order been denied the right to offer an amendment with the important "except to save the life of the mother" clause.

□ 1500

Then, with that amendment adopted I will then offer shortly here an amendment which my colleagues will be able to vote for without any feeling of being accused of the charge that they do not care for lives of pregnant women.

Mr. PEYSER. The effect of the gentleman's amendment, though, is basically to deny funds for abortions for the people in the District of Columbia who would come under this—

Mr. DORNAN. Not this amendment; a coming amendment.

Mr. PEYSER. I think the effect is much the same. What I am getting at is, it raises a question in my mind that in the District of Columbia a certain amount of their taxes collected here by the people in the District of Columbia are monies that are involved in this particular legislative effort.

Mr. DORNAN. True.

Mr. PEYSER. It would seem to me that whether one is pro or con on the abortion issue, that we cannot deny people of their own taxes and their own districts the right of deciding what they want to do with their money. I think that this goes beyond the question of whether I would be supportive of an abortion amendment or not.

It would seem to me that the gentleman wants to offer an abortion amendment withholding funds for abortions, which maybe is his amendment No. 2. Then, we can discuss the pros and cons of whether the abortion should be denied to the people on the grounds of whatever we want to argue. But, it seems to me here that the gentleman is basically depriving American citizens and taxpayers of a very basic right. It would appear, particularly on that side of the aisle, if you will, those Members should be defending, because the position is one that says American taxpayer ought to have control of what their taxes may do in that particular situation.

I will be delighted to get to the gentleman's second amendment and discuss it, but this one certainly should go down.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would just point out to my colleagues, despite the claims made for this amendment, it does not say that funds to save the life of a pregnant woman shall be denied in all circumstances. It just says, "shall be denied."

Therefore, it does not go to the point the gentleman from California raised, namely, that this will in all cases, including abortion, assure that the life of the mother will be saved. It does not say that at all. I think this is just pure persiflage. It has absolutely no meaning whatsoever.

I tell the gentleman that he may be very sincere in his intention, but it will not do what the gentleman says it will do.

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

(At the request of Mr. DORNAN and by unanimous consent Mr. PEYSER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. DORNAN. On the gentleman's interesting observation about the fact that many of the tax dollars are raised in the District, there is a word on the Hill that now strikes terror into the hearts of Congress people. It did not used to, and I am glad it does now. That word is, "commingling of funds."

Even though a portion of this appropriations bill is raised in the District of Columbia, they are commingled with Federal moneys, and this House is given that responsibility. Although there is a debate raging across the country upon which I have not made up my own mind about home rule and voting rights for the distinguished gentleman from the District of Columbia, we have the responsibility. I remind the House that the Congress has denied certain transportation funds to any State which has a speed limit greater than 55 miles per hour. This amendment embodies the same principle.

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

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

Mr. PEYSER. I think the real issue is on the gentleman's second amendment and not on this amendment. I think this amendment has got to be defeated. I think the implications of this amendment are that we could be getting into many other areas where there might be Federal funds in other Federal programs, where we could begin to say to any State, "You cannot do this." We could object even though most of the money may be the State's money.

We should defeat this amendment.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this House has already debated the issue of abortion in the HEW appropriation bill. I would have to ask my colleague if this language, this new abortion language as offered by the gentleman from California, would apply only to a certain number of people in the United States and therefore would be in conflict with our present position. What we would be doing here is establishing new language on a subject already considered in the

HEW appropriations. We would have dual sets of statutes to apply to different people within the country—one set for the district, another set for the rest of the Nation. This is blatantly discriminatory and in conflict with the House position as passed in the Labor/HEW bill.

I would oppose the amendment on the basis of its discriminatory classification.

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

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

Mr. DORNAN. The language we adopted in the Hyde amendment with the exception clause, as the gentleman well knows, is denied to us. He has just seen it denied by a point of order. So, I have come up with these two book-end amendments. The gentleman from New York is correct, a vote on this is also a vote, in some respect, on the second. But, this is not my idea to bring it up in a dual-amendment process. It was because of the point of order game-playing, and also that the Rules Committee did not provide a special rule to allow amendments like my prolife mentor and good friend of life, Mr. Hyde of Illinois, has placed on Labor-HEW appropriations.

I believe these two together accomplish the exact same thing as the Hyde amendment voted upon under HEW, so I would recommend a yes vote on both these amendments. Anybody who voted against the Obey language and voted for the Hyde amendment should vote yes on these two amendments I offer, and they are protected from demagoguing in their districts that they do not care about the life of the mother.

Mr. PURSELL. If I may reclaim my time, I think the language is different than the language in the HEW appropriation bill. Therefore, I would oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

□ 1520

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole has not appeared.

The Chair announces that a regular quorum call will now commence.

Members who have not already responded under the noticed quorum call will have a minimum of 15 minutes to record their presence. The call will be taken by electronic device.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2,

rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 342]

Abdnor	Daniel, R. W.	Hefner
Addabbo	Danielson	Heftel
Akaka	Dannemeyer	Hightower
Albosta	Daschle	Hillis
Alexander	Davis, Mich.	Hinson
Ambro	Davis, S.C.	Holland
Anderson, Calif.	de la Garza	Hollenbeck
Andrews, N.C.	Deckard	Holt
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dellums	Holtzman
Annuozio	Derrick	Hopkins
Anthony	Derwinski	Horton
Applegate	Devine	Howard
Ashbrook	Dickinson	Hubbard
Ashley	Dicks	Huckaby
Aspin	Dingell	Hughes
Atkinson	Dixon	Hutto
AuCoin	Dodd	Hyde
Badham	Donnelly	Ichord
Bafalis	Dornan	Jacobs
Bailey	Dougherty	Jeffords
Baldus	Downey	Jeffries
Barnard	Duncan, Oreg.	Jenkins
Barnes	Duncan, Tenn.	Jenrette
Baum	Early	Johnson, Calif.
Beard, R.I.	Eckhardt	Johnson, Colo.
Beard, Tenn.	Edgar	Jones, N.C.
Bedell	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Okla.
Bellenson	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, Tenn.
Benjamin	Edwards, Okla.	Kastenmeier
Bennett	English	Kazen
Bereuter	Erdahl	Kelly
Bethune	Erlenborn	Kemp
Bevill	Ertel	Kildee
Biaggi	Evans, Del.	Kindness
Bingham	Evans, Ga.	Kogovsek
Blanchard	Evans, Ind.	Kostmayer
Boggs	Fary	Kramer
Boland	Fascell	LaFalce
Boner	Fazio	Lagomarsino
Bonior	Fenwick	Latta
Bonker	Ferraro	Leach, Iowa
Bouquard	Findley	Leach, La.
Bowen	Fisher	Leath, Tex.
Brademas	Pithian	Lederer
Breaux	Flippo	Lee
Brinkley	Florio	Lehman
Brodhead	Foley	Leland
Brooks	Ford, Mich.	Lent
Broomfield	Ford, Tenn.	Levitas
Brown, Calif.	Fountain	Lewis
Broyhill	Fowler	Livingston
Buchanan	Frenzel	Lloyd
Burgener	Frost	Loeffler
Burlison	Fuqua	Long, La.
Burton, Phillip	Garcia	Lott
Butler	Gaydos	Lowry
Byron	Gephardt	Lujan
Campbell	Gilman	Lukens
Carney	Gingrich	Lundine
Carr	Ginn	Lungrun
Carter	Glickman	McClary
Cavanaugh	Goldwater	McCloskey
Chappell	Gonzalez	McCormack
Cheney	Goodling	McDade
Chisholm	Gore	McDonald
Clausen	Gramson	McEwen
Clay	Grassley	McHugh
Cleveland	Green	McKay
Clinger	Grisham	McKinney
Coelho	Guarini	Madigan
Coleman	Guyder	Maguire
Collins, Ill.	Hagedorn	Markey
Collins, Tex.	Hall, Ohio	Marks
Conable	Hall, Tex.	Marlenee
Conte	Hamilton	Marriott
Corcoran	Hammer-	Martin
Corman	schmidt	Mathis
Cotter	Hance	Matsui
Coughlin	Hanley	Mattox
Courter	Hansen	Mavroules
Crane, Daniel	Harkin	Mazzoli
Crane, Phillip	Harris	Mica
D'Amours	Harsha	Michel
Daniel, Dan	Hawkins	Mikulski
		Miller, Calif.
		Miller, Ohio

Mineta	Rhodes	Stockman
Minish	Richmond	Stokes
Mitchell, Md.	Rinaldo	Stratton
Mitchell, N.Y.	Ritter	Studds
Moakley	Roberts	Stump
Moffett	Robinson	Swift
Mollohan	Rodino	Symms
Montgomery	Roe	Synar
Moore	Rose	Tauke
Moorhead, Calif.	Rosenthal	Thomas
Moorhead, Pa.	Rostenkowski	Thompson
Mottl	Roth	Traxler
Murphy, Ill.	Rousselot	Treen
Murphy, N.Y.	Roybal	Trible
Murphy, Pa.	Royer	Van Deerlin
Murtha	Rudd	Vander Jagt
Myers, Ind.	Runnels	Vanik
Myers, Pa.	Russo	Vento
Natcher	Sabo	Volkmer
Neal	Santini	Walgren
Nedzi	Satterfield	Walker
Nelson	Sawyer	Wampler
Nichols	Scheuer	Watkins
Nolan	Schroeder	Waxman
Nowak	Schulze	Weaver
O'Brien	Sebelius	Weiss
Oaker	Seiberling	White
Oberstar	Sensenbrenner	Whitehurst
Obey	Shannon	Whitley
Ottenger	Sharp	Whittaker
Panetta	Shelby	Whitten
Pashayan	Shumway	Williams, Mont.
Patten	Shuster	Williams, Ohio
Patterson	Simon	Wilson, Bob
Paul	Skelton	Wilson, C. H.
Pease	Slack	Wilson, Tex.
Pepper	Smith, Iowa	Winn
Perkins	Smith, Nebr.	Wirth
Petri	Snowe	Wolfe
Peyser	Snyder	Wyatt
Pickle	Solarz	Wyder
Preyer	Solomon	Wyllie
Price	Spellman	Yates
Pursell	Spence	Yatron
Quayle	St Germain	Young, Alaska
Quillen	Stack	Young, Fla.
Rahall	Staggers	Young, Mo.
Rangel	Stangeland	Zablocki
Ratchford	Stanton	Zerferetti
Regula	Steed	
Reuss	Stenholm	
	Stewart	

□ 1530

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN) for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the Members that the time for this vote has been reduced, pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, to a minimum of 5 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 309, noes 112, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—309

Abdnor	Beard, R.I.	Burlison
Addabbo	Beard, Tenn.	Byron
Albosta	Bedell	Campbell
Ambro	Benjamin	Carney
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett	Carter
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bereuter	Cavanaugh
Annuozio	Bethune	Chappell
Anthony	Biaggi	Cheney
Applegate	Blanchard	Clausen
Archer	Boggs	Clinger
Ashbrook	Boland	Coelho
Ashley	Boner	Coleman
Aspin	Bonior	Collins, Tex.
Atkinson	Bonker	Conte
Badham	Bouquard	Corcoran
Bafalis	Bowen	Cotter
Bailey	Breaux	Coughlin
Baldus	Brinkley	Courter
Barnard	Broomfield	Crane, Daniel
Bauman	Broyhill	Crane, Philip
	Buchanan	D'Amours
	Burgener	Daniel, Dan

Daniel, R. W.
 Danielson
 Dannemeyer
 Daschle
 Davis, Mich.
 de la Garza
 Deckard
 Derwinski
 Devine
 Dickinson
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Dodd
 Donnelly
 Dornan
 Dougherty
 Drinan
 Duncan, Tenn.
 Early
 Edwards, Okla.
 English
 Erdahl
 Erlenborn
 Ertel
 Evans, Del.
 Evans, Ga.
 Evans, Ind.
 Fary
 Fish
 Fisher
 Pithian
 Filippo
 Florio
 Foley
 Ford, Mich.
 Fountain
 Fowler
 Frenzel
 Frost
 Fuqua
 Gaydos
 Gephardt
 Gingrich
 Ginn
 Glickman
 Goldwater
 Goodling
 Gore
 Gradison
 Gramm
 Grassley
 Grisham
 Guarini
 Gudger
 Guyer
 Hagedorn
 Hall, Ohio
 Hall, Tex.
 Hamilton
 Hammer-
 schmidt
 Hance
 Hansen
 Harkin
 Harsha
 Heckler
 Hefner
 Heftel
 Hightower
 Hillis
 Hinson
 Holt
 Hopkins
 Howard
 Hubbard
 Huckaby
 Hughes
 Hutto
 Hyde
 Ichord
 Ireland
 Jacobs
 Jeffries

Jenkins
 Johnson, Calif.
 Jones, Okla.
 Kazen
 Kelly
 Kemp
 Kildee
 Kindness
 Kostmayer
 Kramer
 LaFalce
 Lagomarsino
 Latta
 Leach, Iowa
 Leach, La.
 Leath, Tex.
 Lederer
 Lee
 Lent
 Levitas
 Livingston
 Loeffler
 Lott
 Lowry
 Lujan
 Luken
 Lundine
 Lungren
 McClary
 McCloskey
 McCormack
 McDade
 McDonald
 McEwen
 McHugh
 McKay
 Madigan
 Maguire
 Markey
 Marks
 Marlenee
 Marriott
 Martin
 Mathis
 Mavroules
 Mazzoli
 Mica
 Michel
 Miller, Ohio
 Minish
 Mitchell, N.Y.
 Moakley
 Mollohan
 Montgomery
 Moore
 Moorhead,
 Calif.
 Mottl
 Murphy, Ill.
 Murphy, N.Y.
 Murphy, Pa.
 Murtha
 Myers, Ind.
 Mvers, Pa.
 Natcher
 Neal
 Nedzi
 Nelson
 Nichols
 Nowak
 O'Brien
 Oaker
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Panetta
 Pashayan
 Paul
 Pease
 Pepper
 Perkins
 Petri
 Price
 Quayle

Quillen
 Rahall
 Rallsback
 Ratchford
 Regula
 Rhodes
 Rinaldo
 Ritter
 Roberts
 Robinson
 Rodino
 Roe
 Rostenkowski
 Roth
 Rousselot
 Royer
 Rudd
 Runnels
 Russo
 Santini
 Satterfield
 Sawyer
 Schulze
 Sebelius
 Sensenbrenner
 Sharp
 Shelby
 Shumway
 Shuster
 Simon
 Skelton
 Slack
 Smith, Iowa
 Smith, Nebr.
 Snowe
 Snyder
 Solarz
 Solomon
 Spellman
 Spence
 St Germain
 Stagers
 Stangeland
 Stanton
 Steed
 Stenholm
 Stratton
 Stump
 Swift
 Symms
 Synar
 Tauke
 Thomas
 Traxler
 Treen
 Tribe
 Udall
 Vander Jagt
 Vento
 Volkmer
 Walker
 Wampler
 Watkins
 White
 Whitehurst
 Whittaker
 Whitten
 Williams, Mont.
 Williams, Ohio
 Wilson, Bob
 Winn
 Wolf
 Wyatt
 Wyder
 Wylie
 Yatron
 Young, Alaska
 Young, Fla.
 Young, Mo.
 Zablocki
 Zeferetti

NOES—112

Akaka
 Alexander
 Andrews, N.C.
 AuCoin
 Barnes
 Bellenson
 Bevil
 Bingham
 Brademas
 Brodhead
 Brooks
 Brown, Calif.
 Burton, John
 Burton, Phillip
 Butler
 Carr
 Chisholm
 Clay

Cleveland
 Collins, Ill.
 Conable
 Corman
 Davis, S.C.
 Dellums
 Derrick
 Dixon
 Downey
 Duncan, Ore.
 Eckhardt
 Edgar
 Edwards, Ala.
 Edwards, Calif.
 Fascell
 Fazio
 Fenwick
 Ferraro

Findley
 Ford, Tenn.
 Garcia
 Glaimo
 Gilman
 Gonzalez
 Gray
 Green
 Harris
 Hawkins
 Holland
 Hollenbeck
 Holtzman
 Horton
 Jeffords
 Jenrette
 Johnson, Colo.
 Jones, N.C.

Jones, Tenn.
 Kastenmeier
 Kogovsek
 Lehman
 Leland
 Lewis
 Lloyd
 Long, Md.
 McKinney
 Matsui
 Mattox
 Mikulski
 Mikva
 Miller, Calif.
 Mineta
 Mitchell, Md.
 Moffett
 Moorhead, Pa.
 Nolan
 Ottinger

Patten
 Patterson
 Peyser
 Pickle
 Preyer
 Pritchard
 Pursell
 Rangel
 Reuss
 Richmond
 Rose
 Rosenthal
 Roybal
 Sabo
 Scheuer
 Schroeder
 Selberling
 Shannon
 Stack
 Stark

Stewart
 Stockman
 Stokes
 Studds
 Thompson
 Ullman
 Van Deerlin
 Vanik
 Walgren
 Waxman
 Weaver
 Weiss
 Whitley
 Wilson, C. H.
 Wilson, Tex.
 Wirth
 Wolpe
 Yates

NOT VOTING—13

Anderson, Ill.
 Bolling
 Brown, Ohio
 Conyers
 Diggs

Emery
 Flood
 Forsythe
 Gibbons
 Hanley

Long, La.
 Taylor
 Wright

□ 1540

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Messrs. WOLPE, ULLMAN, RITTER, FINDLEY, LELAND, LONG of Maryland, and LEWIS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. VENTO, GUDGER, RITTER, and KOSTMAYER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1550

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN: Page 17, after line 2, add the following new section:

"Sec. 221. None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to pay for abortions."

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, if the Members will indulge me for a brief moment here, I have enough Members committed to prolife votes times three, the number necessary for a recorded vote on the floor right now who have personally promised me they will stay, so that I can guarantee a record vote shortly, depending upon how long the debate will be.

Out of deference to everyone's sensitivity on this issue on both sides, I ask that the House suspend debate, and I simply will reread the amendment for purposes of clarity:

None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to pay for abortions.

Those Members like myself who want to always include the exception clause to save the life of the mother which is not technically necessary from the medical point of view, can tell their constituents that this rare circumstance has been explicitly covered by the amendment that was overwhelmingly passed, so they do not have to be concerned that that language, "except to save the life of the mother," was excluded by a point of order.

Everyone who is prolife but who

desires amendments with an exception clause to defend the mother's life can now vote for this amendment, section 221 cutting abortions to the D.C. appropriations bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHARLES WILSON OF TEXAS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN: "None of the funds in this Act provided by the Federal payment shall be used to perform abortions."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires that some unspecified officials of the District government or the Treasury or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or those who in the District of Columbia administer the medicare, would have to divine whether or not the specific payments for the performance of an abortion were out of the Federal payment or were out of District of Columbia funds raised through District of Columbia tax purposes.

There is no such requirement for any official to make such a determination at this point. It would require duties not now authorized in law, and therefore, it is legislation on an appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLES WILSON) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The point of order is inappropriate, because Federal funds are always accounted for by the District government; and it would require no additional clerical work. If it did, it would be so incidental as to have ample precedent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, the officials have a preexisting duty and responsibility to know where the Federal funds provided in a separate paragraph in this bill are going.

In the opinion of the Chair, this duty is not new under the amendment.

The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLES WILSON) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if my substitute amendment is adopted, then the District of Columbia will be treated just as the 50 States are treated. The substitute applies only to the Federal payment and would prohibit the use of those funds to perform abortions in the District of Columbia. Certainly this House should not put itself in the position of telling the District of Columbia that it cannot use its own funds—funds that it has taxed its

own citizens to acquire—to perform abortions if that is the policy adopted by the elected officials of the District.

I would ask my colleagues to vote the substitute.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Unfortunately or fortunately, depending upon your viewpoint, it is up to the Congress of the United States to legislate on this matter since we are in fact facing the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

The gentleman from Texas offers an ingenious amendment from the viewpoint of those who do not support the prolife position and who in fact would like to allow abortions to be performed in the District of Columbia.

The fact of the matter is that the District would easily be able to divert Federal funds to other functions rather than using them to pay for abortions. The same rate of abortions would continue in the District of Columbia, and the local government would lose no money; and there would be no impact at all.

I, therefore, urge all Members to vote against this amendment and to adopt the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN).

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, our committee supports the amendment offered by the ranking chairman. I think what we are doing here, we should be very careful whether we are proabortion or antiabortion. This is rather discriminatory. We are going to apply two sets of abortion statutes in the United States. One for the District of Columbia and one for the rest of the United States with the language in the HEW appropriations committee.

So I would support the gentleman from Texas and ask that his amendment be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, quite often on abortion votes, one of the problems that many Members have is trying to explain the difference in what these various votes are to their own constituencies; even, Mr. Chairman, those who are prolife or right-to-life in some cases would like to vote another way, if it were clear that they were not voting against their conscience on the right-to-life issue.

The gentleman from Texas has given us that opportunity, because what he is saying is that Federal funds will not be used to support abortion. I do not happen to agree with that point of view, but I am going to vote for this amendment because if we carry the amendment of the gentleman from California through, we place ourselves in the Congress of telling individuals, not only in the District of Columbia, but in any State in this Union, of what they can or cannot do with their own tax dollar.

So we can support the gentleman from Texas, because all we are doing is voting to prevent Federal funds from being used for abortions.

I would ask those Members who have in the past voted against this type of an amendment, in other words, have voted in favor of letting the poor people re-

ceive Federal funds for abortion, to vote with the gentleman from Texas, because it is an opportunity of striking down what is a basic inequity for the people of the District of Columbia; and it still is removing Federal funds from abortion.

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

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

Mr. KAZEN. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the amendment excludes the performance of abortions in hospitals that are not supported with Federal funds?

□ 1600

Mr. PEYSER. All this amendment would do, in answer to the gentleman, is that this would exclude any Federal funds being used by the District of Columbia for the use of abortion.

Mr. KAZEN. That means also those facilities like hospitals that are supported by Federal funds will be barred from performing these abortions?

Mr. PEYSER. No.

Mr. KAZEN. With D.C. funds?

Mr. PEYSER. No, only the monies in this appropriation bill for the District of Columbia will be involved.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how one distinguishes between Federal funds and non-Federal funds in this amendment. I do know that it has been traditional with this House to deny the use of funds for abortion, and I urge a defeat of the substitute and adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN).

There are currently more abortions performed in the District of Columbia than there are live births each year.

The question of Federal funds for abortions has been the subject of repeated action by this body, in connection with Labor/HEW appropriations.

It is a credit to Congress that we have consistently denied the use of taxpayer funds for discretionary abortions to suit the convenience of pregnant women.

The exact same principle applies in connection with this bill.

The important difference is that the \$191.5 million Federal payment to be appropriated under this act is not subject to the current restrictions of HEW appropriations barring the use of Federal funds for abortions.

Furthermore, Federal funds appropriated under this bill are commingled with locally generated District of Columbia revenues, which by law are also appropriated by Congress.

By commingling Federal and District of Columbia funds, both can be and are used to pay for abortions by the Department of Human Resources.

Local funds used for abortions, that would otherwise be available for other purposes by the Department of Human Resources or D.C. General Hospital, can be and are replaced by Federal dollars whenever Federal dollars are not themselves used directly by the city to pay for abortions.

This is a sound amendment in principle. An abortion is an abortion.

Federal funds appropriated under past District of Columbia appropriations acts, outside the scope of so-called Hyde amendment restrictions, have been used to pay for abortions in the District, which is the Nation's leader in infant mortality through abortions.

To millions of Americans, it makes no difference whatsoever whether the babies being aborted are white or black.

It makes no difference whether they are conceived to a family that is poor, or not poor.

What matters to millions of Americans is that they find abortion morally abhorrent, and that Federal funds—their tax dollars—are still being used to pay for abortions.

A vote for this amendment can take care of this misuse of taxpayer dollars.

I urge my colleagues to vote as they have in the past to prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars for abortions, and to adopt this amendment.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find it very interesting that we are hung up in technicalities. We are supposed to be able to vote for the substitute because it will not allow Federal funds to be used for abortion. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the question is much clearer than that. If we are committed to the prolife cause, committed to the preservation of the lives of the unborn, whether or not we are going to terminate the pregnancy by Federal funds or by D.C. funds is irrelevant. What we have here, if we reject the substitute amendment and adopt the Dornan amendment, is the opportunity to save the lives of more unborn children.

If we buy the substitute amendment, all we are doing is saving less lives. I do not know how anybody who says they are committed to the prolife cause can buy the substitute instead of buying the Dornan Amendment.

The Dornan amendment gives us the maximum chance to save the lives of the unborn children of the District of Columbia. The substitute, just a technicality, is an opportunity to make "a prolife vote" while favoring abortions that are funded by D.C. funds.

Let us not cloud the issue, let us not cloud the issue with the technicality of who is going to pay for the abortion. Let us address the issue on its merits. If we are committed to saving the lives of unborn children we must reject the substitute and adopt the Dornan amendment. No matter how we dress it up, no matter how we phrase it, the substitute is a cop-out, it is an opportunity to duck the tough question. It is a cop-out because then the Members can go home and say, oh I voted to cut off Federal funds in the District of Columbia for abortions, but did not address the real issue. The real issue is will we make the maximum effort to eliminate funding that destroys the lives of unborn children. That is the question.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in reluctant support of the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I say I rise in reluctant support because, as the Members know, three-quarters of a million people in the District of Columbia for whom the House will today set policy over their budget have no vote on this matter. We ought to know however that 85 percent of the budget upon which the House will vote here is raised by the people of the District of Columbia. Without taking a position as pro- or anti-abortion on this question, it is very clear to me that we should at least treat the District of Columbia residents, whom we govern without their consent, as we treat all other citizens of this country pursuant to the Hyde amendment, which was passed, that was limited to Federal funds. Certainly no one here would stand and vote that the entire budget of his State would be governed by a decision made by this body, and in that respect I think the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee at least provides some equity in terms of the treatment of the District of Columbia residents who pay \$1.4 billion Federal taxes a year and who alone among Americans are denied a vote in the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAUMAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHARLES WILSON OF TEXAS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAUMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN: delete from the amendment of the gentleman from Texas the following words: "provided by the Federal payment".

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to pursue a point of order at this time?

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do. As I understand the amendment it in essence takes it back to the original Dornan amendment without providing for the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order, it simply is an accurate description of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard further?

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the point of order is that it is a sham amendment in that it just repeats the intent of the original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman from Texas is suggesting that the perfecting amendment broadens the scope of the substitute amendment, and for that reason is not germane. The point of order is sustained under the precedents that a motion to strike cannot broaden the scope of the pending proposition.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder

if the Chair could cite a precedent for his ruling?

The CHAIRMAN. Deschler's procedure chapter 28, section 15.3.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLES WILSON) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 217, answered "present" 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—200

Akaka	Foley	Moorhead, Pa.
Alexander	Ford, Mich.	Neal
Anderson, Calif.	Ford, Tenn.	Nolan
Andrews, N.C.	Fowler	Obey
Anthony	Frenzel	Oettinger
Ashley	Frost	Panetta
Aspin	Fuqua	Pease
AuCoin	Garcia	Pepper
Baldus	Gialmo	Peyser
Barnes	Gilman	Pickle
Bedell	Ginn	Preyer
Bellenson	Glickman	Price
Bennett	Gonzalez	Pritchard
Biaggi	Gore	Pursell
Bingham	Gray	Rahall
Blanchard	Green	Rallsback
Bowen	Guarini	Rangel
Brademas	Gudger	Ratchford
Brinkley	Hall, Ohio	Reuss
Brodhead	Hamilton	Richmond
Brooks	Hance	Ritter
Brown, Calif.	Harkin	Roberts
Broyhill	Harris	Rodino
Buchanan	Hawkins	Rose
Burison	Hefner	Rosenthal
Burton, John	Hefel	Roybal
Burton, Phillip	Holland	Sabo
Butler	Hollenbeck	Scheuer
Carr	Holtzman	Schroeder
Cavanaugh	Horton	Seiberling
Chisholm	Howard	Shannon
Clay	Huckaby	Sharp
Cleveland	Hughes	Simon
Coelho	Jacobs	Slack
Conable	Jeffords	Smith, Iowa
Corman	Jenrette	Snowe
Coughlin	Johnson, Calif.	Solarz
D'Amours	Johnson, Colo.	Spellman
Danielson	Jones, N.C.	Stack
Daschle	Jones, Okla.	Staggers
Davis, S.C.	Kastenmeier	Stark
Dellums	Kogovsek	Steed
Derrick	Kostmayer	Stockman
Dickinson	Lehman	Stokes
Dicks	Leland	Studds
Diggs	Lloyd	Swift
Dingell	Long, Md.	Synar
Dixon	Lowry	Thomas
Dodd	Lundline	Thompson
Downey	McClory	Udall
Drinan	McCloskey	Ullman
Eckhardt	McCormack	Van Derlin
Edgar	McHugh	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	McKinney	Vento
Erdahl	Maguire	Walgren
Ertel	Marks	Waxman
Evans, Del.	Marlenee	Weaver
Fascell	Martin	Weiss
Fazio	Matsui	White
Fenwick	Mattox	Whitley
Ferraro	Mikulski	Whitten
Findley	Mikva	Williams, Mont.
Fish	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Fisher	Mineta	Wirth
Fithian	Moffett	Wolf
Florio	Mollohan	Wolpe
		Yates

NOES—217

Abdnor	Andrews, N. Dak.	Archer
Addabbo	Annunzio	Ashbrook
Albosta	Applegate	Atkinson
Ambro		Badham

Bafalis	Hanley	Oakar
Balley	Hansen	Oberstar
Barnard	Harsha	Pashayan
Bauman	Heckler	Patten
Beard, R.I.	Hightower	Paul
Beard, Tenn.	Hillis	Perkins
Benjamin	Hinson	Petri
Bereuter	Holt	Quayle
Bethune	Hopkins	Quillen
Bevill	Hubbard	Regula
Boggs	Hutto	Rhodes
Boland	Hyde	Rinaldo
Boner	Ichord	Robinson
Bonior	Ireland	Roe
Bonker	Jeffries	Rostenkowski
Bouquard	Jenkins	Roth
Breaux	Jones, Tenn.	Rousselot
Broomfield	Kazen	Royer
Burgener	Kelly	Rudd
Byron	Kemp	Russo
Campbell	Kildee	Santini
Carney	Kramer	Satterfield
Carter	LaFalce	Sawyer
Chappell	Lagomarsino	Schulze
Cheney	Latta	Schulze
Clausen	Leach, Iowa	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	Leach, La.	Shelby
Coleman	Leath, Tex.	Shumway
Collins, Tex.	Lederer	Shuster
Conte	Lee	Skelton
Corcoran	Lent	Smith, Nebr.
Cotter	Lewis	Snyder
Courter	Livingston	Solomon
Crane, Daniel	Loeffler	Spence
Crane, Philip	Long, La.	St Germain
Daniel, Dan	Lott	Stangeland
Daniel, R. W.	Lujan	Stanton
Dannemeyer	Lukens	Stenholm
Davis, Mich.	Lungren	Stewart
de la Garza	McDade	Stratton
Deckard	McDonald	Stump
Derwinski	McEwen	Symms
Devine	McKay	Tauke
Donnelly	Markey	Traxler
Dornan	Marriott	Treen
Dougherty	Mathis	Trible
Duncan, Tenn.	Mavroules	Vander Jagt
Early	Mazzoli	Volkmer
Edwards, Ala.	Mica	Walker
Edwards, Okla.	Michel	Wampler
English	Miller, Ohio	Watkins
Erlenborn	Minish	Whitehurst
Evans, Ga.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Whittaker
Evans, Ind.	Moakley	Williams, Ohio
Fary	Montgomery	Wilson, Bob
Filippo	Moore	Wilson, C. H.
Fountain	Moorhead,	Winn
Gaydos	Calif.	Wyatt
Gephardt	Mottl	Wyder
Gingrich	Murphy, Ill.	Wyllie
Goldwater	Murphy, N.Y.	Yatron
Goodling	Murphy, Pa.	Young, Alaska
Gradison	Murtha	Young, Fla.
Graham	Myers, Ind.	Young, Mo.
Grassley	Myers, Pa.	Zablocki
Grisham	Natcher	Zerfetti
Guyar	Nedzi	
Hagedorn	Nelson	
Hall, Tex.	Nichols	
Hammer-	Nowak	
schmidt	O'Brien	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Collins, Ill.

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson, Ill.	Flood	Patterson
Bolling	Forsythe	Runnels
Brown, Ohio	Gibbons	Taylor
Conyers	Levitas	Wright
Duncan, Oreg.	Madigan	
Emery	Mitchell, Md.	

□ 1620

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Runnels against.
Mr. Mitchell of Maryland for, with Mr. Emery against.

Ms. MIKULSKI changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

Mrs. HOLT, and Messrs. HALL, LATTA, MARRIOTT, MOAKLEY, CHARLES H. WILSON of California, JONES of Tennessee, and EDWARDS of Alabama changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, while the nearly three-quarters of a million citizens who are exclusively and unaffected by the measure have no vote on the floor of this House, I rise to voice the great difficulty that I and the citizens of our Nation's capital have with both the form and the substance of the work of the Committee on Appropriations with respect to the District of Columbia. In form, the committee's action, in my view, not only undermines the intention of the Congress in granting the District a home rule charter in 1973, but also destroys the incentives of the local government to set its own priorities and make its own plans. In substance, the cuts made by the committee, both in line items and across the board, severely impair our city's ability to meet critical needs.

Let me deal first with the substance of the budget cuts you are being asked to approve. And let me preface what I say by indicating that I am as concerned as any Member of this Congress about the rising cost of government, the number of city employees that we have, and the apparent imbalance between administrative and service positions. After all, it is we the taxpayers of the District of Columbia who while being denied access to 50 percent of the land for tax purposes, must raise 86 percent of the budget which is before you.

But I am also concerned about the proper targeting of our city's resources to deal with the serious problems of family disintegration, youth who without our help harden into delinquents, addicts or criminals, homeless and displaced people, and elderly citizens suffering from poverty and helplessness. When one looks at the substance of the cuts made in the budget, he readily sees how the city's ability to meet these needs is impaired.

The across the board cuts in pay increases and general program funds is a case in point. The directive that \$25,250,000 in pay increases be absorbed from salaries of departed and separated employees whose positions would be frozen is a mandate to abandon priority setting and to make program decisions dependent upon attrition or chance. This is certainly an irresponsible and unacceptable method of Government and should not be forced upon our city by the Congress. Freezing vacant positions is Government by happenstance and this is irrational.

Let us look at a few more cuts. At a time when double digit inflation is driving our elderly citizens up the wall in terms of higher food, housing and utility costs, now is not the time to deny us an

increase of 100 beds at our facility for the elderly at D.C. Village; not when we have 500 elderly citizens waiting desperately to use these beds right now. And yet this is what the committee has done.

Now is not the time to cut \$6,227,000 from our public assistance budget; not when our public assistance payments now are 55 percent to 71 percent below the Department of Labor's lowest standard of living levels for metropolitan area.

It is hard for me to believe that the same Congress which 2 years ago deplored conditions at Forest Haven and ordered the city to make major improvements is now about to vote to cut \$1,100,200 from a modest \$2.1 million budget, thus limiting our ability to comply with both the Pratt and Waddy decrees.

Now is not the time to cut our disadvantaged youth out of the budget process. Now is not the time to limit our ability to pursue fathers who fail to make their child support payments by cutting our budget for paternity and child support enforcement by \$27,800; not when we have a backlog of some 21,000 deserted mothers who have asked to go on public welfare; instead, let us make the fathers pay.

At a time when hundreds of our juvenile offenders remain confined to institutions, now is not the time to cut \$300,000 from our Juvenile Diversion Services budget; certainly not when that cut jeopardizes an additional \$225,000 in Federal funds designed to eliminate the more damaging and expensive programs for keeping these young people in institutions.

When the average caseload for workers handling foster care children is 80 per worker, now is not the time to cut 18 positions from our budget. The \$253,310 cut could be quadrupled in savings if we could just reduce that case work load by a third.

When so many of our children require decent day care if their parents are able to work and stay off of more costly public assistance, now is not the time to cut \$275,000 from our plans to increase compensation to those who provide that much needed services.

The only way the city can end rent control would be to assure that persons with small incomes can pay higher rents and yet we are about to cut the \$1,265,200 rent supplement program. Now is not the time for that kind of thing.

I could go on and on about these proposed cuts. The bottom line is that if the Congress is concerned about our efforts to stem the disintegration of our families, to prevent the hardening of our juveniles into delinquents, addicts or criminals, and to halt the slide of our elderly citizens on limited income into poverty and helplessness, we are going about it in the wrong way. We cannot do it by cutting desperately needed direct services and positions that can only be offset by more costly solutions and that place in jeopardy large sums of matching Federal dollars.

Let me turn, finally, to the question of the form that this cut takes, a form which, in my view, undermines the intentions of the Congress in granting the

city a home rule charter back in 1973. Aside from the fact of the cuts, which I believe are both unwarranted and overly severe, I have to take great issue with the role of the Appropriations Committee in deciding the policies and directions of the District of Columbia government.

In maintaining a congressional role in the appropriations process, the Home Rule Act contemplated a process that would assure the orderly and adequate operation of city government through the provision of adequate financial resources, one of which would be the Federal payment.

Section 501 of the Home Rule Act specifically notes nine items which should be considered in determining the level of the Federal payment. Each of these contemplate the uniqueness of the city; more importantly, the tone which this section sets further suggests that the Federal payment should operate to encourage efforts on the part of the Government to increase its own revenues and to seek additional efficiencies and economies. Nowhere is it contemplated that the Federal payment or the budget process should be used to either set policies for the city government, punish the city, or discourage helpful programs.

A review of the sufficiency of programs or whether these objectives are proper is made within a complicated process established for the city in the Home Rule Act. Additionally, there is substantial review of every act passed by the Council. Finally, there is continuing overview by the Legislative Committee of the directions of the city government to assure that the policies are in accord with the intentions of the act. I hasten to point out that it is not for the Congress to decide on the merits of a proposal; it is for Congress to decide only whether or not a proposal falls within the intention and powers of the Home Rule Act. This year's Appropriation Committee decisions go far beyond that role.

I would note, for example, that while it is proper to note a concern over the operation of a policy such as rent control, it is an inappropriate exercise of power to deny the city a rent supplement program that is clearly beyond any conceptual impact on the Federal Establishment. Denial of funds to operate a computer in the rental accommodations office is an attention to a degree of detail that clearly ought to be left to the city and the Legislative Committee which would inquire into its use and purpose for assurance that it is within the intentions and powers of the Home Rule Act.

The Advisory Neighborhood Commission, for another example, is authorized by the Home Rule Act funds of not less than that part of such revenues raised by levying 1 cent per \$100 of assess valuation which bears the same ratio to the full sum raised thereby as the population of the neighborhood bears to the population of the District. The city accordingly requested \$1,067,900 for the ANC's and received \$25,000,000 less than was appropriated for the current year.

The Committee has made a policy judgment not to fund the Minority Business Opportunity Commission at the very time when there is an increasing concern over whether or not minorities are receiving their fair share of the purchases by the Government. Similar judgments were made in the Office of Consumer Protection, the Department of Insurance, and the Commission on Licensure of the Healing Arts. These are not proper issues to be considered by the Committee and the Congress after home rule.

Neither is it right or proper to deny funds for increases in public assistance payments in a time when inflation continues to take a heavy toll on the already limited resources of the poor. An expressed concern over the error rates in welfare payments is proper; guidance on how to meet that concern and adequate resources to cure these problems is the proper answer. That is not the, answer provided by a punitive cut of more than \$5 million.

Finally, I want to comment on the level of the Federal payment. The Federal payment is intended to help the city meet its obligations as the Nation's Capital. This is quite clear in the Home Rule Act and it is also quite clear that there are decisions and reasons which make it more difficult for the city to raise resources that other similar cities may be able to raise. That we have a fine zoo is not compensation for our need to assure the safety of our visitors, to keep our parks and streets clean, to provide ample traffic enforcement, or to set the tone which our Nation wants and demands of its Capital City.

Yet, the citizens of this city raise more than 85 percent of the costs of the operation of the city in this budget. It certainly cannot be said that the Federal Government has overly subsidized the citizens of this community. We have to go back some 15 years—1965—to find a comparable proportion of the sharing of the costs of this city by citizens and the Federal Government. It is wrong that the Federal Government be able to use the services of the city without paying adequately for them. Monuments such as the Kennedy Center, the Visitors Center, the galleries, the museum, and the zoo, while nice and deeply appreciated, were built for the whole Nation and as a repository of our Nation's history just as the Capitol Building and the White House are symbols and a repository of our Nation and its history.

The Federal payment is steadily declining. Each time the city increases its revenues, adds taxes, et cetera the Federal payment declines thereby destroying any incentive to do the hard things which must be done. This process has got to change.

We cannot do much about it in this budget even with the adoption of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I hope, however, that we will be able to change this process so that the Congress will end its meddling, which this year has been taken to new heights,

in the city's budget by eliminating the appropriations process by Congress over the budget and by authorizing an entitlement in the Federal payment.

□ 1630

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRADemas) having assumed the chair, Mr. GORE, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4580) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 147, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—272

Addabbo	Boland	Conte
Akaka	Boner	Corcoran
Albosta	Bonior	Corman
Alexander	Bonker	Cotter
Ambro	Bouquard	Danielson
Anderson,	Bowen	Davis, Mich.
Calif.	Brademas	Davis, S.C.
Andrews, N.C.	Breaux	de la Garza
Andrews,	Brinkley	Dellums
N. Dak.	Brodhead	Derrick
Annunzio	Brooks	Dickinson
Ashley	Broyhill	Diggs
Aspin	Buchanan	Dingell
Bailey	Burgener	Dixon
Baldus	Burrlison	Donnelly
Barnes	Burton, Phillip	Dorman
Beard, R.I.	Butler	Dougherty
Bedell	Carter	Downey
Benjamin	Cavanaugh	Drinan
Bennett	Chappell	Duncan, Ore.
Bereuter	Chisholm	Duncan, Tenn.
Bevill	Clay	Early
Biaggi	Coelho	Eckhardt
Bingham	Collins, Ill.	Edgar
Blanchard	Conable	Edwards, Ala.

Erdahl	Lujan	Rinaldo
Ertel	Lukens	Rodino
Evans, Del.	Lundine	Roe
Evans, Ga.	McClory	Rose
Fary	McCloskey	Rosenthal
Fazio	McDade	Rostenkowski
Ferraro	McEwen	Roybal
Findley	McHugh	Royer
Fish	McKay	Russo
Fisher	McKinney	Sabo
Filippo	Maguire	Sebelius
Florio	Markay	Seiberling
Foley	Marks	Shannon
Ford, Mich.	Marlenee	Sharp
Ford, Tenn.	Marriott	Shelby
Fountain	Mathis	Simon
Frenzel	Matsul	Skelton
Frost	Mattox	Slack
Fuqua	Mavroules	Smith, Iowa
Garcia	Mazzoli	Smith, Nebr.
Gephardt	Mica	Snowe
Gilman	Michel	Solarz
Gingrich	Mikva	Spellman
Ginn	Mineta	St Germain
Gonzalez	Minish	Stack
Gore	Mitchell, Md.	Staggers
Gray	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stanton
Green	Moakley	Stark
Grisham	Moffett	Steed
Guarini	Mollohan	Stewart
Gudger	Montgomery	Stokes
Hamilton	Moorehead, Pa.	Stratton
Hanley	Mottl	Swift
Harkin	Murphy, Ill.	Synar
Harris	Murphy, N.Y.	Tauke
Hawkins	Murtha	Thomas
Heckler	Mvers, Pa.	Thompson
Hefner	Natcher	Traxler
Heftel	Neal	Treen
Hightower	Nedzi	Udall
Hillis	Nelson	Ullman
Holland	Nichols	Van Deerlin
Holt	Nolan	Vanik
Horton	Nowak	Vento
Howard	O'Brien	Volkmer
Hubbard	Oakar	Wampler
Huckaby	Oberstar	Waxman
Hutto	Ottinger	White
Hyde	Patten	Whitley
Jenrette	Patterson	Whitten
Johnson, Calif.	Pease	Williams, Ohio
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wilson, Bob
Jones, N.C.	Perkins	Wilson, C. H.
Jones, Tenn.	Peyser	Wilson, Tex.
Kildee	Pickle	Winn
Kogovsek	Preyer	Wirth
LaFalce	Price	Wolf
Leach, La.	Pritchard	Wright
Lederer	Pursell	Wyatt
Tehman	Quillen	Wyllie
Leland	Rahall	Yates
Lent	Rallsback	Vatron
Lewis	Rangel	Young, Mo.
Livingston	Regula	Zablocki
Lloyd	Reuss	Zeferetti
Long, La.	Rhodes	
Lonz, Md.		

NAYS—147

Abdnor	Daschle	Ireland
Anthony	Deckard	Jacobs
Applegate	Derwinski	Jeffords
Archer	Devine	Jeffries
Ashbrook	Dicks	Jenkins
Atkinson	Dodd	Jones, Okla.
AuCoin	Edwards, Calif.	Kastenmeier
Badham	Edwards, Okla.	Kazen
Bafalis	English	Kelly
Barnard	Evans, Ind.	Kemp
Bauman	Fascell	Kindness
Beard, Tenn.	Fenwick	Kostmayer
Bellenson	Fithian	Kramer
Bethune	Fowler	Lacomarsino
Broomfield	Gaydos	Latta
Brown, Calif.	Glickman	Leach, Iowa
Burton, John	Goldwater	Leath, Tex.
Bvron	Gooding	Lee
Cambell	Gradison	Levitas
Carney	Gramm	Loeffler
Carr	Grassley	Lott
Cheney	Guyer	Lowry
Clausen	Hagedorn	Lunnen
Cleveland	Hall, Tex.	McCormack
Clinger	Hammer-	McDonald
Coleman	schmidt	Martin
Collins, Tex.	Hance	Mikulski
Coughlin	Hansen	Miller, Calif.
Courter	Harsha	Miller, Ohio
Crane, Daniel	Finson	Moorhead,
Crane, Phillip	Hollenbeck	Calif.
D'Amours	Holtzman	Murphy, Pa.
Daniel, Dan	Hopkins	Mvers, Ind.
Daniel, R. W.	Hughes	Obey
Dannemeyer	Ichord	Panetta

Pashayan	Sawyer	Trible
Paul	Schroeder	Vander Jagt
Petri	Schulze	Walgren
Quayle	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Ratchford	Shumway	Watkins
Richmond	Shuster	Weaver
Ritter	Snyder	Weiss
Roberts	Solomon	Whitehurst
Robinson	Spence	Whittaker
Roth	Stangeland	Williams, Mont.
Rousselot	Stenholm	Wolpe
Rudd	Stockman	Wydler
Runnels	Studds	Young, Alaska
Santini	Stump	Young, Fla.
Satterfield	Symms	

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson, Ill.	Emery	Gibbons
Boggs	Erlenborn	Hall, Ohio
Bolling	Flood	Madigan
Brown, Ohio	Forsythe	Scheuer
Conyers	Gialmo	Taylor

□ 1640

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Emery.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Forsythe.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Madigan.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Hall of Ohio with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. 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 pertinent extraneous matter, on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT ON THURSDAY, JULY 19, 1979, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit on Thursday, July 19, 1979, while the House is reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 210, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ORGANIZATION ACT OF 1979

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendments to the Senate bill (S. 210) to establish a Department of Education, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule XX of the rules of the House and the direct instructions of the Committee on Government Operations, I move that the House insist on its amendments to the Senate bill (S. 210) to establish a Department of Education, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Government Operations, I have asked that we go to conference. I do not intend to take much of the time of the House. It is essential as part of the legislative process that when the House and Senate disagree on a bill, they go to conference and try to work out their differences.

This is usually done by unanimous consent, but in this case the opponents of the bill, which was passed last week, to establish a Department of Education have indicated their objection. So under the House rules, the Committee on Government Operations has authorized and directed me to offer this motion.

If the motion is approved, it will simply permit the conference procedure to go forward and permit the conferees to bring back a conference report to the House for its acceptance or rejection. That is all it does. It is simply a motion to go to conference instead of a unanimous-consent request to go to conference. It preserves all the rights of the Members to vote the conference report up or down when it comes back.

Mr. Speaker, this is nothing but a routine procedural step, and I urge approval of the motion.

□ 1650

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN).

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, this is, as the gentleman from Texas suggested, a somewhat unusual procedure, but it is not without precedent. We have in the past gone this route of having a vote—and I hope in this case it would be record vote—on a motion to send the bill to conference.

Ordinarily, it is not necessary to have a procedure such as this because the general practice of the House is followed in most cases.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened in this case is, this bill, S. 210, passed the House last week. It has been held in the House and is still in the House and has not been transmitted to the Senate.

By requesting the conference at this time, as the gentleman from Texas has done with his motion, we become the first of the two bodies to act in requesting a conference. Then, under the procedures of the Congress, after the conference

committee completes its work, the conference report will go to the other body first. If the other body then adopts the conference report and discharges the conferees, when the conference report is considered in the House there will be no motion to recommit the conference report to the conference.

If the usual procedure of the House had been followed, the bill would already be over in the other body, and they would make the request. That would protect the right of the House to have a motion to recommit either with or without instructions when the conference committee report was considered.

It was because the managers of this bill have not followed the usual procedure that it is necessary in the protection of the prerogatives of the House that this objection was made by me a moment ago, and I am going to request a record vote on sending the bill to conference. If we want to protect the prerogatives of the House, we will vote no on the motion to go to conference.

There is another good reason to do this. There are four highly controversial amendments, four or more, in the bill under consideration, one on busing, one on quotas, one on prayer in the school, and one on abortion.

There have been rumors in the debate last week, calls by some Members, for removing these amendments, most of which passed by a better than a 2-to-1 margin in the House, removing them in the conference. The only way we can protect those amendments as adopted overwhelming margins in the House is to retain the right to the motion to recommit.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit the House must today vote no on the motion to go to conference so that we can protect our prerogatives.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that he was in doubt.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 263, nays 156, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—263

Akaka	Boggs	Clay
Albosta	Boland	Clinger
Alexander	Boner	Coelho
Anderson,	Bonior	Collins, Ill.
Calif.	Bouquard	Conte
Andrews, N.C.	Brademas	Corcoran
Andrews,	Breaux	Corman
N. Dak.	Brinkley	Cotter
Anthony	Brodhead	Coughlin
Ashley	Brooks	D'Amours
Aspin	Brown, Calif.	Daniel, Dan
Atkinson	Broyhill	Danielson
AuCoin	Buchanan	Daschle
Baldus	Burison	Davis, Mich.
Barnard	Burton, John	Davis, S.C.
Barnes	Burton, Phillip	Dellums
Beard, R.I.	Carr	Derrick
Bedell	Cavanaugh	Dicks
Beilenson	Chappell	Diggs
Benjamin	Chisholm	Dingell
Bevill	Clausen	Dixon

Dodd
Donnelly
Dougherty
Downey
Drinan
Duncan, Tenn.
Early
Eckhardt
Edgar
Edwards, Calif.
English
Erdahl
Ertel
Evans, Ind.
Fary
Fascel
Fazio
Fenwick
Fish
Fisher
Fithian
Filippo
Florio
Foley
Ford, Mich.
Ford, Tenn.
Fowler
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gephardt
Glaimo
Gilman
Gingrich
Ginn
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gore
Gramm
Gray
Grisham
Guarini
Gudger
Hall, Ohio
Hamilton
Hanley
Harkin
Harris
Hawkins
Heckler
Hefner
Hefel
Hillis
Holland
Hollenbeck
Horton
Howard
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Jennette
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, N.C.

Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kildee
Kogovsek
LaFalce
Leach, Iowa
Leath, Tex.
Lee
Lehman
Leland
Levitas
Lewis
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lowry
Lujan
Lundine
McCormack
McHugh
McKay
Magdian
Maguire
Markey
Marks
Matsui
Mattox
Mavroules
Mazzoli
Mica
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Mineta
Mitchell, Md.
Moakley
Moffett
Mollohan
Moorhead, Pa.
Mottl
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murphy, Pa.
Murtha
Natcher
Neal
Nedzi
Nelson
Nichols
Nolan
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ottinger
Panetta
Pashayan
Patten
Patterson
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Preyer
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall

Rallsback
Rangel
Ratchford
Reuss
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Runnels
Russo
Sabo
Santini
Scheuer
Schroeder
Selberling
Shannon
Sharp
Shelby
Simon
Skelton
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Spellman
St Germain
Stack
Staggers
Stark
Steed
Stewart
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tauke
Thompson
Traxler
Trible
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vento
Volkmmer
Walgren
Wampler
Waxman
Weaver
White
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams, Mont.
Williams, Ohio
Wilson, C. H.
Wilson, Tex.
Wirth
Wolfe
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Zablocki

NAYS—156

Abdnor
Addabbo
Ambo
Annunzio
Applegate
Archer
Ashbrook
Badham
Bafalis
Balley
Bauman
Beard, Tenn.
Bennett
Bereuter
Bethune
Blaggi
Bingham
Bowen
Broomfield
Burgener
Butler
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Carter
Cheney
Cleveland
Coleman
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Courtner
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Phillip
Daniel, R. W.
Dannemeyer

de la Garza
Deckard
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dornan
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Okla.
Erlenborn
Evans, Del.
Ferraro
Findley
Fountain
Frenzel
Gaydos
Goldwater
Goodling
Gradison
Grassley
Green
Guyer
Hagedorn
Hall, Tex.
Hammer
Hanschmidt
Hance
Hansen
Harsha
Hightower
Hinson
Holt
Hopkins
Hyde
Ichord

Jeffries
Johnson, Colo.
Kelly
Kemp
Kindness
Kostmayer
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach, La.
Lederer
Lent
Livingston
Loeffler
Long, Md.
Lott
Luken
Lungren
McClory
McCloskey
McDade
McDonald
McEwen
McKinney
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin
Michel
Mikulski
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mitchell, N.Y.
Montgomery
Moore

Moorhead, Calif.
Myers, Ind.
Myers, Pa.
Nowak
O'Brien
Paul
Peyser
Pickle
Quayle
Regula
Rhodes
Richmond
Ritter
Robinson
Rosenthal
Roth
Roussetot

Royer
Rudd
Satterfield
Sawyer
Schulze
Sebellus
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Shuster
Smith, Nebr.
Snowe
Snyder
Solazar
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stanton
Stenholm

Stockman
Stratton
Stump
Symms
Thomas
Treen
Vander Jagt
Walker
Watkins
Weiss
Whitehurst
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wydler
Wyllie
Yatron
Young, Mo.
Zeferetti

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson, Ill.
Blanchard
Bolling
Bonker
Brown, Ohio

Conyers
Emery
Evans, Ga.
Flood
Forsythe

Gibbons
Holtzman
Mathis
Rodino
Taylor

□ 1700

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Ms. Holtzman for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Emery against.
Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Mathis with Mr. Evans of Georgia.
Mr. Bonker with Mr. Forsythe.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Blanchard.

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

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

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1710

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALKER moves that the managers on the part of the House and the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate bill S. 210 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in section 101 (2).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an attempt on my part to assure that the conference will look favorably on language that this House adopted by a vote of 277 to 126. This is specifically the language which was put into the purpose section of the bill which defines the antiquota portion of the legislation passed by the House.

The Members may remember that the language we adopted said that there is a continuous need to insure equal access for all Americans to educational opportunities of a high quality and that no individual should be denied such educational opportunities by rules, regulations, standards, guidelines and orders which utilize any ratios, quotas, or other numerical requirements related to race, creed, color, national origin or sex. In other words, this is specifically antidiscrimination legislation.

I make a very specific point here that this is not anti-affirmative-action legisla-

tion or language. I have said time and time again, I have argued this specific language on the floor that in no way does this impact on real affirmative action where there is an attempt to reach out to minorities, where there is an attempt to really help people in their upward mobility. What this does is deny the use of quotas. We have argued this matter in this House many times previously and we have come to the conclusion in this House time and time again that we do not want quotas as a part of American life.

The reason why we should provide instruction language, even on something that was passed as overwhelmingly as 277 to 126 previously, is because this amendment was mentioned over and over again in the debate as being a mischievous amendment, that there was something wrong with this amendment and with language being adopted by the House, and somehow we were doing something that was not educational in nature.

I would say that the Office of Education has been one of those areas that has been very much involved in the whole quota philosophy. If we are going to end quotas in our society, one of the places we are going to have to do it is in the field of education because we have seen in higher education quotas imposed on institutions of higher learning. We have seen quotas imposed on local school districts, and this is what this language is all about, to make certain that a new Department of Education would not use the quota philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this language was mentioned even in the well of the House as we were about to pass this legislation as being one of those things which the conferees would have to strip out in order to get a few votes to pass a conference report. Well, I think it is time that the House goes on record again to show that we do, in fact, mean what we say about antiquota language, that we do, in fact, mean that this Department should stay away from the use of quotas, and that is what this language would do on the motion to instruct. I would ask the House to vote in favor of the motion to instruct.

□ 1720

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

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, one can understand that I am, of course, opposed to this motion. I do not think we need a whole lot of discussion about it. I am opposed generally to motions to instruct conferees even when I am not a conferee.

The whole idea of a conference between the House and Senate is to try to come up with some compromise between the differing positions of the two bodies. There has to be some give-and-take if we are ever going to get to a final agreement. The effort to instruct conferees works against that hope of compromise. It says to the Senate, "You give and we will take."

That is not the way everybody gets together. I have said that I will do all I can to sustain the House position, but I

have also said that I am not going to stand by and see this conference end in a deadlock. My main purpose in going to conference is to work out an agreement that will lead to the establishment of a Department of Education. Now, that is not the purpose of the Member who has offered this amendment and who is now insisting on instructing the conferees.

So, I hope the motion will be defeated. I hope the House will stand by its conferees by trusting them to do the best job they can. I assure the Members that I will do the best job I can to bring back a bill that will have the support of a substantial majority of the House Members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a no vote on the motion.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees. Let me say at the outset that I seldom have voted for a motion to instruct. I think, as the gentleman from Texas has aptly put it, the conferees should be given freedom to adjust the differences in a give-and-take atmosphere, the differences between the two bodies.

But, here we have a situation that is somewhat different. I expect, by the way, to be one of the conferees, and I do not take it as a personal affront that the gentleman is making this motion to instruct me and the conferees as to what the House would like us to do. Why do I say that this is different than the usual situation? It is because it was an open secret that prior to the passage of the bill last week there were indications that this and other amendments would be stripped out of the bill in the conference. The gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) took the well last week and conditioned his support in voting on the bill on this and other amendments being taken out of the bill. Newspaper stories prior to the passage of the bill indicated that those White House lobbyists and the NEA lobbyists were promising Members that if they voted for passage of the bill these amendments would come out in conference.

With that as a background, with the lack of any secrecy about the intentions of at least some people who are an influence over the course of this legislation intending not to stand up for the House position, I think it is altogether fitting and proper that this motion be made and that it be passed by a vote of 277 to 126, as was the amendment itself.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the motion to instruct would be supported.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have had the honor and privilege of serving on a number of conferences since I have been in this House. I have been a conferee on the Budget Committee, on the various housing committees, and on small business and other areas. It is awfully hard for me to deter-

mine any circumstance—any circumstance—under which we should instruct conferees. It is just exceedingly difficult for me to accept that as a political, philosophical way of life when the design of the conference is to give latitude for movement.

I know the gentleman wants to protect his nonantiaffirmative action amendment—it is nonantiaffirmative. I know he wants to protect that, and I can understand that, but there is a larger issue. I do not think this House wants to start the practice of capriciously instructing conferees everytime there is an amendment a Member has an intense interest in. Also, I do not think this House wants to start instructing conferees on the basis of rumors, stories, rumors that are made about what might happen in conference and who has promised what to whom or under what circumstance. That is Washington. That is the way we operate in terms of these stories and rumors.

If this House is going to degrade its dignity to instruct conferees on the basis of rumors floating around, that is almost disgraceful.

I hope that we would vote down this rush to a very dangerous development to harm this House.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out to the gentleman that this is not a capricious action, by any stretch of the imagination. I picked the amendment that had the biggest vote on the House floor. This was by far the one in which the House has shown the most interest. I would also say to the gentleman that it is more than rumors we are dealing with; it is specific statements on the RECORD, on the House floor, that dealt with the deletion of specific amendments in the conference.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 214, nays 202, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

YEAS—214

Abdnor	Breaux	Crane, Phillip
Ambro	Brinkley	D'Amours
Annunzio	Broomfield	Daniel, Dan
Applegate	Broyhill	Daniel, R. W.
Archer	Burgener	Dannemeyer
Ashbrook	Butler	Davis, Mich.
Atkinson	Byron	de la Garza
AuCoin	Campbell	Deckard
Badham	Carney	Derwinski
Bafalis	Carter	Devine
Bailey	Chappell	Dickinson
Barnard	Cheney	Dingell
Bauman	Clausen	Donnelly
Beard, Tenn.	Cleveland	Dornan
Bennett	Clinger	Dougherty
Bereuter	Coelho	Duncan, Tenn.
Bethune	Coleman	Early
Bevill	Collins, Tex.	Edwards, Ala.
Biaggi	Conable	Edwards, Okla.
Boland	Coughlin	English
Boner	Courter	Erdahl
Bowen	Crane, Daniel	Erlenborn

Evans, Del.	Levitas	Royer
Evans, Ind.	Lewis	Rudd
Ferraro	Livingston	Russo
Findley	Loeffler	Satterfield
Flippo	Long, Md.	Sawyer
Fountain	Lott	Scheuer
Frenzel	Luken	Schulze
Gaydos	Lungren	Sebelius
Gingrich	McClory	Sensenbrenner
Glickman	McCloskey	Sharp
Goldwater	McDade	Shelby
Goodling	McDonald	Shumway
Gradison	McEwen	Shuster
Gramm	McKay	Skelton
Grassley	Madigan	Slack
Grisham	Marlenee	Smith, Nebr.
Guyer	Marriott	Snowe
Hagedorn	Martin	Snyder
Hall, Tex.	Mathis	Solomon
Hamilton	Mica	Spence
Hammer-	Michel	Stangeland
schmidt	Miller, Ohio	Stanton
Hanley	Minish	Stenholm
Hansen	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stockman
Harsha	Moakley	Stratton
Heckler	Montgomery	Stump
Hinson	Moore	Symms
Holt	Moorhead,	Tauke
Hopkins	Calif.	Thomas
Hubbard	Mottl	Treen
Huckaby	Murphy, Pa.	Trible
Hutto	Murtha	Vander Jagt
Hyde	Myers, Ind.	Walker
Ichord	Myers, Pa.	Wampler
Jeffries	Neal	Watkins
Jenkins	Nelson	Waxman
Jones, Okla.	Nichols	White
Kazen	O'Brien	Whitehurst
Kelly	Pashayan	Whittaker
Kemp	Paul	Whitten
Kindness	Quayle	Wilson, Bob
Kostmayer	Quillen	Wilson, Tex.
Kramer	Regula	Winn
Lagomarsino	Rhodes	Wolff
Latta	Rinaldo	Wyatt
Leach, Iowa	Ritter	Wydler
Leach, La.	Roberts	Wyllie
Lederer	Robinson	Yatron
Lee	Roth	Young, Fla.
Lent	Rousselot	Zerfetti

NAYS—202

Addabbo	Edgar	Kastenmeier
Akaka	Edwards, Calif.	Kildee
Albosta	Ertel	Kogovsek
Alexander	Fary	Leath, Tex.
Anderson,	Fascell	Lehman
Calif.	Fazio	Leland
Andrews, N.C.	Fenwick	Lloyd
Andrews,	Fish	Long, La.
N. Dak.	Fisher	Lowry
Anthony	Pithian	Lujan
Ashley	Florio	Lundine
Aspin	Foley	McCormack
Baldus	Ford, Mich.	McHugh
Barnes	Ford, Tenn.	McKinney
Beard, R.I.	Fowler	Maguire
Bedell	Frost	Markey
Bellenson	Fuqua	Marks
Benjamin	Garcia	Matsui
Bingham	Gephardt	Mattox
Boggs	Glamo	Mavroules
Bonior	Gilman	Mazzoli
Bonker	Ginn	Mikulski
Bouquard	Gonzalez	Mikva
Brademas	Gore	Miller, Calif.
Brodhead	Gray	Mineta
Brooks	Green	Mitchell, Md.
Brown, Calif.	Guarini	Moffett
Buchanan	Gudger	Mollohan
Burlison	Hall, Ohio	Moorhead, Pa.
Burton, John	Hance	Murphy, Ill.
Burton, Phillip	Harkin	Murphy, N.Y.
Carr	Harris	Natcher
Cavanaugh	Hawkins	Nedzi
Chisholm	Hefner	Nolan
Clay	Hefel	Nowak
Collins, Ill.	Hightower	Onkar
Conte	Hillis	Oberstar
Corcoran	Holland	Obey
Corman	Hollenbeck	Ottiger
Cotter	Holtzman	Panetta
Danielson	Horton	Patten
Daschle	Howard	Patterson
Dellums	Hughes	Pease
Derrick	Ireland	Pepper
Dicks	Jacobs	Perkins
Dixon	Jeffords	Petri
Dodd	Jenrette	Peysner
Downey	Johnson, Calif.	Pickle
Drinan	Johnson, Colo.	Preyer
Duncan, Oreg.	Jones, N.C.	Price
Eckhardt	Jones, Tenn.	Pritchard

Pursell	Shannon	Udall
Rahall	Simon	Ullman
Railsback	Smith, Iowa	Van Deerin
Rangel	Solarz	Vanik
Ratchford	Spellman	Vento
Reuss	St Germain	Volkmer
Richmond	Stack	Walgren
Rodino	Staggers	Weaver
Roe	Stark	Weiss
Rose	Steed	Whitley
Rosenthal	Stewart	Williams, Mont.
Rostenkowski	Stokes	Williams, Ohio
Roybal	Studds	Wirth
Sabo	Swift	Wolpe
Santini	Synar	Young, Mo.
Schroeder	Thompson	Zablocki
Seiberling	Traxler	

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson, Ill.	Diggs	LaFalce
Blanchard	Emery	Runnels
Bolling	Evans, Ga.	Taylor
Brown, Ohio	Flood	Wilson, C. H.
Conyers	Forsythe	Wright
Davis, S.C.	Gibbons	Young, Alaska

□ 1740

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Emery for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Blanchard with Mr. Runnels.

Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Wright.

Mr. Evans of Georgia with Mr. Young of Alaska.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Forsythe.

Mr. LaFalce with Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. COELHO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the preferential motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BROOKS, FUQUA, MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, FASCELL, ST GERMAIN, LEVITAS, HORTON, ERLBORN, and STANGELAND.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1979

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3875) to amend and extend certain Federal laws relating to housing, community, and neighborhood development and preservation, and related programs, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. REUSS, ASHLEY, MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, ST GERMAIN, GONZALEZ, FAUNTROY, PATTERSON, AU COIN, LUNDINE, VENTO, STANTON, WYLE, MCKINNEY, KELLY, and EVANS of Delaware.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4040, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION, 1980

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 96-347) on the resolution (H. Res. 368) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4040) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1980 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and for civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, to authorize the military training student loads, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1980 for civil defense, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2859, DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1979

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-346) on the resolution (H. Res. 367) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2859), to authorize appropriations for programs under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, to amend such act to facilitate the improvement of programs carried out thereunder, to authorize urban volunteer programs, and for other purposes which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3282, ASBESTOS SCHOOL HAZARD DETECTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1979

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-345) on the resolution (H. Res. 366) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3282) to establish a program for the inspection of schools to detect the presence of hazardous asbestos materials, to provide loans to local educational agencies to contain or remove hazardous asbestos materials from schools and to replace such materials with other suitable building materials, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3434, SOCIAL SERVICES AND CHILD WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1979

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-344) on the resolution (H. Res. 365), providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3434) to amend the Social Security Act to make needed improvements in the child welfare and social services programs, to strengthen and improve the program of Federal support for foster care of needy and dependent children, to establish a program of Federal support to

encourage adoptions of children with special needs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4007, FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX AMENDMENTS

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-342) on the resolution (H. Res. 363) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4007) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the provisions which increase the Federal unemployment tax in States which have outstanding loans will not apply if the State makes certain repayments, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3398, AGRICULTURE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1979

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-343) on the resolution (H. Res. 364) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3398) to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 relating to increases in the target prices of the 1979 crops of wheat, corn, and other crops under certain circumstances, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—ATTIRE OF MALE MEMBERS OF HOUSE DURING SUMMER MONTHS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 369) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 369

Whereas traditions of the House require that male Members wear coats and ties at all times in the Chamber

Whereas national energy conservation policies now require that temperatures in the Chamber, The Capitol and House Office Buildings be maintained at new and higher levels during the summer months, causing unnecessary discomfort and inefficiency for male Members and employees; now therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that during the period June 1st to Labor Day in 1979 and each year the current energy or conservation policies are required (as determined by the Speaker for 1980 and subsequent years), Members may dispense with coats and/or ties so long as suitable, dignified, tasteful and appropriate clothes are worn; be it further

Resolved, That at all other times and in all other respects traditional attire shall be appropriate.

□ 1750

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BAUMAN

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BAUMAN moves to table the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion to table.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UDALL) there were—yeas 89, nays 31.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 303, nays 105, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

YEAS—303

Abdnor	Drinan	Lederer
Addabbo	Duncan, Tenn.	Lee
Akaka	Early	Levitas
Alexander	Eckhardt	Lewis
Andrews, N.C.	Edwards, Ala.	Livingston
Andrews,	Edwards, Okla.	Lloyd
N. Dak.	English	Loeffler
Annunzio	Erdahl	Long, La.
Anthony	Erlenborn	Long, Md.
Archer	Evans, Del.	Lott
Ashbrook	Evans, Ga.	Lowry
Ashley	Evans, Ind.	Lujan
Atkinson	Fary	Lungren
AuCoin	Fenwick	McClory
Badham	Fish	McCloskey
Bafalis	Fisher	McDade
Bailey	Fithian	McDonald
Barnard	Flippo	McHugh
Bauman	Foley	McKay
Beard, R.I.	Ford, Mich.	Madigan
Beard, Tenn.	Fountain	Marlenee
Bellenson	Fowler	Marriott
Benjamin	Frost	Martin
Bereuter	Fuqua	Mathis
Bethune	Gaydos	Matsui
Bevill	Gilman	Mavroules
Blaggi	Gingrich	Mazzoli
Boggs	Ginn	Michel
Boland	Glickman	Miller, Ohio
Boner	Gonzalez	Mineta
Bonker	Gooding	Minish
Bowen	Gore	Mitchell, Md.
Brademas	Gramm	Mitchell, N.Y.
Brinkley	Grassley	Moakley
Brooks	Grisham	Moffett
Broomfield	Guarini	Mollohan
Broyhill	Gudger	Montgomery
Buchanan	Guyer	Moore
Burgener	Hagedorn	Moorhead, Calif.
Burlison	Hall, Tex.	Moorhead, Pa.
Butler	Hamilton	Mottl
Byron	Hammer-	Murphy, Ill.
Campbell	schmidt	Murphy, N.Y.
Carney	Hance	Murphy, Pa.
Carr	Hanley	Murtha
Carter	Hansen	Myers, Ind.
Chappell	Harris	Myers, Pa.
Cheney	Harsha	Natcher
Chisholm	Hawkins	Neal
Clausen	Heckler	Nedzi
Cleveland	Heftel	Nelson
Clinger	Hightower	Nichols
Coleman	Hillis	O'Brien
Collins, Ill.	Hinson	Oberstar
Collins, Tex.	Holt	Panetta
Conable	Holtzman	Pashayan
Conte	Hopkins	Patten
Corcoran	Horton	Paul
Cotter	Hubbard	Pease
Coughlin	Huckaby	Perkins
Crane, Daniel	Hughes	Petri
Crane, Philip	Hutto	Pickle
Daniel, Dan	Hyde	Preyer
Daniel, R. W.	Ichord	Price
Danielson	Ireland	Quillen
Dannemeyer	Jeffries	Rahall
Davis, Mich.	Jenkins	Rangel
de la Garza	Johnson, Calif.	Regula
Deckard	Jones, Okla.	Rhodes
Derrick	Jones, Tenn.	Richmond
Devine	Kazen	Rinaldo
Dickinson	Kelly	Ritter
Dicks	Kemp	Roberts
Dingell	Kildee	Robinson
Dixon	Kindness	Roe
Dodd	Kostmayer	Rosenthal
Donnelly	Lagomarsino	Rostenkowski
Dornan	Latta	Roth
Dougherty	Leach, La.	

Rousselot
Roybal
Royer
Rudd
Russo
Satterfield
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schulze
Sebelius
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Simon
Skelton
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Nebr.
Snyder
Solomon

Spellman
Spence
St Germain
Stack
Staggers
Stangeland
Stanton
Stenholm
Stewart
Stockman
Stokes
Stump
Swift
Tauke
Thomas
Traxler
Treen
Tribie
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Walker

Wampler
Watkins
Weaver
Weiss
White
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Williams, Ohio
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wirth
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, Mo.
Zablocki
Zeferetti

NAYS—105

Albosta	Gephardt	Nowak
Ambro	Goldwater	Oakar
Anderson,	Gradison	Obey
Calif.	Gray	Ottinger
Aspin	Green	Patterson
Baldus	Hall, Ohio	Peyser
Barnes	Harkin	Pritchard
Bedell	Hefner	Quayle
Bennett	Holland	Railsback
Bingham	Hollenbeck	Ratchford
Bonior	Howard	Reuss
Bouquard	Jacobs	Rose
Breaux	Jeffords	Runnels
Brodhead	Jenrette	Sabo
Burton, Phillip	Jones, N.C.	Santini
Cavanaugh	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Clay	Kogovsek	Selberling
Coelho	Kramer	Snowe
Corman	Leach, Iowa	Solarz
Courter	Leath, Tex.	Steed
D'Amours	Lehman	Stratton
Daschle	Leland	Studds
Davis, S.C.	Lent	Symms
Dellums	Luken	Synar
Derwinski	Lundine	Thompson
Downey	McCormack	Udall
Edgar	McEwen	Vento
Edwards, Calif.	McKinney	Volkmer
Ertel	Maguire	Walgren
Fascell	Marks	Whittaker
Fazio	Mattox	Williams, Mont.
Ferraro	Mica	Wilson, Tex.
Findley	Mikulski	Wolff
Florio	Mikva	Wolpe
Ford, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.	
Garcia	Nolan	

NOT VOTING—26

Anderson, Ill.	Duncan, Oreg.	Markey
Applegate	Emery	Pepper
Blanchard	Flood	Pursell
Bolling	Forsythe	Rodino
Brown, Calif.	Frenzel	Stark
Brown, Ohio	Gialmo	Taylor
Burton, John	Gibbons	Waxman
Conyers	Johnson, Colo.	Wilson, C. H.
Diggs	LaFalce	

□ 1800

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

Ms. HOLTZMAN changed her vote from "present" to "yea."

So the preferential motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1810

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—DECORUM AND DIGNITY OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 370) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 370

Whereas the Speaker has made an announcement to the House with regard to the appropriate attire while Members are in the Hall of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas in accordance with the customs and precedents of the House with regard to decorum and dignity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in order to maintain that decorum and dignity, Members should be required to wear proper attire as determined by the Speaker and may not be admitted to the Hall of the House of Representatives unless in compliance with the Speaker's announcement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.) for 1 hour.

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I think we would all agree that there is far more important business to come before the House yet this evening than this vote or the proceeding for that matter.

I think the Speaker described the situation very well today and put it in proper perspective, and the Speaker said it is a question of the dignity of the House and the duty of all of us to uphold that dignity.

The Speaker pointed out, in earlier times, people wore much more burdensome clothing than we wear now; and there was no air-conditioning then.

The gentleman from Arizona said something about discomfort and inefficiency. Well, I would like for him to speak for himself, because I do not feel uncomfortable or inefficient myself.

In the interest of time, I would ask for a vote.

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

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri for one question.

Mr. VOLKMER. What is the cost of the amount of energy that is used to keep this room at the temperature it is?

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. I do not think that is really central to the question, I would respond to the gentleman.

I think that dignity of the House is a higher consideration.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1980

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolutions 353 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 353

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4473) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes, all points of order against the following provisions in said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 and 6, rule XXI, are hereby waived: beginning on page 2, line 5 through line 24; beginning on page 4 line 22 through page 8, line 22; beginning on page 9, line 8 through

page 10, line 13; beginning on page 11, lines 1 through 5; beginning on page 11, line 16 through page 13, line 25; beginning on page 16, lines 15 through 23; beginning on page 18, line 21 through page 19, line 9; beginning on page 20, lines 18 through 22; and beginning on page 21, line 6 through page 22, line 11.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DERRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 353 provides for the consideration of H.R. 4473 making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for fiscal year 1980.

As Members are aware, appropriation bills are privileged under rule 24 of the rules of the House and may be brought up for consideration without a rule. However, in some instances, the Appropriations Committee requests a rule to waive points of order which lie against an appropriation measure in order that the House may consider the legislation in an orderly manner without delay.

House Resolution 353 provides for waivers of clauses 2 and 6 of rule 21. Clause 2, rule 21, prohibits an appropriation for any expenditure not previously authorized by law and further prohibits legislation in an appropriation bill. This waiver is the one most commonly requested by the Committee on Appropriations.

With the implementation of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act, the Congress must complete action on all appropriations prior to adoption of the second concurrent budget resolution. This tighter legislative schedule does, of necessity, require waivers for measures not yet authorized by law.

Clause 6 prohibits the consideration of an appropriation bill or amendment if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations. This is necessary because section 503 of the bill makes available up to \$24 million of unobligated funds for use in fiscal year 1980.

Under title I of H.R. 4473, authorizations for the Inter-American development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Fund and the international organizations and programs are included in two bills, H.R. 3829, authorizations for international development banks which the committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs has reported to the House, and H.R. 3324, the International Development Cooperation Act of 1979, which has passed both bodies and is scheduled for conference.

In title II of the bill, waivers are granted to the paragraphs which appropriate funds for basic economic assistance programs, security assistance programs, migration and refugee assistance, and emergency refugee and migration assistance due to lack of authorizations. Three of the four authorization bills have already passed both houses.

Under title III, authorizations for military assistance, international military education and training and foreign mili-

tary credit sales are included in the International Security Assistance Act of 1979, H.R. 3173, which the House passed on March 29 and the Senate passed on May 22.

Finally, under the general provisions title of the bill, title 5, waivers are granted to section 503 which reappropriates unobligated balances, section 512 Concerning human rights, section 513 prohibiting aid to Mozambique, section 521 a provision dealing with the availability of documents in the international financial institutions, and to sections 523 and 524 which again this year include provisions dealing with the prohibition of financing the production of surplus commodities for export.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign assistance appropriations bill for fiscal 1980 contains recommended appropriations of \$7.8 billion in new budget authority which is \$1.2 billion below what the executive branch requested. Included in the recommended appropriation is \$2.7 billion for six international financial institutions, of which \$1.1 billion is for callable capital which will, theoretically, never result in any budgetary outlays. Approximately 28 percent of the total recommended appropriation is to carry out the middle east programs. The Foreign Operations Subcommittee has reported a bill which reasonably balances the need for fiscal restraint with our international responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt House resolution 353 so that we may proceed to the consideration of this important legislation.

□ 1820

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of one of the most controversial of all our appropriation—the foreign assistance and related programs appropriation bill for fiscal year 1980, H.R. 4473. Due to the lack of prior authorization and the inclusion of legislation on a general appropriation bill, clause 2 of rule XXI is waived. Further, clause 6 of rule XXI also is waived because the bill contains reappropriations of unobligated balances.

These waivers apply to so many items in the bill it would almost be easier to list the items against which no points of order would lie. Suffice it to say that over half of H.R. 4473 would be subject to points of order were it not for this rule.

This year's foreign assistance appropriation does not include funding for the International Monetary Fund. If we discount for this item, the fiscal year 1980 appropriation is approximately \$432.3 million more than the amount recommended in the fiscal year 1979 appropriation. As a result, this year's bill actually represents about a 6-percent increase over last year's level. In this connection, it should also be mentioned that the total amount of the fiscal year 1980 bill is below the administration's budget request by \$1.2 billion and is below the amount allocated in the first concurrent resolution on the budget by around \$267 million. The Appropriations Committee, especially the gentleman from Florida, the ranking minority

member of the subcommittee, is to be congratulated.

Even so, Mr. Speaker, foreign aid in any form has become a less than popular term in these days of budget consciousness. There remain areas in this bill where we can make substantial and constructive cuts. We simply cannot continue to bankroll the world. The load must be shared if we are to ever get out from under our mounting public debt and our unmanageable balance of payments deficit.

While I have no objections to the passage of this rule, I do intend to support efforts to trim the funding level in this bill during the amending process.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4473) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4473, with Mr. KAZEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the first reading of the bill.

□ 1830

Mr. BAUMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

□ 1840

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pur-

suant to rule XXIII, clause 2, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KAZEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4473) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes had come to no resolution thereon.

ALCOHOL ENGINE OFFERS NEW ENERGY CONCEPT

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced H.R. 4760, to provide the forum for debate and discussion on the concept of alcohol-fuel motor vehicles. Before I introduced my bill, I discussed the program with Mr. Edward Lipinsky, senior research leader of the alcohol-fueled motor vehicle program at Battelle, the largest private research organization of its kind in the world, which is in my district.

I would not have had the temerity to introduce such a bill were I not convinced that our dependence on OPEC can be greatly reduced by this process. The alcohol engine is here. It is not a year 2000 concept. The oil crisis is here. Twenty-six percent of all the oil we consume is used in the automobile. It is axiomatic that the automobile, not to speak of trucks, and mass transportation vehicles, are a way of American life and the cornerstone of our economy. But the automobile does not have to run on gas.

I am submitting a letter from Mr. Edward Lipinsky which confirms my belief, and in which he offers to provide Congress with some of his expertise on the subject. Mr. Lipinsky has an engine which runs from alcohol. I think it is something on which we should experiment and on which we should have discussion and debate.

If Ford Motor Co. can make an alcohol engine car for Brazil and Volkswagen can supply Brazil with an oil-free auto engine, why not here?

I hope you will take a look at the bill.

BATTELLE,

Columbus, Ohio, July 13, 1979.

Congressman CHALMERS WYLIE,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WYLIE: It was a pleasure to discuss the concept of alcohol-fueled motor vehicles with you yesterday by telephone. This letter is to provide you with some additional information on alcohol-

fueled engines and on opportunities to integrate the production of fuels for these engines from carbohydrate crops, forestry residues, and coal. My colleagues and I would be glad to supply additional information or answer your questions on these matters.

As you know, the U.S. Department of Energy has an alcohol fuels program. It is in the Office of Transportation Programs and is headed by E. Eugene Ecklund (376-4892). In that program, a number of contractors are dealing with the use of straight alcohol and gasoline/alcohol mixtures in internal combustion engines for highway vehicles. The efficient use of straight alcohol is being found to require significant engine modifications. For example, one of the contractors (Santa Clara University) modified a stock engine by increasing the compression ratio and modifying the carburetion system with good results.

The telephone company of Sao Paulo, Brazil has tested a Volkswagen design for several years. A limited production of Volkswagens modified to accept straight alcohol derived from sugarcane products is occurring during the 1980 model year. We have been informed that during the 1981 model year a standard VW capable of running on gasoline-free 95% ethanol-5% water will be offered. We are also informed that other automobile companies in Brazil also will make vehicles that use straight ethanol in 1981.

Engineers from Volkswagen Brazil presented a paper concerning the principle that they are using in adapting their standard engine for this purpose. This paper was presented at the 3rd International Symposium on Alcohol-Fuels Technology held at Asilomar, California. Some of the exhaust gases are used to heat the combustion air and to increase the vapor pressure of the ethanol just prior to combustion. Of special interest to you is a paper at the same conference by several Ford Motor Company engineering and research staff in the United States in collaboration with Ford of Brazil. They demonstrate a high level of awareness of the steps required to adapt an automobile for the use of straight alcohol.

With regard to the manufacture of sufficient alcohol fuels to replace significant quantities of gasoline, we at Battelle prefer an integrated approach over selecting one option. The United States needs the flexibility and increased availability that comes from the use of multiple resources. With technology we are developing at Battelle, manufacture of methanol using coal and woody raw materials (forests residues, agricultural residues, and forest-product industry residues) and ethanol from such carbohydrate crops as corn grain and sweet sorghum at an integrated facility appears to be feasible.

Of course, there are costs associated with anything new. Establishment of a major fuel production and distribution system would require high capital investments. As stated earlier, an automobile engine that is optimized for ordinary gasoline would require modifications to run efficiently on alcohol.

We would be glad to discuss further the pros and cons of alcohol-fueled vehicles with you at your convenience.

Cordially,

E. S. LIPINSKY,
Senior Research Leader.

LEGISLATION REQUIRING NEW LABELING FOR CONTRACEPTIVE PRODUCTS

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation requiring the manufacturers of contraceptive drugs and devices to label their products and to include in their advertising an indication of the effectiveness of these products in preventing pregnancy.

Research into the relative merits and the validity of various claims of effectiveness is incomplete at present, and there is an urgent need for studies of this sort to move forward expeditiously. My legislation in fact stipulates that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall develop a reliable standard for determining the effectiveness of contraceptive drugs and devices.

In addition to the effectiveness notice, the bill would mandate that contraceptive labeling include directions for use and a recommendation that professional advice be sought to determine the most appropriate form of contraception.

While available data are not yet fully conclusive, there are strong indications that many forms of contraception fail to fulfill the claims of their manufacturers. The consequences are often tragic for many families and couples.

One finding in this area comes from a preliminary panel report of the Food and Drug Administration dealing with contraceptives. In this 1978 study, the panel notes it has reviewed the claims made by the manufacturers of the various products under the purview. The panel tentatively concludes that "certain claims for effectiveness have been made in the past without adequate, valid supporting data."

Another disturbing finding on contraceptive effectiveness is contained in a 1978 FDA pamphlet entitled "Contraception: Comparing the Options." The report notes that of 100 women who use an IUD for 1 year, 1 to 6 will become pregnant. For every 100 women who use a diaphragm with a spermicidal product for 1 year, 2 to 20 will become pregnant. And of 100 women who use jellies and creams alone for 1 year, 4 to 36 will become pregnant.

Consumers of these drugs and devices have the right to be informed adequately as to the reliability of their chosen method of contraception. Failure rates should be truthfully presented to prospective purchasers so that they can make a crucial decision of this sort based on the most informed judgment possible. The results of unanticipated failure of one of these drugs or devices is frequently irreversible and always undesired.

A fully informed consumer's proper usage of contraceptives can significantly reduce the incidence of unwanted pregnancy and thereby decrease the need to make a choice about abortion. Unplanned pregnancies are not only a burden for many women and couples, they can also become a social and governmental burden as well. Reliable and safe contraception is an essential component of a high-quality health care system in our Nation.

As the Select Committee on Population concluded in its report to the 95th Congress on the importance of family

planning and contraceptive research in the United States:

Despite the "contraceptive revolution," many American men and women . . . still do not have effective, practical, safe and acceptable means of fertility regulation.

My bill would do much to meet this glaring need. I am very pleased that my colleagues HENRY WAXMAN, ANTHONY BEILENSON, BARBARA MIKULSKI, PARRIN MITCHELL, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, and ANDREW MAGUIRE are joining me in this effort to enact a very necessary piece of legislation. I invite other Members to join us in cosponsoring this bill.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 4834

A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that the label and advertising for contraceptive drugs and devices state the effectiveness of the drugs and devices in preventing conception in humans, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Contraceptive Labeling and Advertising Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 502 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 352) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(u) (1) If it is a drug or device to prevent conception in humans, unless—

"(A) its label states (i) in accordance with subparagraph (2), the effectiveness of the drug or device in preventing conception in humans, (ii) directions for use, and (iii) that professional advice should be sought to determine the most appropriate form of contraception; and

"(B) unless the manufacturer, packer, or distributor thereof includes in advertisements and other printed descriptive matter issued or caused to be issued by the manufacturer, packer, or distributor with respect to the drug or device such information respecting the effectiveness of the drug or device in preventing conception in humans as may be required under subparagraph (2).

"(2) The Secretary shall by regulation establish for drugs and devices subject to subparagraph (1) standards for determining the effectiveness of such drugs and devices in preventing conception in humans and the form and manner in which such effectiveness shall be stated in the labels of such drugs and devices and in advertisements and other printed descriptive matter for such drugs and devices."

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall first promulgate the regulation referred to in section 502(u) (2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (as added by subsection (a) of this section) not later than one hundred and eighty days after the date of the enactment of this Act. Such regulation shall take effect upon its promulgation.

ENERGY SCRAMBLE SEEN RISKING WAR

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

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, the July 4 edition of the Washington Star contained an article that had, among other things, to do with nuclear power. Strangely, the article was representative

of an interview with Anatoly P. Alexandrov, of the Soviet Union's Academy of Sciences, in which he says:

"You know that all gas and oil deposits are likely to run out in 30 to 50 years—Russia's may last close to 50 years—but in 30 years it is impossible to reorganize the world in terms of energy from coal.

"We must therefore build nuclear power reactors in all parts of the world, otherwise wars will one day be fought over the remnants of oil and gas deposits. And they will be wars, however peculiar this may sound, between the capitalist countries, because the Soviet Union will have concentrated on the production of nuclear power and be ahead of everybody else," the Soviet scientist declared.

Mr. Speaker, I think America and Americans are smarter than this. It is too bad that some of our leaders are not that smart.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the entire article for the further information of the Members:

[From the Washington Star, July 4, 1979]

SOVIETS CONSIDER NUCLEAR POWER VITAL: ENERGY SCRAMBLE SEEN RISKING WAR

(By Henry Brandon)

Moscow.—Without the development of nuclear power as a source of energy, the competition for energy sources in the world could ultimately lead to war, the president of the Soviet Academy of Science warns.

Resistance to the development of nuclear power as an energy source, Anatoly P. Alexandrov said in an exclusive interview, poses more danger for mankind than the original splitting of the atom.

Alexandrov, a nuclear physicist and director of the I. V. Kurchatov Institute for Atomic Energy, blamed regulations in the United States, inadequate safety standards, incompetent supervisory personnel and the news media for the harm done to the use of nuclear energy.

Also present at the interview was Nikolai Inozemtsev, the director of Moscow's prestigious Institute for World Economics and International Relations.

A member of the Academy of Sciences and, like Alexandrov, a member of the Communist Party's Central Committee, Inozemtsev cautioned that a shift of priorities from military to civilian production cannot even begin until the SALT II treaty has been ratified by the U.S. Congress.

The influence of scientists in the Soviet governmental decisionmaking process, Inozemtsev said, exceeded that of their counterparts in the United States.

Alexandrov was interviewed in his spacious office at the headquarters of the Academy of Sciences, located in a well-kept 18th century mansion built for Catherine the Great.

On the future of nuclear power plants, Alexandrov opened his discussion with a reminder that even early in the Middle East conflict, when there was no energy crisis the United States began talking about the possibility of having to protect its oil imports by force of arms.

"You know that all gas and oil deposits are likely to run out in 30 to 50 years—Russia's may last close to 50 years—but in 30 years it is impossible to reorganize the world in terms of energy from coal," Alexandrov said.

"We must therefore build nuclear power reactors in all parts of the world, otherwise wars will one day be fought over the remnants of oil and gas deposits. And they will be wars, however peculiar this may sound, between the capitalist countries, because the Soviet Union will have concentrated on the production of nuclear power and be

ahead of everybody else," the Soviet scientist declared.

Alexandrov suspects opponents of nuclear power fear it because they believe a nuclear power plant failure can lead to an atomic bomb explosion akin to that of Hiroshima.

"They have no real idea of the modern safety devices imposed on the risks involved," he said.

Alexandrov voiced strong criticism of the handling of the Three Mile Island nuclear accident, claiming that from the beginning there were faults with the operating methods which accounted for the trouble: negligence regarding security measures taken by the plant management, inferior operating personnel and inadequate technical safeguards built into the plant against accidents.

He said that only specially trained engineers are allowed to operate Soviet nuclear plants, and that at the central control panel two men must always be on duty.

"I can't imagine the kind of (accident) in the Soviet Union, where pump valves remain closed when they were supposed to be open."

(Among other problems, a pump valve remained closed at Three Mile Island and prevented cooling of the reactor.)

Alexandrov added: "And yet, despite all that happened, there was no serious danger, and whatever danger might have existed, was exaggerated."

On the issue of storing radioactive waste, one aspect of the nuclear power problem that troubles the American public, he said he was certain this could be solved.

"There are many ways to go about it because there exist 'hermetic structures' in the outer layer of the earth which are safe storage places," Alexandrov said.

In a reference to the youthful character of the anti-nuclear movement in the United States, Alexandrov countered that he had three sons who were all in favor of it.

The Soviet scientist insists that nuclear energy production is safer than coal mining or production of chemicals.

"People in the vicinity of nuclear power plants are not exposed to greater radiation than that which comes from natural radiation sources. And a worker in a nuclear power plant does not absorb more radiation in a year than you get from one x-ray examination," he said.

"For all practical purposes, we in the Soviet Union have today the same technical know-how as the United States. The United States was ahead at the start, but her nuclear energy development has slowed down, while ours has accelerated," Alexandrov contended.

"All people with common sense should realize that by the end of the century the United States will be compelled to create new great nuclear production facilities, possibly nuclear fusion plants, otherwise she will find herself desperately short of energy. There is no other way to preserve the modern way of scientific development," Alexandrov said.

Inozemtsev, the Soviet economist, was asked whether the Soviet Union would begin shifting the economic emphasis from military to civilian production now that the SALT II agreement has been signed.

Without hesitation, he seized on the occasion to sound still another Soviet call for the U.S. Senate to ratify the agreement.

His reply: "We live in a very important period when decision as regards industrial production can move in either direction. The Vienna meeting opened the way for decisions to be taken in favor of civilian production, certainly."

"But the history of the last years tells us that progress in the field of armaments

can be swift and that newer and newer types of weapons are being invented.

"The only way we can protect ourselves from surprises and a further escalation is through the SALT process, which now includes not only quantitative but also qualitative restrictions."

NEVER HAVE SO MANY WAITED SO LONG FOR SO LITTLE

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of President Carter's speech Sunday night, one London newspaper wrote:

Never have so many waited so long for so little.

After 10 days at Camp David and visits with more than 130 opinion leaders in government, business, religion, labor, civil rights, and education, the President gave the impression that a new, dynamic block-buster program would emerge from his "domestic summit."

To the disappointment of millions of Americans, the President's proposals contained little that was new. Congress has already acted on synthetic fuels. A solar development bank was proposed months ago by several of us. Two years ago the President proposed utilities convert from oil to coal.

One of the few new ideas was the Energy Mobilization Board, a concept that is redundant as long as we have a Department of Energy. A new layer of bureaucracy simply is not needed and cannot be justified.

As Columnist Joseph Kraft wrote in today's Washington Post:

Mr. Carter's six-point energy program shies away from the hard choices.

The President cited a "crisis of confidence" in the Nation; I say it is a crisis of leadership. The problem is not with the American people; the problem is with the Nation's governmental leaders.

John W. Gardner summed it up very well:

Our system, great as it is, can't function with nonleaders in leadership positions.

The article follows:

CARTER: A CANDIDATE AGAIN
(By Joseph Kraft)

The Jimmy Carter who came off the mountain Sunday night wasn't a president ready to make decisions, bite bullets and cut Gordian knots. He was a candidate currying favor with his constituency. So even as he announced the country was at a "turning point in our history," he missed the turn.

Carter accomplished the regression from president back to candidate by a bold stroke. He rounded on himself. He asserted that in the past three years he had become "increasingly narrow, focused more and more on what the isolated world of Washington thinks is important . . . what the government should do."

Having pleaded guilty to the sin of trying to govern, he swore off and reverted to his original love—campaigning. He cited various people who had said particularly wise things during his recent stay at Camp David. They

turned out to be, in this order: "a Southern governor . . . a young woman in Pennsylvania . . . a young Chicano . . . a religious leader . . . a black woman . . . a labor leader."

In other words, the populist constituency, the core Carterites. Having called the roll, he delivered the message that worked so well in 1976. He talked of the awful blows the country had sustained over the "past generation"—which is to say, under other presidents. Assassinations. Vietnam. Watergate. Inflation. Shortages.

He then assured us that all these ills would yield to a new assertion of faith, a rebirth of the old American spirit. When it came down to the sacrifices the ordinary citizen should make, Carter was indulgence itself. "Say something good about our country" was his bottom line.

That syrup might have been useful if it had been served up for the purpose of making hard choices go down easily. But Mr. Carter's six-point energy program shies away from the hard choices. Indeed, the program repeatedly approaches decision, and then out of deference to the Carter constituency, finches.

Consider, first, the overall goal. "Beginning this moment," Carter said, "this nation will never use more foreign oil than we did in 1977. Never." That sounds like rough stuff. Cold-turkey withdrawal.

But, in fact this year and next year present no problems at all. The drop in economic expansion coming along with the recession assures no increases in oil imports in 1979 and 1980.

As to the future, one way to hold down imports is to increase supplies. The Carter program promotes energy supplies by two devices. First, through establishment of an Energy Security Administration to finance development of fuel from coal, oil shale, plant products and the sun. Next, through the establishment of an Energy Mobilization Board, which "like the War Production Board in World War II will have the responsibility and authority to cut through the red tapes, the delays and the endless road blocks to completing key energy projects."

But the "road blocks" are not just things that happen to be in the way. They are obstacles deliberately thrown up by environmentalists and consumer groups. Carter knows that. But the environmental and consumer lobbies are part of his constituency, so he didn't say their goals might have to be deferred. On the contrary, he said, "We will protect the environment."

The other way to cut imports is to cut down consumption. But how do you get people to use less gasoline? The obvious way is to allow prices to rise rapidly to world levels. But the Carter constituency doesn't want a rapid price increase. So the president has decided not to decontrol gasoline and oil as of now.

Instead, he relies on a series of constraints—rationing, import control, legislation to make utilities back away from oil and toward coal, and subsidies to mass transit. Apart from putting the government, of which the president is so skeptical, further into the allocation business it handles so badly, all these measures have in common what they require now. That is talk, not action.

Once again, in other words, Carter shrinks from decision. He says nothing about the truly hard task of pulling a sick industrial system out of the dumps. He ducks when it comes to raising prices and deferring environmental objectives.

Far from governing, far from paying out popularity to make hard things possible, Carter is now moving to accumulate popularity by doing easy things. So far the tactic

has worked—witness the enthusiastic crowds in Kansas City and Detroit. But they only mean that the president has become a candidate, and forced the nation back on its ultimate faith—the faith that the unguided free play of the democratic process, the mere fact that more people are talking about energy, will somehow enable the country to muddle through.

LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE DOUBLE TAXATION OF DIVIDENDS

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to eliminate the double taxation of corporate dividends. Under my proposal, domestic corporations will be allowed a deduction for all of the dividend distributions which they make in the same manner as they are able to deduct interest payments on debt. The effect of this deduction will reverse the current system by which distributed profits are taxed twice; once at the corporate level and again at the personal level under the individual income tax.

Virtually all middle size and small listed corporations find it impossible to raise capital dollars through equity offerings. The price penalty is far too expensive to offer stock for financing since rarely today or for the last several years, will the market and asking price even roughly approach book value, particularly in the manufacturing companies.

The large investors and institutions are primarily interested in blue chip securities, tax free's or issues involving significant capital gain prospects. Therefore, these buyers offer little market for the type of equity security to which I have made reference.

On the other hand, the great bulk of American middle-class are very much interested in cash return on their investment and very few companies of the type to which I have referred can afford to pay dividends after taxes in an amount exceeding the regular bank interest rates on savings and still accumulate capital for growth purposes. The deductibility of dividends would enable corporations such as these to which I refer, to substantially increase if not double their dividend rate at the same cost as presently.

This would have two totally distinct and separate benefits to the entire economy.

First. These small and middle size listed companies could cease becoming dependent on borrowing for their financing, which is a much more attractive source of funds now because of their availability and the deductibility of interest payments; and

Second. It would get the average American into the equity market and let him share in the ownership of the Nation's businesses, which would be an extremely healthy development.

Additionally, this necessary dependence upon debt financing hazards the

very existence of these middle size and small companies that form the backbone of the American economy when a severe downturn in the economy occurs.

The loss of revenue involved will be significantly offset by a reduction of corporate borrowing requirements and hence the payment of tax deductible interest, increased earnings on additional retained capital and increased taxes resulting from receipt of more dividend income by individual stockholders.

WHY THE FREEDOM OF CHOICE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 7 PROVIDES THE BEST SOLUTION TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE MEMBERSHIP PROBLEM

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

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will debate an extremely important piece of banking legislation—H.R. 7. This legislation addresses the problem of bank withdrawals from the Federal Reserve due to the excessive cost of membership, and the implications for the Fed's ability to control monetary policy. During the debate, I intend to offer an alternative to H.R. 7 in the form of an amendment. My amendment, the freedom of choice compromise, differs significantly from the approach taken by H.R. 7. Where H.R. 7 stops the outflow of banks by mandating reserves at the Fed, my alternative would simply improve the current reserve structure by lowering the level of reserves for member banks. Lowering reserves will reduce the cost of membership and stop the outflow of banks from the system. If, however, my voluntary alternative fails to solve the current problem, I include a safety net. If bank withdrawals continue to decline to a certain level the mandatory provisions of H.R. 7 would replace the voluntary system.

Several criticisms of my freedom of choice amendment have been raised. I am glad these concerns have been brought forth. Before the House votes on an issue as important as this, it is necessary that all Members have an opportunity to fully contrast the provisions of H.R. 7 and my freedom of choice compromise.

As the proponent of the freedom of choice compromise to H.R. 7, I obviously believe that there are no defects in the proposal. It offers a true compromise to a most difficult problem. Furthermore, the freedom of choice compromise does not have the severe negative impacts imposed by H.R. 7 on the dual banking system and our current financial structure.

One criticism of the freedom of choice compromise which has been raised is that the compromise will not halt the attrition of banks from the Fed and that the proposal only delays the day when H.R. 7 will take effect. The primary reason banks have left the Fed is the excessive cost of maintaining sterile reserves with the Fed. The freedom of choice amendment addresses this problem directly by

significantly reducing reserve requirements for all member banks. The reductions of the freedom of choice amendment will completely eliminate the burden of membership for banks under \$120 million in deposits. For banks between \$120 and \$500 million in deposits, the burden of membership is reduced by over 75 percent, and for banks over \$500 million in deposits over 50 percent of the cost burden is removed. These reductions will solve the problem. Thus, I believe the provisions of H.R. 7 will never be triggered.

A second criticism of the freedom of choice compromise is that if the mandatory provisions of H.R. 7 were put in place by the action of the trigger, the banking system would experience the sudden shock of a totally new system. I have two responses to this criticism. First, the impact of the change in reserves due to the trigger being activated would not be different than the impact of the passage of H.R. 7. That is, the freedom of choice proposal retains the same gradual phase-in of new reserve requirements found in H.R. 7. Second, and more importantly, the reserve requirement ratios of my proposal are almost identical to H.R. 7. The percentage requirement for short-term nonpersonal time deposits is 3 percent under both proposals. The percentage requirement for transaction accounts above \$35 million is the same, 11 percent in both proposals, the only differences between the ratios is that, first, transaction accounts below \$35 million are exempt from reserves under H.R. 7 and are subject to a 3-percent reserve under the freedom of choice compromise, and second, the \$10 million exemption on nonpersonal short-term time accounts found in H.R. 7 is absent in the freedom of choice compromise.

Next, it has been argued that the freedom of choice amendment omits coverage of transaction accounts at nonmember banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions and mutual savings banks. This is absolutely correct. The amendment does not address accounts at these institutions, because I do not believe such an action is presently warranted. To subject nonmember banks, savings and loans, credit unions and mutual savings banks to Federal Reserve control amounts to a major structural change in our banking system. Such a change would place unprecedented power in the hands of the Fed and cannot be presently justified.

Fourth, the critics of my proposal have also indicated that it "continues the present system, with all its faults." This criticism does an injustice to the great minds that devised the Federal Reserve System in 1913. Few would argue that the system has not functioned extremely well during the past 66 years. It is only recently that some banks have found the benefits of membership outweighed by the costs. To discard the current system, because of this recent problem is simply not necessary. A reduction in the cost of membership for those banks which are presently part of the system will enable us to solve the problem and retain the system which has proven its worth over and over again.

Fifth, it has also been argued that the freedom of choice amendment gives foreign banks a free ride. This is inaccurate. In 1978, the Congress enacted the International Banking Act which required virtually all foreign banks operating in the United States to hold reserves with the Fed. Moreover, my amendment has been modified to insure that any foreign bank not covered by the International Banking Act will still be required to hold reserves.

Finally, the underlying value of the freedom of choice amendment is that it leaves the future of the dual banking system and the membership of the Fed in the hands of the bankers themselves. The compromise is consistent with the goals and desires of hundreds of bankers throughout the country who have stated time and time again that they are leaving the Fed most reluctantly, and only because of the excessive cost of reserve requirements. Thus, the compromise reduces the cost of reserves and solves the problem. Furthermore, in doing so, it insures the Fed's ability to control the monetary policy and in turn inflation.

Lastly, I have attached a comparison of the key features of H.R. 7 and the freedom of choice compromise, along with some charts on the impact of the two proposals:

KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN H.R. 7 AND FREEDOM OF CHOICE COMPROMISE

H.R. 7

Reserve requirement structure: Mandatory reserves at 11 percent for transaction accounts, 3 percent for commercial time accounts; except for the first \$35 million in transaction deposits, and the first \$10 million in short-term nonpersonal time deposits.

Depository institutions subject to Fed control: Commercial banks, savings and loans, credit unions, mutual savings banks.

Percentage of deposits subject to reserves for monetary control purposes: 66 percent.

Number of banks holding reserves: 1,020.
Cost of legislation: \$155.6 million.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

Reserve requirement structure: Voluntary reserves at 3 percent on first \$35 million in transaction deposits, 11 percent for transaction deposits above \$35 million, and 3 percent on all short-term nonpersonal time deposits.

Depository institutions subject to Fed control: Only commercial banks that are presently members of the Federal Reserve System.

Percentage of deposits subject to reserve for monetary control purposes: 72 percent.
Number of banks holding reserves: 5,664.
Cost of legislation: \$166.4 million.

[Charts not printed in Record.]

AMTRAK RIDERS SHOULD CONTRIBUTE TO ITS OPERATION

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

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 3996, the Amtrak Reorganization Act, tomorrow. Once again, the House will deal with what seems to have become an annual problem—how to deal with the necessity of funding the Nation's passenger rail system. This year we have an addi-

tional factor to consider—the tremendous surge in ridership on Amtrak, because of the recent gasoline shortage and increase in gasoline prices.

This ridership increase will certainly continue because it will cost more—much more—to use a private automobile for inter-city travel. Therefore, alternatives such as Amtrak will be attractive to the traveling public and so it is inappropriate to call once again upon the general American public to support through its tax money the continuation of a transportation system without additional financial contribution from those who actually use the system.

We must require those who use the system to contribute more to its operation. The National Taxpayers Union strongly supports this position and I ask that a copy of a letter sent to each Member be entered into the RECORD. I call special attention to the remarks in the fourth paragraph which deal with riders of Amtrak assuming a greater share of the cost of operating the trains they ride. When the Amtrak bill is considered tomorrow, my amendment is designed to do just this.

With increased ridership, it is unfair to call upon the taxpayers to pay the cost of two-thirds of the ridership bill. We talk about a shortage of energy in this Nation and everyone in Congress is interested. I remind my colleagues that there is also a shortage of taxpayers' dollars, and I hope they will pay more attention to this problem:

JULY 12, 1979.

HON. TOM HAGEDORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEDORN: In the next few weeks, or even days, final action will be taken on the Amtrak issue. I would like to briefly call to your attention again the pressing financial burden Amtrak imposes on the taxpayers of this country. American taxpayers are beset by ever increasing inflation and economic problems. Unreasonably high subsidies to Amtrak are an outstanding example of wasteful Government fiscal policies that have contributed to the economic turmoil presently facing us.

The Department of Transportation's route restructuring plan is a sound first step in correcting the problems of Amtrak. It will cut routes that lose the most money (because they carry the fewest passengers) and thus cut back on the amount of money needed for operating subsidies. As even Amtrak President Alan Boyd recognizes, the system must be streamlined.

Congress has approved this plan. But numerous attempts are now being made to diminish the effect of, or even kill altogether, the restructuring. Various proposals range from adding back a few routes, or even freezing the present system for a year or two. These "back-door" moves are unacceptable to the taxpayers. They are unacceptable not so much because some routes may be added back in, but because in all of them the cost of retaining routes is imposed directly on the taxpayers.

The justification for retaining already dropped routes is that new ridership levels supposedly indicate new health for some routes previously thought unworkable. But if ridership is up, then why are the taxpayers being asked to foot the bill to the same old tune of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the costs? There is no reason why the riders of Amtrak cannot assume a greater share of the cost of operating

the trains they ride. For this reason, we ask you to demand an increase in the percentage of costs Amtrak recovers from the fare box before you consent to any addition in routes.

A year of hard work went into the adoption of the present plan. Let's not throw all that work out the window in some last minute settlement of the Amtrak issue.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN R. NELSON.

□ 1850

THE KGB ANSWERS JOAN BAEZ

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, we were pleasantly surprised when Joan Baez, a longtime apologist for the Vietnamese Communists placed an ad in the press protesting the violations of human rights in Communist conquered Vietnam. Some of Miss Baez's anti-Vietnam war buddies joined her in signing the ad. But, other leftists such as Tom Hayden and Jane Fonda ignored the invitation to sign, while William Kunstler condemned those who would criticize a Communist dictatorship.

The latest attack against Miss Baez, for exposing the tortures, murder, and imprisonment perpetrated by the Vietnamese Communist regime, came from the Soviet Secret Police and Intelligence Service, the KGB. It came in the form of an ad, signed by Wilfred Burchett, a self-styled "distinguished journalist," which appeared in the Washington Post of June 27, 1979. Burchett is better known as an identified KGB agent who serves the Soviets in a variety of ways. Yuri Krotkov, a former KGB officer testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security in November 1969, under the name "George Karlin." Krotkov identified Burchett as a KGB agent and described how he had been used to recruit others to the Soviet service. In addition, Burchett serves as a KGB media asset, by placing propaganda articles in the international press. During both the Korean and Vietnam wars, Burchett visited the POW camps and assisted in the brainwashing of United States, British, and other Western prisoners.

Burchett has served as a correspondent for the Communist newspaper, the Guardian—formerly National Guardian—published in New York. Last February, he resigned from the Guardian because the paper had refused to endorse the Soviet position on the Vietnam-Cambodia dispute. Burchett wrote a confidential letter to the Guardian, dated February 11. Burchett wrote:

In the name of "evenhandedness" how can you possibly put Socialist Vietnam, with its immense contributions to the revolutionary cause in the same scales with Pol Pot's Kampuchea and pretend there is a balance. Can half a century of exemplary revolutionary activity—admired by progressives and revolutionaries all over the world, and taken as a model wherever people take to arms for national liberation—be equated by almost 4 years of the primitive Fascist dictatorship of Pol Pot.

We can, of course, agree with Burchett's characterization of the Commu-

nist regime in Cambodia, despite the peculiar punctuation and grammar. But, of course, the Vietnamese dictatorship is only different in degree from that of Cambodia. The slave labor camps—or reeducation centers—as Burchett likes to call them—the religious and political persecution and the plight of the boat people trying to escape are all typical of the reality of communism. It is interesting that refugees never flee toward communism—always away from it.

Burchett, the man chosen by his KGB masters to defend the Soviet puppet state of Vietnam has been allowed by the State Department to visit the United States on propaganda tours, in violation of the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

Burchett's propaganda ad against Joan Baez was placed in the press by the U.S. Peace Council and signed by Michael Myerson, executive director. Myerson, a longtime member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., takes pride in his travel to Communist countries. In February 1970, when Myerson spoke at New York University, the official Communist Party leaflet announcing his speech identified him as, "Invited by the Cuban Government to observe the 10th anniversary of the revolution—first U.S. citizen to visit North Vietnam—Secretary, Peace Commission, New York State Communist Party."

The U.S. Peace Council is the U.S. section of the World Peace Council. The Central Intelligence Agency issued a report last year on Soviet propaganda. The report prepared at my request and released by the House Intelligence Committee cited the World Peace Council as, "the most important Soviet front organization." According to the CIA; "it is usually the first of the various front groups to respond to new Moscow propaganda initiatives."

Moscow has fired some of its "big guns" at Joan Baez because of her concern for human rights in Vietnam. This should be a lesson to all those who lend themselves to Communist propaganda operations. The skilled agents of the Soviet Union take propaganda as a serious business. They know how to use the well meaning but ignorant novices.

SENIOR CITIZENS INTERN PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined today by some of my colleagues who sponsored senior citizen interns this past May. This seventh session of the program brought over 165 interns to Washington for the 2-week program May 7 through May 19. They came from 34 States plus the District of Columbia.

Once again, active older Americans spent 2 weeks in their Congressman's or Senator's office getting a firsthand view of the Federal Government and how it operates—especially in the area of aging. They worked in our offices and attended

briefings on subjects of special interest to the elderly.

I must emphasize that this is a most unique internship. It is not self-serving. Used wisely, the program can benefit hundreds of elderly in a congressional district. After completion of the internship period of learning the individual returns home equipped with the knowledge to help fellow seniors. Such is done in many different ways. Each intern has his or her own ideas and particular interests. Each goes about their task at a different speed and in a different manner. Some pursue the role of activist for the elderly in their home community. Others branch out into a new career—we have produced newspaper columnists and a physical fitness coordinator to name a few. Others use their internship as a continuation of an education in the field of gerontology.

Ultimately it is the elderly in our districts who benefit from this internship. A new program or idea of how to do something better develops and is put to work in the community. An alternative housing or transportation concept may be brought back home. A better understanding of the Older Americans Act or other legislation affecting the elderly will be explained by the intern to his or her peers.

My own intern this year, Hazel Teter of Kokomo, was a 65-year-old retired widow. She already has begun a role of advocacy for the elderly in her hometown and the surrounding communities. Only a few weeks after the internship, she led another group of senior citizens to Washington to attend the National Council of Senior Citizens annual meeting. She has been getting together with various groups in my district to share what she learned here. My office receives an update regularly on what she is doing and problems which exist within the elderly segment of our area in Indiana.

Hazel believes in being active after retirement. She still has something to give to others. Her enthusiasm to be a productive part of the community as much after 65 as before is an inspiration to all of us. Since May she has met with over 20 senior groups—and she continues to do so.

In praising my own intern, I could not omit the fact that Hazel Teter is typical of the individuals who participate in the program. I have heard from dozens of "the Class of '79," as they call themselves, who are using the internship in much the same manner as Hazel.

Former Congressman Pete Beister of Pennsylvania and I had no idea when we started this program in 1973 that it would become such an important contribution to the elderly not only in our own districts but to the elderly across the Nation. Nearly 500 older Americans have been a part of the program since that time—hundreds more have benefited. I thank my colleagues for their growing interest through the years because without their cooperation we would not have been able to continue. I especially want to express appreciation to Congressman TONY COELHO and Senator WILLIAM ROTH who have acted as joint coordinat-

ing officers. Their assistance in planning the 1979 program helped to make it a successful one.

I could not let this time on the House floor pass without mentioning the legislation which would make the senior citizen intern program an official function of the House and Senate. House Concurrent Resolution 15, pending now before the House Administration Committee with over 130 cosponsors would give us the support mechanisms to continue the intern program in future years. I urge passage of this proposal so that the 1980 program will be aided by its provisions. ●

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, the seventh annual senior citizen intern program, which was conducted for 2 weeks in May, showed clearly that just because persons may be over 60 does not also mean they are over the hill. The 150 interns were put through a hectic and grueling program and demonstrated exceptional vitality and vibrancy to 106 fortunate House and Senate offices representing 80 different congressional districts.

The interns were all active community leaders. Their trip to Washington afforded them a chance to see how the national leadership works. They observed the House and Senate in session, attended seminars, heard Federal officials, congressional staff, and others active in the Federal policymaking process. These experiences and working in Government offices provided a front row view of how the Government runs.

The program in Washington, the interns agreed, will be very valuable to them back home. In a letter to their sponsors at the end of the program the interns expressed their "thanks and deep appreciation for making possible (their) participation in what (they) found to be a worthwhile and rewarding experience." They also promised to make a "sincere and continuing effort in (their) various congressional districts to make senior citizens aware of the Federal, State, and local efforts in their behalf and to implement what (they) learned."

Consequently, I am convinced that the program should be continued. To try and make sure of this I have joined Congressman BUD HILLIS in introducing a resolution which would authorize every Member of Congress to hire a senior citizen each year for 2 weeks. It would also provide partial compensation for these older interns. This is a very important aspect of the resolution. My office was to have an intern this past year. Unfortunately, the person selected could not finance his trip to Washington, and since I have a full staff I could not pay his way. This was a strong reminder that many senior citizens are on low fixed incomes and must be helped financially—not just in this intern program but in many areas. Moreover this is just one problem the growing population of those over 60 is facing. With what they have learned by coming here to Washington, these senior citizens can now go back home and work toward the solutions to the difficulties that confront our older population. They learned about the problems that plague their segment of society but also about the power they have as

members of this population to do something about these problems.

In closing, I would like to commend my colleague, BUD HILLIS, and certainly his staff assistant, Donna Norton, for having established and coordinated this exceptional program. I hope we are successful in our efforts to make the senior citizen intern program a permanent fixture in Congress. ●

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS) and his assistant, Donna Norton, for their tremendous leadership with the senior citizen intern program this year. Once again I had the pleasure of participating in this worthwhile program, which affords each of us the opportunity to profit from one of our richest resources in America—our senior citizens. My intern this year was Mr. John Cross, an energetic individual who has been involved with the Tenants Council of Lorain Square Estates in Cleveland. He has served as council president for the past 4 years. His activity at Lorain Square and throughout the community enabled him to serve an invaluable function as the 20th District senior liaison in Washington.

The well-organized program of seminars concerned with social security, medicare, retirement, and legislation affecting older Americans gave Mr. Cross a greater insight concerning Federal programs and policies and how they are concerned with the everyday lives of seniors at home. Oftentimes our Older Americans are neglected and ignored. We tend not to listen to the sound advice that comes from years of experience. The senior intern program gives us the opportunity to lend our ears to the elderly who can give us formidable remedies to some of our present day problems.

I would like to share with you a letter I have recently received from Mr. Cross reflecting on his Washington experience.

Again, I urge my colleagues to adopt legislation now to fund and staff this valuable program. Our Older Americans are our most ready resource providing us with so many answers to our questions. As students of life, we must be attentive to the real teachers of our society.

The letter follows:

CUYAHOGA METROPOLITAN
HOUSING AUTHORITY,
Cleveland, Ohio, July 12, 1979.

Ms. MARY ROSE OAKAR,
Congresswoman, 20th District, Ohio, Can-
non House Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MISS OAKAR: First of all, I would like to say "Thank You" for selecting me to be the Senior Intern representing Cleveland, Cuyahoga County and the State of Ohio in Washington, D.C. It was a great honor and I shall never forget it.

I was pleasantly surprised to see the interest taken by all the Members of Congress, whom I met, for their sincere interest in the problems of the Senior Citizens and poor people of our country.

There are a growing number of people who think that the elected Members in Congress are do-nothings but I can tell them differently. As I found them to be hard working people and working long hours to try and

solve some of our problems and problems of the whole country.

I was very much impressed by President Carter's speech in the Rose Garden at the White House. Contrary to what has been written, I really believe that he has a genuine interest in the welfare of the Senior Citizens and poor people.

In closing, I would like to say "Thank You" to all the Congressmen and residents of Ohio, who have written me cards and letters since I have been home.

Sincerely Yours,

JOHN W. CROSS,
Tenant Council President.

● Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, this spring I had the opportunity of having a senior citizen from my district, Anna Colnaghi, with me in my office in Washington for 2 weeks as an intern. It was a valuable experience for me and for my staff to be able to work with her on the variety of issues of concern to senior citizens and I am happy to say that she has agreed to continue working for me during the next year in my office in Paramus. I am looking forward to continuing to work on the problems facing senior citizens, and I know that her work will be of great benefit to the seniors in my district.

I want to submit for the RECORD Anna Colnaghi's observations on her 2 weeks here, and on the program in which she participated.

Many thanks to Congressman Maguire and all the members of House and Senate who set up and supported the Senior Intern program. To most of us, who know the "scenic post card" Washington of monuments and museums, this program provided an opportunity to become part of the vibrant, working Legislative, Judicial, and Executive processes that make our country unique and great.

Many thanks to Donna Norton and her staff who provided a carefully balanced program geared to senior desires and abilities. Mrs. Norton anticipated our needs, welcomed our questions, and gave us a feeling of belonging from the first briefing to the closing breakfast.

I could write a book on the benefits I received from my 2 weeks as a Senior intern, but I would like to list the highlights for the sake of brevity.

1. The opportunity to meet and enjoy the company of our counterparts from all over the United States.

2. The opportunity to compare problems, to hear the solutions in the areas, and to brainstorm new ideas. Planning a quarterly publication by this group as a follow-up should benefit the Seniors and their legislative sponsors.

3. Working in the Congressional Office gave me a deeper appreciation of the in-depth exploration of problems by Congressman Maguire and others before voting on bills.

4. The presentations that were most impressive and valuable in answering my questions were: "The House and Senate Committee on Aging," "Medicine, Medicaid, Health," "A Look at Social Security" and "Housing and the Older American."

5. Meeting with President Carter.

6. Attending the Briefing on the President's rationing plan and attending the Congressional deliberating and voting as a follow-up.

7. The closing breakfast—a beautiful way to say, "good-bye and thank you."

As I wrote to Congressman Maguire, my two weeks in Washington went all too quickly, but the memory and the message are indelibly etched. ●

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I would

like to begin by thanking my colleague, BUD HILLIS, for providing me with the unique opportunity of having senior interns join us in Washington every year in the senior intern program. Congressman HILLIS and his staff work exceptionally hard to make it a valuable experience for all concerned, and he has been very successful over the years. I think the enthusiastic responses we receive from our interns in the months after they have gone home attest to that.

Perhaps a country can be judged by the manner in which it treats its elderly citizens. If this is true, the United States might be accused of insensitivity, unresponsiveness, and shortsightedness. Fortunately, I think this is changing. The development over the years of legislation to disallow further age discrimination in jobs, expansion of programs recently developed to serve the special needs of elderly, and the general elimination of age barriers that have grown up in the past few decades, are all indications of our greater appreciation of our elderly citizens.

Congressman HILLIS has guaranteed that those of us who work on Capitol Hill are aware of not only the problems and needs of senior citizens, but the insight, knowledge, and skills they can offer both the private and public sectors. I find having senior interns in my Washington office to be most rewarding, and hope the interns I have had over the years feel the experience was beneficial to them, as well.

My intern this year was Robert Brown, an auditor by training and experience, who worked earlier this year in my mobile office assisting senior citizens on filing their tax returns. He is a volunteer for several organizations, now that he has retired from Government service.

Of the many volunteer jobs he now holds, one position is counselling prospective small business people and conducting workshops every other week. He delivers meals to the homebound as an advocate and volunteer for the meals on wheels program and is an escort at Chestnut Hill Hospital, helping patients who need assistance in going for treatment.

Though his attendance of committee hearings and briefings and speeches offered by various agencies and associations, Bob got to see firsthand how policies and laws are developed, and said he found the experience to be most beneficial. He thinks the Government can help aid senior citizens in coping with their problems, but that the greatest help to senior adults will continue to come through person to person contact, particularly through volunteer organizations.

I know that Bob's experiences have been of benefit to the many senior adults with whom he is in contact back home. I am sure Congressman HILLIS' program will continue to offer this type of direct contact and communication between Washington, the Congress, and the elderly population. I was most gratified to participate again this year and look forward to more years of joining in the senior intern program. ●

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, this past

May I had the honor of sponsoring two women from my district in Michigan to the congressional senior citizen intern program. This was the first year I was involved in such a program, and I can say it proved to be a very rewarding and learning experience for my staff, myself, and most importantly my two interns.

The two women chosen to be interns were Mary Neal Yourd and Benita Cure Smith.

Mary has always been quite involved in her local community. Beside being a former elementary schoolteacher, she was active in girl scouts, cub scouts, and the Michigan Women's Commission. She remains active in senior activities, R.S.V.P., as well as various church programs.

Benita, for 40 years, was a "professional" civil leader. She also is actively involved in her community, including the American Association of Retired Persons.

I mention their backgrounds only to bring out the fact that I believed they were excellent applicants for the program, and their 2 weeks with my staff and myself did not alter this belief.

I want to mention just how important I believe the congressional senior citizen intern program is. Congressman HILLIS deserves a great deal of credit for the promotion of the program. Since its origin, it has grown from 9 interns in 1973 to 160 in 1979. The few requirements for the internship are that the intern be involved in senior citizens projects back home, and realize that the year. Those two points are important for the sponsors will be assured of getting responsible, concerned citizens as interns. Also, since they are concerned with their community, they will be able to represent to the full extent their fellow citizens, and be able to go home and report back to their friends just how their elected officials are responding to their special needs.

The program is centered on getting the reactions of representative senior citizens to the Government's response to their needs. The best part of the program is that the senior citizens themselves now have a direct voice in conveying their wants. They are able to come to Washington and familiarize themselves with the Federal Government and learn how it operates, have a congressional office they will observe, and most importantly attend a series of briefings on subjects of interest to the elderly.

My two interns, Benita and Mary, wholeheartedly involved themselves in the above situations. They had a firsthand look at how the Government operates, but more to the point, how the Government responds to the problems faced by the senior citizens. I find it quite logical that the senior citizens themselves have the opportunity to direct to their Government officials their hopes and wishes of how some of their needs can be answered. Benita and Mary know best how to express their needs; what to ask for, what to change, and so forth. I believe they both had an experience that will help them to better understand the difficulty both the Govern-

ment and senior citizens have in trying to establish programs and benefits for the elderly.

I know that I greatly benefited from Benita's and Mary's views and opinions on matters concerning themselves and fellow senior citizens. They gave me a new perspective which will not go unheeded. I can say I have much more concern and compassion for the desires of our senior citizens now than if I had not participated in the congressional senior citizen intern program.

Benita has evaluated the program, picking out what she believes its strengths and weaknesses are:

If the purpose of the program is to familiarize seniors with various government resources, it is successful. However, I had hoped there would be more evaluation of present programs. Discussions of imaginative new approaches to meeting not only the needs of older people, but also their desire to make meaningful contributions to society.

Mary also responded to the program as follows:

The Congressional Senior Citizen Intern Program was a tremendous learning experience for me, and I am grateful for it. Whether or not I learned the intended lesson I do not know, for I am not quite sure what that was. From the formal program I learned something of the process of government and the people involved in it. Meeting and talking with other interns greatly increased my knowledge of my country and of my countrymen and countrywomen. The result of my two weeks internship is that I have returned home more knowledgeable, less parochial than I was before, with enough food for thought and action to last a long time. I am conscious that I am highly privileged to have had this wonderful opportunity. I thank you, each and every one who has made it possible.

Mary's and Benita's critiques of the congressional senior citizen intern program show appreciation of being chosen as interns. It is true there are some points that need to be smoothed over. Benita has made some general suggestions concerning the program. She feels perhaps there are too many lectures for the duration of the 2 weeks, and she also questions why the interns have to be 60 to 70 years old to participate. Benita suggests too that perhaps some of these senior citizen projects funded by Federal tax dollars should be abolished, for they help neither the senior citizen or the taxpayer. Hopefully as the program grows, these points will be addressed. I urge my fellow representatives to realize the opportunities the program offers for both senior citizens and the Government officials that represent them. The outcome of the internship is more beneficial programs for senior citizens, and the opportunity to give senior citizens a bird's eye view of how and why such programs are implemented.

Once again, I would like to commend Bud Hillis and his staff on this excellent program and urge my colleagues to get involved in an experience that will enrich everyone concerned.

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the past 2 years, I have participated in the senior citizens intern program. I feel the senior citizen intern program is an effective

method to increase the awareness of Federal programs affecting our older citizens. To observe firsthand is a very beneficial experience. This program provides a forum where senior citizens from across the country who are involved in community activities and projects can learn about the legislative process and the Federal Government and Federal programs. They can, in turn, provide a network to pass on to others information gained.

Senior citizens better than anyone else are aware of the problems and concerns confronting senior citizens. The senior citizens intern program contributes significantly to a two-way communication system whereby seniors are more cognizant of their Federal Government and its programs and thus can better respond and communicate to others. This program puts the senior citizens in touch with the Federal Government. My senior citizen interns have found the program most helpful and have returned to the district with enthusiasm to share what they have learned and apply the knowledge gained. My interns both years continue to be an extension of my office for senior citizen matters. The senior citizen intern program is a very worthwhile and effective program, and I enthusiastically support it.

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with so many of my colleagues today to emphasize the many benefits of the senior citizen intern program.

At the outset, I want to commend Congress Bud Hillis, my colleague from Indiana, for the many hours of planning and hard work that he and his staff have expended to make this a most successful program. His dedicated efforts are appreciated by all Members of Congress who sponsored interns, but most of all by the interns themselves who were fortunate enough to participate in this year's program.

When Gordon Kinning, my senior intern from St. Paul came to Washington this spring, I am sure he did not know quite what to expect. But, like my senior interns last year, Gordon established a camaraderie with his fellow participants from all over the country and looked forward to each day's hectic schedule with enthusiasm.

I found it particularly impressive that the 130-plus senior citizens who were here trudging around the Capitol attending countless meetings and seminars for 2 full weeks, still radiated lots of energy when the program concluded. I think most of them would have gladly stayed on for another 2 weeks to tackle even more work and to gain even more insight into the legislative process and the issues so important to them.

The senior citizen intern program is an excellent vehicle to allow senior citizens—from all parts of the country—the chance to actively participate in the legislative process. The program focuses on important issues like social security, medicare, transportation, consumer protection, and housing, to name a few, which impact dramatically on the lives of all elderly persons in the United States. Most importantly, the senior intern program provides each

Congressman who participated, and effective ombudsman who will return to the district to work actively with seniors and senior groups. I know that my intern last year, Mr. Ted Schmitz, has used his experience and the information he gained to great advantage. He has, in fact, worked actively with senior groups in St. Paul since the spring of 1978 and always comments, when I am back in the district and run into him, how much he appreciated the opportunity he had to participate in the 1978 program. I know that my intern this year, Gordon Kinning, will be equally active as a result of his experience.

I am personally delighted that I chose to participate in the senior program again this year, and I urge my colleagues to give this program their full support in the future.

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, it gives me the greatest of pleasure to join with my colleagues in expressing enthusiastic support for the congressional senior intern program and to commend the leadership and commitment of our colleague, Bud Hillis, whose tireless efforts have made the program so successful.

After participating in the senior intern program for 5 years, I continue to be impressed by the many benefits the program affords—to the senior intern, to me and my staff and, most importantly, to the community.

Each year, the senior intern brings to my office a wealth of experience and insights to share regarding the needs and concerns of the elderly. The senior intern comes to know my staff as co-workers and friends, while participating in our day-to-day office routines. Through a perpetual round of meetings, visits to various committees and agencies, and by observing the legislative process, the senior intern gains a better understanding of our Government.

The senior intern program facilitates that key ingredient so essential to our democracy—effective two-way communication between the people and their representatives. And, when they return to the community, the senior interns are able to share their experiences with the community from their unique perspective of personal involvement in the workings of government.

By involving the elderly in their Government and by providing all participants—Members, staff and the interns—with an opportunity to reexamine programs, policies, and goals affecting the elderly, the senior intern program has proven to be exceptionally valuable.

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct privilege for me to participate in the 1979 senior citizen intern program. Vernon Robinson, a resident of Simi Valley in my congressional district, came to Washington for several weeks of exposure to the legislative branch of Government and the operation of a Member's office. I know that Vernon returned to his wife in California with a better understanding of how our Government works. For him, it was a rewarding experience, one which I hope to make available to other senior citizens with an interest in the machinations of the Federal bureaucracy.

From what I can gather, Vernon was typical of his fellow senior interns in feeling a deep sense of satisfaction about the program. I was fortunate to meet a number of the senior interns who attended several of the functions organized on their behalf, and all of them expressed their pleasure at having this rare opportunity.

Let me commend my colleague **BUD HILLIS** and his most capable staff assistant, **Donna Norton**, for the outstanding job they did in making the program a success. I look forward to participating in the future and was glad to sponsor someone this year who gained so much from the internship.

● **Mr. GREEN.** Mr. Speaker, several months have passed since my office had the pleasure to host **Katharine Reed** of Manhattan as our first senior citizen intern. Today, the congressional intern program is at the opposite end of the spectrum; my office is currently enjoying the presence of three colleague students. It is clear that a Washington experience, whether it lasts for 2 weeks or for an entire summer, is something which benefits everyone.

On May 21, I had printed in the **RECORD** brief remarks by Ms. Reed and I took that opportunity to call for the commitment of this body to the establishment of a permanent senior citizen intern program. Today we are hearing from many more Members of Congress who are expressing similar sentiments. The senior citizen intern program is a valuable and productive idea—both for the participating constituent and the participating office. I look forward to having the opportunity to vote on this legislation and by its passage let our senior citizens know that their participation and presence in Washington is welcomed and encouraged.

● **Mr. WINN.** Mr. Speaker, I want to express my gratitude to **Mr. Hillis** for organizing the successful 1979 senior citizen intern program for the sixth consecutive year. I believe that the program is a valuable learning experience for the participating interns and the congressional staffs. One important benefit from this program is the direct communication between the senior interns and their representatives about the needs of older Americans.

It was a privilege for me to play a role in the senior citizen intern program for the second year. In May of this year, I was fortunate to have two capable and knowledgeable senior citizens from **Shawnee Mission, Kans.**—**Harry and Agnese Mahon**.

Mr. Mahon served for 45 years as a superintendent and teacher in **Oberlin, Turner, and Shawnee Mission, Kans.** **Mrs. Mahon** was involved in the teaching field for 23 years.

Since retirement, the **Mahons** have continued their community activity and awareness. **Mr. Mahon** has served as president and legislative chairman of the **Johnson County Retired Teachers Association**. As a couple, both have worked directly in political campaigns in **Johnson County**.

During the **Mahons'** visit to **Capitol Hill**, they attended a series of lectures

of particular concern to the elderly. Since then, they have taken the insight they gained back to the **Third District**. Their job has not ended, as they continue to keep me informed on the current issues of concern to the elderly.

As those of us who have participated in this program know, it has developed into a meaningful and productive 2-week period. And with these thoughts in mind, **Mr. Speaker**, I believe that the program should be developed further to include all congressional districts. I hope to see passage of legislation to fund this necessary and effective effort to meet the needs of our older Americans.

● **Mr. REGULA.** Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege again this year of participating in the congressional senior citizen intern program and once again I came away from the experience feeling that everyone involved benefited from the program.

Mr. Lester and **Mrs. Carrol Kettering** of **Canton, Ohio**, who were sponsored by my office, graciously briefed me on issues raised during their 2-week tenure. They helped increase my awareness of important matters facing **Older Americans** such as health care, medical insurance, social security, housing, and transportation. I particularly appreciated their opinions based on what they had learned during their 2 weeks of meetings in the intern program.

I was inspired by the enthusiasm and active participation of the **Ketterings**, not only in **Washington**, but in their hometown where they serve as volunteers in several senior citizen programs.

In their followup report, **Mr. and Mrs. Kettering** indicated that they had greatly expanded their knowledge and awareness of the **Federal Government** as a result of their experience as senior citizen interns. In their report they stated:

"We only wish that everyone could have our recent experience. If all could see how very hard our representatives in government work for us, they would take heart and feel, as we do, that our government is not all bad." Based on their experiences in **Washington**, they close their report with this advice, which I echo: "Go to the polls on election day and vote to change what is bad, keep what is good, and support all candidates who work very hard for you and me to keep **America** the great Nation we know that she is."

● **Mrs. SCHROEDER.** Mr. Speaker, my office is still talking about this year's senior citizen intern program and **Janet Malloy**, our intern.

Janet is known as a rabble-rouser in **Denver**. I thought it would be good to let her loose on **Washington**. I was not disappointed. Neither was she. Here is what she had to say on the program:

DENVER, COLO.,
July 13, 1979.

IN SUPPORT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN INTERN PROGRAM

When I answered the phone call from **Rep. Pat. Schroeder's** Washington office I immediately felt "Very Special" for I had been selected as the senior citizen to receive the honor from **District 1, Colorado**. It felt good to be recognized for the feeble efforts that I have made towards a better community—while I am still living and can enjoy that feeling of pride!

Once in **Washington** I was enthused by the

alertness, mobility and knowledge of all of the other selected senior citizens who had also been chosen. Somehow the feelings of emotion, personal conflicts and verbosity on the part of a few who 'always say their piece' at public hearings on senior citizen matters became a thing of the past. These people knew how to act in public with intelligent questions, sincerity of purpose and a keen desire to learn the legislative process in order to get the needed programs in their home states.

Great credit goes to the facilitator (**Donna Norton**) and the sponsors of this program for the opportunity to be exposed to the many facets of the upper echelons of our government. In my sponsor's office I was surprised to find the oft-repeated phrase 'Write a letter to your Congressperson' really was the effective way to apprise the staff of the local scene. I was afforded the opportunity to trace the channels of communication of a proposal for an innovative program for senior citizens of downtown **Denver**, and enjoyed the exchange of pertinent information with the Director of that particular **H.U.D.** program. (I think he learned something, too!)

Perhaps the most important comment is that this program in **Washington** replaces a lot of 'hot-air emotionalism' with concrete facts about the concerns of senior citizens in all segments of the society. It was a two-way exchange to change the image of seniors and the bureaucrats! It was real—it was personal!

In closing, I wholeheartedly support the concept that this program should be funded by the federal support system to enlighten the senior citizen populace in every state. I hope that I can copy this orientation to the legislative process for senior citizens in **Colorado**. It would become a powerful tool at election time to have an informed public of such magnitude.

Yours Sincerely,

JANET G. MALLOY. ●

● **Mr. ROBINSON.** Mr. Speaker, in each of the last 4 years, I have been privileged to select an individual from **Virginia's Seventh Congressional District** to participate in the intensive, 2-week congressional senior citizen intern program here in **Washington**.

Those citizens that have been chosen have always willingly shared with their fellow citizens back home what they learned here about programs and legislation of interest to the elderly. This is the key value of this program, in my opinion, and it is well illustrated by the following letter that I recently received from the **Seventh District's** participant this year, **Mrs. Lucile Lane** of **Ashland, Va.**:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBINSON: Being in **Washington** this past May as a Senior Citizen Intern is one of the major highlights of my life. It was a very full, exciting, informative, and instructive two weeks—from our reception the first Monday at The Capitol Hill Club (and seeing all the elephants in the cabinet, flanked by the portraits of the **Eisenhowers**) to the breakfast on the last day with the Interns, their Congressmen and Senators, and our speaker, the Honorable **Robert Ball**.

The daily roster of speakers was most impressive and they gave us what was the intent of the program—to educate, inform, and instruct a diverse group of American citizens in the problems, purposes, processes and programs of **The Hill**, with particular reference to the ever-growing group of Senior Citizens. I came away with a great increase of respect for the tremendous and complex tasks facing our elected representatives as they endeavor to solve the problems

of some 200 million Americans and to make life in America better every day in every way. I have become rather vocal in my support of you on The Hill—Republicans and Democrats alike.

It was a rare privilege to meet the President in the Rose Garden at the White House; to spend every spare moment in the House and Senate Galleries, listening to the debates and watching the voting; to see how a Congressman's office works and the magnitude of a Congressman's job; to ride the Capitol Subway to and from our meetings; and yes, to eat bean soup in the Senate Cafeteria.

It was an education in itself to meet and talk with some 160 Senior Citizens from across the nation—retired college vice-president, State Legislature member, retired ranchers, farmers, teachers, secretaries, salespeople, nurses, and housewives, representing many different walks and stations in life and sections of our nation from the Atlantic to the Pacific—but each one facing the one thing all human beings face, if they live long enough—Aging. Some of the group—in their 70's—walked from the hotel to the Capitol, some 2½ miles. One young man of 70 or so wore a pedometer and clocked 52 miles of walking on The Hill. I was most impressed by the fact that these men and women—most in their upper 60's and 70's and a few in their 80's—were concerned, not about the particular problems they personally face as aging Americans, but about other Senior Citizens less fortunate than themselves. Through their questions in the panel discussions, our speakers themselves were given an indepth look at the Aging and their needs.

Our speakers ranged from the Honorable Claude Pepper, a Senior Citizen himself, to some very able and young staff members, informing us on such pertinent subjects as Medicare, Medicaid, Health, Social Security, Consumer Problems, Housing, and Transportation. Each one of us came away from Washington with increased knowledge and inspiration to be better American citizens. I am receiving invitations to speak to various groups concerning what I "learned in Washington" and I look forward to being of service.

There is no better way to spend tax dollars than to continue the Senior Intern program nor can there be any one program that will reap such benefits as these. Senior Citizens go back to their various localities across America as better informed American citizens, better able to help others.

Thank you for allowing me to be your Senior Intern this year.

Sincerely,

LUCILE LANE.●

● Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to once again participate in this special order commemorating the senior citizen intern program. I have sponsored senior interns in past Congresses. It has been a meaningful exchange for me and my staff as well as the interns.

We were made aware of their concerns and those of their peers who have entered their retirement years. Their vitality and enthusiasm so aptly indicates that being elderly and retired hardly needs to be synonymous with retirement from being an active, contributing member of society.

I hope that the hundreds of senior interns that descend upon Washington each year will continually bring home the fact that the aging in America comprise the fastest growing segment of our population. It is crucial that we continue to address their future and we must be ever so careful not to be shortsighted.

It hardly takes a statistical genius to realize that as the percentage of our population over 65 increases other facets of our lives will be affected. While the exchange between interns and Members of Congress was only for a short time, messages are imparted to many of our seniors at home, since most interns participate in many local senior organizations. But even more importantly, I think these same individuals and their friends are more inclined to make their views known after witnessing firsthand, by working in the office or attending hearings, the impact of constituent concern.

In closing, I would only like to emphasize my commitment to the senior citizen intern program and ask that our efforts throughout the 96th Congress and subsequent Congresses continue to address issues affecting our Older Americans. During these difficult economic times, we must be careful not to increase the burdens of our elderly, those least capable of bearing them.●

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS) for his excellent leadership in coordinating, once again, this fine senior citizen internship program, and for taking this special order today. This is the first year I have become involved with this effort, and I feel that the experience has been a good one—for me, my senior intern, and my constituents.

At this point I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following report authored by my 1979 congressional senior citizen intern, Mr. Ernest E. Hanson of DeKalb, Ill. Mr. Hanson's remarks express many of the extremely positive reactions to the program that my staff and I experienced through his work with us. The purpose of the program—to bring Government and the elderly closer together—will continue to be served as Mr. Hanson shares his insights with the many senior citizens throughout the 15th District of Illinois. In fact, I held a seminar for senior citizens in Aurora, Ill., on June 16 utilizing the talents of Mr. Hanson and others in trying to make life a little more comfortable and profitable for our seniors. The following remarks by Mr. Hanson indicate the many successes of this year's senior citizen congressional intern program:

I considered it a real privilege to have the opportunity to participate in the 1979 Senior Citizen Congressional Program. After receiving the appointment, I wasn't sure what to expect for two weeks from a program in which I would "receive briefings by a panel of experts on social security, community services, medicare, nursing home care, and consumer affairs. There will also be an opportunity to work closely with my staff and me, learning the legislative process." (Your December 1978 Congressional Report).

Indeed, we did have a panel of experts. Our speakers came from congressional committees, governmental agencies, and private organizations, namely: House Select Committee on Aging, Senate Special Committee on Aging, Counselor to the President on Aging, Administration on Aging, Medicare, Social Security, ACTION, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Department of Consumer Affairs, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Urban Mass Transportation Administration, National Association of Retired Federal Employees, National Council

of Senior Citizens, American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, and, greetings from the President and a tour of the White House.

The presentations and discussions in each of the sessions were aimed primarily on the problems, programs, and legislation which related to the concerns of the elderly. An effort was made to clarify the responsibilities and functions of the respective committees, agencies, and organizations. The answers to the questions presented by the interns were, on the whole, adequately answered.

The complexity of the Federal programs for the elderly unfolded during the two-week period. Hopefully, the senior Citizen Congressional Intern Program will continue in the future because it provides another means of getting first-hand information back to the elderly in the respective districts.

One of the positive features of the program was the interrelationship that developed in the group of 165 interns. I enjoyed the small dinner groups and the discussion groups that met on short notice at the hotel. Through these groups and sessions, I was able to learn about on-going programs and services for the elderly in many geographical areas other than my own.

As I pointed out earlier, part of the time I was to work closely with you and your staff in learning the legislative process. You and the entire staff made this opportunity available to me. As the "senior" member of your staff I participated in conferences with you and your staff relative to the needs and programs for the elderly.

In addition, I attended committee hearings, answered correspondence from constituents (with proper briefing), reviewed pending legislation, aided in the development of a Bill (which was later introduced), and tried to aid the staff in furthering their resources relating to the elderly. I might add that working in the office with you and your staff was one of the highlights in the two-week experience.

After spending the two-week period in this program, I can honestly say that I believe in the Senior Citizen Congressional Intern Program and certainly hope that it will be continued and that more congressional offices will participate in the program. It helped me to gain insight into the many programs and services available to the elderly. Hopefully, I will be able to share some of the information I received with the elderly in the 15th Congressional District of Illinois. Our group had 165 interns.

I believe the objectives of the program would be difficult to attain if the group gets larger. If this does happen, I would suggest and urge the planning for two sessions a year and divide the group. Earlier I indicated that the presentations and discussion periods that followed were quite adequate. It is unlikely that this would continue to be true if the number of interns in a group would exceed the number in our 1979 sessions.

The housing and available food services left something to be desired. It might be well to explore the possibilities of trying to house the interns in a hotel with better facilities including meeting rooms for small discussion groups. And, possibly try to locate a hotel with better food services within reasonable distance than that in this year's location.

You may be interested in knowing that since returning home I have appeared before two senior groups and currently have two more scheduled. In these sessions I try to bring to the groups some of my experiences in the program, and, at the same time try to bring to the groups some of the programs and services available from the various agencies that appeared before our

group of interns. I'll be glad to share information with senior groups in the 15th Congressional District if they care to get in touch with me.●

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been a great privilege for me to serve as a sponsor in the senior citizen 1979 congressional intern program. There can be no questioning the fact that older Americans are this Nation's greatest untapped resource. Far too often, simply because of chronological age, senior citizens are relegated to the backburners of society.

The success of the senior citizen internship program is crystal-clear evidence that the elderly have much to contribute to this great Nation.

I was most fortunate to have the Honorable Eugene Zoppo, a retired labor leader from Paterson, N.J., and immediate past president of the New Jersey Federation of Senior Citizens, in my office as a congressional intern under this program. He is a man of great vitality, intelligence and extreme dedication whose lifetime of service to our people has truly enriched our community, State and Nation. Mr. Zoppo was indeed well qualified to represent the senior members of my congressional district and throughout our State. His 2-week stay as a member of my staff was a most productive time for both of us. I will certainly miss the advice and counsel he guided and provided me with.

Gene Zoppo and the 160 other older Americans who traveled to our Nation's Capital this May to participate took part in events that will have long lasting beneficial effects on senior citizens programs in New Jersey and the rest of our Nation. They attended a series of briefings on such subjects of special interest to the mature senior as consumer problems, medicare/medicaid, nursing homes, social security, housing, physical fitness, and transportation. In addition to a meeting with President Carter at the White House, Mr. Zoppo and the other senior interns also met with representatives from both the House and Senate Select Committees on Aging and several key organizations representing the interests of the seniors.

Projects like the senior citizen internship program engender a communion of interest and bridge-building between the people at home and representatives here in Washington blended together with firsthand experiences in the district that will most assuredly open up new communications channels for the senior citizens on Federal programs that were created to serve them. So it is clear the senior intern program does not end after the 2-week working session in the Member's office. The residents of the Eighth Congressional District and State of New Jersey will reap the benefits of the knowledge Mr. Zoppo obtained here and what can be done at the local level to make them more effective.

It was a pleasure to participate with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana—our colleague, Hon. ELWOOD HILLIS—and other Members of Congress in this most worthwhile and highly productive internship program. The dimensions of adding the seniors' lifetime of rich experiences, practical knowledge and

expertise to the legislative process presents a most formidable and exciting challenge, and I do trust we are successful in having the House of Representatives adopt, by formal resolution, the senior citizen intern program as an integral part of each Member's office. I certainly plan to participate in the senior citizen intern program again next year, and I urge every one of my colleagues to take part in this richly rewarding experience.●

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the English poet, Robert Browning, made an astute observation of senior citizens when he said:

What's a person's age? They must hurry more, that's all;
Cram in a day what their youth took a year to hold."

Mrs. Helen Burke, of Louisville, participated in the 1979 congressional senior citizen intern program.

This 2-week program ran from May 7 through May 18 in Washington and consisted of briefings and discussions on issues of interest to older Americans.

Helen Burke came into my office with enthusiasm, a capacity for hard work, and a charm that could only have been found in an "Irish Colleen."

My permanent Washington staff benefited from working with Helen.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues Helen's report of her observations of her internship:

READY OR NOT, HERE WE COME

(By Helen Burke)

The Senior Citizen population in this nation is expanding at a very rapid rate and represents an ever increasing portion of the population with unique needs—similar to, and yet different than those of other age groups.

The 1979 Intern Program gave us a broad insight into the Federal programs benefiting the elderly such as the Hill Burton Act for the construction and modernization of health delivery services facilities; community mental health centers; construction of nursing homes and intermediate care facilities; Medicaid assistance program to the states; the Medicare program of health insurance for the aged and the disabled; veterans domiciliary care program; and the veterans nursing home care program.

We found all of the foregoing enlightening but, finally, in roundtable-type discussions, we concluded that medical costs for the elderly are beyond the ability of most to pay and that a National System of Health Care Insurance is needed now. We concluded that too many of the medical needs and expenses of the elderly are excluded from private and government health insurance programs and should be incorporated into any and all new programs considered and/or adopted: prescription drugs, eyeglasses, hearing aides, foot care, dentures, and care by licensed practical nurses, to name a few.

Medicare, which was conceived to serve the aging and disabled is making some health care contributions but it could, and should, do more than it does for more people. The elderly pay more for health care than any other segment of the population yet they have less than half of the National Median Income.

When an older person has a need for health care he/she is faced with a maze of fragmented, inefficient, and incomprehensible procedures, regulations, and "paper work" to battle his/her way through. Unfortunately, this sort of fragmentation leads

to the denial of certain services to large portions of the population. These services are enjoyed by many others. Perhaps a National Health program would correct these inequities.

It is amazing and somewhat confusing the things I've learned since becoming part of the Intern Program about the complicated way our government functions trying to solve our many and diverse problems the best way government can. The 1979 Congressional Senior Citizen Intern Program gave all of us who participated a deeper knowledge and wider insight into the problems and special needs of the elderly in this country. We represented thirty-four (34) states and the one-hundred-and-sixty-four (164) of us in attendance were unanimous in our agreement that the organizers, daily group leaders, and all of the speakers are to be commended for their organization of activities, and their skills in sharing their talents with us. The United States Senators and Representatives who sponsored us are to be commended also for their genuine demonstration of their commitment to the elderly of the nation.

The insidious nature of inflation is such that all aspects of America's life and people are hurt by it. But, foremost among those hurt earliest and most severely are the aging Americans. Their incomes are greatly reduced and their cost-of-living is rapidly increasing. But, aging Americans are developing new life styles also. They are taking active parts in the affairs of states, their counties, their cities, their political parties. They take part in our society today. They take more interest in what is going on. They are contributing to the growth and development of our nation.

They have ideas: one such idea being that "improved public relations is a very vital need for older citizens." Their image in this country is very obscure.

Nuclear families necessitated by upward mobility, and tremendous influx of the youth into the work force, are some of the factors that go into generation gaps and cast the older citizens into a framework of forgotten people.

Everything in American society is geared to technology and profit. Many young adults hold responsible positions in our system and grew up in a youth-oriented age. Many of them never knew anyone outside their peer group unless it was a parent or teacher; therefore, they just don't know anything about old people or the needs of the elderly. They dismiss older people as an "odddity" or as "cute"—which, of course, is de-humanizing. For this reason, older citizens need good public relations to present a positive image to the country.

Old citizens are real people with real needs who contributed real service to the nation, to the nation's economy, to the nation's children. And, they are deserving of necessary benefits and services because they have earned them through a lifetime of service and meaningful contributions.

"Aging Americans," "the elderly," "older citizens"—whichever they may be called—they vote on election day. They are anxious to vote on such topics as: real estate tax rebates, lower taxes on the interest and/or dividend earned on small, lifetime savings.

When older Americans were younger, they invested in the U.S. Government (such as Series E Bonds) at low-interest over long years. Such bonds, being recalled now in times of exorbitant inflation plus increased tax schedules, have left many elderly people with a questionable return on their "investment in the Government." Many would like to vote on that topic!

It is thought by many that we can dispel the theory that government programs are the main cause of inflation. Only casual attention to the so-called "energy crisis" clearly indicates the too-long delayed needs

for widespread trust-busting, anti-monopoly suits against all multi-national corporations and multinational banks as a key to the solutions to global inflation—not just inflation in the U.S.A.

Services to the Senior Citizen need improving. Many millions of Senior Citizens have been around since Teddy Roosevelt stormed San Juan Hill and have, therefore, lived through some of our nation's most trying military campaigns. They are, generally speaking, in favor of America's preparedness but are also apprehensive of our present defense budget and are of the opinion that it can be greatly reduced. Such a reduction would contribute greatly to (so-called) Social Welfare programs for all Americans—Senior Citizens included.

The elderly should have the opportunity to participate in training programs so that they can continue to work after sixty-five (65) years old. Education should be available to them so that they can learn new skills commensurate with their "new" position in the work force: they will no longer be competing in the young-person-upward-mobility-get-ahead syndrome.

Most of the working people now classified as Senior Citizens were unable to accumulate large "nest eggs" because of wars (and their contribution to their nation in the form of prolonged military service); the Depression, dust bowls, low wage scales; and the spiraling inflation of the past twenty years. The more fortunate among them who prospered greatly and invested profitably have no limit on their personal incomes from age 62 through 72. They can collect maximum Social Security regardless of income from investments; whereas, the person without such investment return, who has to work-to-live during that ten year span has to sacrifice . . . has to make a choice: work for highest wages attainable and pass up Social Security payments or take some inferior type of work at some inferior wage scale and, even then, run the risk of having to repay portions of the Social Security income received during the quarters when income exceeds the arbitrary limitation.

Workers as well as investors should also receive their Social Security incomes without income limits. After all, "workers" are not only people but are dignified people as well.

Many Senior Citizens, male and female, have the physical and mental capabilities to perform skillfully many job functions from which they are presently excluded. Foremost among these are social services related occupations dealing with the elderly. Senior Citizens should be given more consideration and employment in these fields. The near equal age status of the worker would contribute greatly to reducing the frustrations of the aid-recipient.

The reduced rate of housing construction in this nation is presently bordering on national disgrace and the money lenders' greed for high interest rates is at the root of the problem for all Americans. In the meantime, increasing millions of elderly Americans are living in quiet desperation as their own homes deteriorate and collapse over their heads because niggardly Social Security incomes and inflation leave them little for sustenance and nothing at all to pay the inflated service charge of home repair companies. And for those in nursing homes—may God be with them. National law is needed without delay to bring about quarterly inspections of nursing homes and to insure that nursing home inspection laws are adhered to.

The so-called "energy crisis" aside, transportation has long represented a special need for the elderly. Falling eyesight, impaired physical condition and age-restrictive auto driver's licensing laws in most states make transportation assistance for the elderly a must. Further, the inability to be able to get

about—especially for health care—increases the necessity for in-home care services.

Lobbying efforts are underway at state legislatures and at the U.S. Congressional level to assist other citizens to reduce the cost of prescription medicines. And, efforts will continue, to reduce and/or eliminate those vestiges of discrimination against older people which continue in the United States.

Society is beginning to note the older people. ●

● Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations to Congressman HILLIS and his staff, along with all the other hard-working volunteers that made the 1979 congressional senior citizen intern program a success. I feel that this was an excellent program because it brought to Washington active elderly individuals to join in a unique learning experience. I know that the participating senior citizens will share their experiences with fellow seniors and apply what they have learned to benefit the elderly and their community as a whole. The success of the program is obvious since it has grown from 24 participants in 1972 to over 160 participants this year.

I believe that the true worth of this program is best expressed by the interns themselves. Accordingly, I am including the two letters sent to me at the conclusion of the program by our interns, Mary Stoner of Greensburg, Pa., and Nick Pallone of Arnold, Pa.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAILEY: I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the opportunity afforded me in participating in the Senior Citizens Intern Program, made possible by your devotion of time and resources to this worthy program. A special thanks to you and your staff for all the courtesies shown me, making my visit most enjoyable.

This has been a most enlightening experience, giving me an insight into the task confronting our legislators. I now realize the amount of time and work required of you in studying and evaluating the overwhelming volume of legislation being presented for consideration each day. Knowing, I now more fully appreciate your efforts of long hours of work on behalf of your constituents.

Meeting with Senior Interns from all areas of our country, exchanging ideas, discussing mutual problems, etc., has been the most rewarding experience. Given top priority in our concerns is the need of a National Health Plan, which, we all agreed, is long overdue.

Our summation: Happiness is a requisite to good health. It is better by far to prevent, rather than to cure illness, if possible. Keeping the elderly active, both mentally and physically would help to achieve that goal. A center with various programs to promote attendance and participation by the elderly, is essential in every community.

Here in Greensburg we are far behind in the establishment of a Senior Center, due mostly to the division existing between the two senior citizen organizations. With the help of our township, city, and county officials, I hope we can unite the two groups.

The knowledge I gained in my internship will be shared with my associates. If I can be of any assistance, feel free to call.

Sincerely,

MARY STONER.

CONGRESSMAN BAILEY: On behalf of the senior citizens of the 21st congressional district, we wish to thank you and the members of your staff for an enjoyable and informative two-week stay in our nation's capital. Your understanding of the need of senior

citizens to know the difficulties of having legislation passed in their behalf is in our opinion very commendable. Your staff extended all the courtesies of your office to attending interns.

Our purpose in attending this internship was to listen to various speakers on present legislation and suggest to them and to your office, its shortcomings and to make suggestions on how it can better serve our senior citizens.

Many areas of legislation were discussed during our two weeks, and we recognize that some legislation now in effect serves our senior citizens quite well. We do, however, hope that you will support several legislative bills that are of immediate concern to our senior citizens.

Areas of need to senior citizens are presented by the 1979 Interns:

1. National Health Plan
2. Social Security
3. Seniors Centers
4. Nursing homes versus in-home care
5. Nutrition Programs
6. Transportation
7. Making the Senior Citizens Intern program a formal function of Congress twice yearly.

Priorities given to numbers 7, 1, and 3.

Sincerely,

NICKOLAS H. PALLONE. ●

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support for the senior citizen intern program. This is the second year that I have been privileged to participate in the program established by our distinguished colleague, BUD HILLIS. Once again, the experience was a rich and rewarding one, not only for me and my office, but for our intern as well. The senior citizen intern program which began 7 years ago on an informal basis deserves our continued and enthusiastic support.

In fact, I would like to see the senior citizen intern program attain permanent status by making special funds available to each Member of Congress specifically earmarked for paying a senior intern's expenses for the 2 weeks he or she is in Washington. This would allow every Member the chance to utilize the special talents, maturity, and enthusiasm that an older person brings to the program. I have cosponsored legislation to accomplish this. The costs involved in setting up an official program are small when weighed against the benefits that a program of this kind brings. It has both short- and long-term benefits that work to the mutual betterment of senior citizens and the Congress.

It is easy to become isolated in Washington. We are constantly bombarded by experts in the geriatric field eager to shower us with their expertise on the special needs and problems of the elderly. Many of these suggestions ultimately find their way into our statute books in our attempts to do the right thing for the fastest growing segment of our population.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are missing the surest bet of all if we do not go directly to the source, senior citizens themselves, for some wisdom and guidance on what laws should be enacted and what others should be repealed. The senior citizen intern program also helps the older people understand more clearly the challenges facing legislators working with a limited amount of dollars and trying to

stretch them as far as possible to meet the needs of all the American people.

I am delighted that I had the opportunity to participate in the 1979 senior citizen intern program. I hope that by May of 1980 the senior citizen intern program will be available to all Members of Congress who care about the special needs of our elderly and who want to become involved on a firsthand basis with active and eager senior citizens in a mutually beneficial relationship. ●

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my great appreciation for having had the opportunity to participate in the congressional senior citizen intern program for 1979. For 2 very informative weeks I had on my staff Mrs. Sunday Anderson, who turned 84 years old just 2 months before coming to Washington to participate in the program.

Mrs. Anderson has been active in community and political affairs for over 42 years, having served one term in the Utah House of Representatives (1951-52) and having held several leadership positions at the county, State, and National levels. She received the Senior Citizens Award of the Year from the Utah Jaycees in 1973 and the Hall of Fame Award in 1978.

She is past president of the Utah Chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) and was the "moving spirit" behind the Sunday Anderson West Side Senior Citizens Center in Salt Lake City.

I not only learned much from Mrs. Anderson's internship, but we continue to keep in touch as we deal with the issues of vital interest to senior citizens in my home State.

I submit at this time for the benefit of my colleagues a letter I received recently from Mrs. Anderson regarding the internship program:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As a senior citizen Congressional intern of 1979, I wish to thank you for selecting me as your candidate. Having worked with the senior citizens for many years, most of the issues of the conference were very familiar to me.

The Older American Act was great. I was delighted on my return to assure our people that the government is concerned about improving social security. The physical fitness program I participated in with everyone else in the program taking part was a thrill.

I attended every meeting that was scheduled, and I appreciated the prompt starting and ending of every one. I would have liked to bring home a sample of all the materials, but the first three rows of each meeting were the lucky ones who got the information, and the rest of us had to write for the materials we didn't get. I hope to receive mine sometime soon.

I was escorted everywhere I went by a member of your staff, including when I was picked up at the airport on May 6 by Greg Korologos and taken to a delightful dinner at her home.

I spent the next five days learning what Congress is trying to do for the senior citizens. There were 32 states represented with 165 interns present.

On May 8 an intern meeting was held on the roof of the hotel. After I returned I spoke at the Nutrition Council on June 15. On July 20 I will speak to the Division on Aging.

As a result of my internship in your office, I hope to organize the site managers of the county Aging Services Division and other interested senior citizens to get com-

ments on the needs of older Utahans. As I told you before I left Washington, I will make recommendations to you about what can be done to help senior citizens in Utah, and I hope to accomplish this real soon.

During the program in Washington, the following statement was issued by Kitty Shaffer, chairperson of the 1979 Senior Interns:

"Washington, D.C., May 10, 1979. The '1979 Senior Interns' held a meeting (posted) at the Park Central Hotel Thursday, May 10, 1979, at 8 p.m. to collate their joint and major concerns. It was the consensus of opinion of those present (unanimously) that we will continue to share both our similar and our diverse concerns through the media of a quarterly Newsletter over a period of time.

"By acclamation (and his offer)—John Cy (Hopkins) of 510-15th Avenue, New Brighton, Pennsylvania 15066, will edit and mail out this letter to all delegates who may wish to participate. He needs your input. (Information must be in by July 15, 1979; newsletter will be out September 1, 1979.)

"His labors will be 'volunteer' at this time; but the cost of paper, printing, and mailing must and should be absorbed by the recipients.

"By unanimous vote, Nick Pallone, 1608 Leishman Avenue, Arnold, Pennsylvania 15608—will serve as treasurer of these funds. Make checks payable to: '1979 Senior Interns.' Submitted by Kitty Shaffer, chairperson."

So as you can see, Congressman, we did accomplish much during our two weeks in Washington, and we will continue to keep in touch and accomplish much more.

Thank you again for allowing me to be your intern. And I hope we can keep in touch and help the senior citizens.

Sincerely,

SUNDAY ANDERSON,
Senior Citizens Council Inc., and Sunday Anderson West Side Senior Citizens Center.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the program was a success, and I intend to participate in it again next year. As long as people like Sunday Anderson maintain a high level of interest and participation in programs such as these, the interests of senior citizens and all Americans will be protected.

● Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join in congratulating our colleague, BUD HILLIS, on this year's successful and informative congressional senior citizen intern program. His efforts to produce such a worthwhile opportunity for interested participants must be commended. The program's success is witnessed by the ever-increasing numbers of participants. In 1973, only 11 interns participated in the program. This year, a total of 160 individuals from across the Nation journeyed to Washington for the intensive workshops.

This was the first year that my office participated in the program. All signs indicate that it was a most useful and exciting session for Ms. Ida Berkowitz who represented the 21st Congressional District of California. Ms. Berkowitz, of Van Nuys, Calif., spent an exhausting 2 weeks attending extensive meetings on the functions of Congress, medicare/medicaid, health care, transportation, housing, and social security.

At the conclusion of the program, Ms. Berkowitz said she learned a great deal during the seminar session, but was particularly "amazed at the length of time

and painstaking process it takes to get legislation passed by Congress and implemented. I do not think many people fully understand the time and effort it takes to get a bill through."

Ms. Berkowitz and some of her new found friends also did independent research on the issue of health care. She summarized her experience this way, "We went from one representative to another getting their views on health care. It was fascinating to learn different sides of the issue and then weigh the pros and cons of conflicting views. It gave each of us an opportunity to gain firsthand information from those Members of Congress whose views most interested us."

Ms. Berkowitz also expressed her concern that "not enough is being done to reeducate older Americans. No one takes the time to help them find reemployment—a second career—or simply allow them to experience the joy of learning. Older people are put on the shelf, given food, shelter, and then forgotten. Older people must stay involved—it's a health benefit. Today, society is sadly lacking in helping older people keep active in community affairs. We have so much more to offer."

The 1979 senior interns plan to continue their interchange of ideas by publishing a newsletter. It will inform interns from across the Nation of what is happening within each of the different communities.

Ms. Berkowitz plans to meet with various community groups back home and share with them her experience in Washington. She believes that it is important to broaden her peers' understanding of the functions of the Government and how it works for them, a feeling shared by many of her colleagues in the program. Ms. Berkowitz hopes to help better organize senior groups in expressing their concerns and suggestions about legislation which comes before the Congress.

It was a delight and great pleasure to have Ms. Berkowitz with us. Her contributions to the program and sharing of her experience and interests with others are beneficial to the citizens of our community. I am grateful to her for giving my office an opportunity to participate in the program, and to Congressman HILLIS for making the senior intern program possible. ●

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, nearly 15 percent or about 69,000 people in the Indiana Fourth District are 60 years and older. As a group they constitute a valuable resource for Indiana and our Nation. We need to establish stronger lines of communication to study their concerns and to seek their ideas on responsible solutions to their problems, and those of our country.

The congressional senior citizen intern program which was held again this year in May proved to be an excellent forum for an exchange of views with senior citizens from across the country.

Two active representatives from the Fourth District of Indiana were on my staff for this year's program. They were Mrs. Edith Schemahorn of LaGrange

and Albert G. Jennings of Fort Wayne. After their return from Washington they took the opportunity of sharing their experiences and reactions with others in their communities. They have also met with the 4th District Senior Citizen Advisory Committee to initiate a program of action and recommendations that could be helpful to me.

I wish to commend my able colleague from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS) for his leadership in pioneering this program that continues to grow in popularity each year. At the same time, my appreciation also is extended to Congressman TONY COELHO of California and Senator WILLIAM ROTH of Delaware for their contributions to the success of the project.

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues to express my enthusiastic support for the congressional senior citizen intern program, in which it was my privilege to participate for the first time this year. My distinguished colleague, Mr. HILLIS, should be commended for his leadership in this program.

Our office was very fortunate in having Miss Zipora Braunschweig, of Lake City, Iowa, with us for the 2-week period in May. Zipora has been an outstanding leader of Lake City senior citizens for many years. A retired nurse anesthetist she has been secretary of the Stewart Memorial Hospital Board in Lake City for 10 years, and helped form a corporation to build a nursing home in the city. She helped secure a \$26,000 grant for the Lake City Senior Center, and was instrumental in forming a taxi service for the Lake City elderly in 1967 which is still functioning today. Further, she was recently reelected to her second term as Senator to the Older Iowans legislature.

Zipora was a great addition to our staff during that 2-week period, partly due to her extraordinary vitality and determination, and also because of the contribution she made to my entire office's awareness of the concerns of senior citizens in northwest Iowa.

While Zipora was very enthusiastic about the amount of personal insight she was able to gain from the intensive seminars which were held on issues of particular interest to the elderly, she indicated that the real benefit of the program would be realized in her subsequent work back in the community.

"The senior citizen interns participating in the 1979 program have comparatively little influence or power as a small group," she said. "Our effectiveness will lie in our ability to communicate our knowledge to senior citizens back in the district, and to convince them that their voices do have an impact and that congressional offices need and want to hear from them."

Zipora has devoted much of her time since returning home to meeting with various senior citizen groups, relaying her experiences to them and relaying their concerns to my office. I expect that, in this capacity, she will be able to do a great deal to enhance the lines of communication between Government officials and older Americans in northwest Iowa.

The congressional senior citizen internship program has been a terrific experience for our office, as I know it has

for the growing number of other congressional offices who now participate. I have joined with Congressman HILLIS to sponsor legislation to make the program an official internship program of the House, similar to the LBJ Internship program for students. I am hopeful that Congress will see fit to give this program the official recognition and support that it so richly deserves.

● Mr. PHILIP R. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join so many of my colleagues in speaking again on behalf of the senior intern program. This was the fifth year my office participated in the program, and once again we have found it to be a productive and rewarding experience.

This year my senior interns were Mrs. Geneva Micklitsch of Bluffton, Ind., and Mr. Alfred Markin of Hartford City, Ind. Both are very active in senior citizen organizations in the 10th District—Mrs. Micklitsch serves on the executive board of the Area III Council on Aged and Aging and on the Wells County Council for Aged and Aging, and Mr. Markin coordinates the Area VI Council on Aging's nutrition program.

Both Mrs. Micklitsch and Mr. Markin were excited about returning to Indiana and sharing their experiences with others, and they felt the information they had gained would be very useful to the efforts of their organizations to expand senior citizen services. Before they left Washington, they evaluated the 2-week program for me, and I would like to share with my colleagues some of their thoughts.

Mrs. Micklitsch reported:

I am happy and very grateful to you to have this opportunity to participate in the senior intern program and hope that I will be able to bring at least part of this information back to the area. What I liked most about the intern program was the sociability of the other interns, their capability and knowledge about the many programs for the elderly. The lectures were very knowledgeable and the speakers very well versed. Questions and answers have helped us understand some of the programs. It is surprising the vast number of programs and problems that we covered. Some of the things I am personally interested in and especially enjoyed briefings on were National Health Insurance, generic drugs, the food stamp program, home health care, transportation for the elderly, and senior citizen nutrition programs. I also enjoyed working in the Congressional office and learning about the vast amount of mail received daily. Thanks again for this wonderful opportunity.

Mr. Markin reported:

We commend the founders, Rep. HILLIS and Sen. ROTH, and their staffs for initiating this fine program which continues to grow year after year. Particularly the excellent planning and leadership of Donna Norton. Her expertise, diplomacy and firm control of every session deserves the highest praise.

I personally feel greatly honored in having the opportunity to participate in this splendid program. In working and associating with our congressional office we fully realize that the interests of constituents are taken very seriously. As representatives of Senior Citizens we can go home with assurance for our areas that the Congress needs and wants meaningful communication and will respond as early and as effectively as possible. Naturally, I am primarily in-

terested in adequate funding of the Nutrition Programs and transportation for the elderly, being actively engaged in these services in Area VI. With contact and communication between state and local agencies on aging and the Federal Administration on Aging, the most advantageous legislation will be enacted on behalf of the growing population of older Americans.

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, having taken part in this senior citizen intern program for 2 years, I would like to take this opportunity to say what a privilege it has been to participate. I feel this program is extremely valuable, not only for the interns and what they learn about how Congress and the executive branch of our Government operate, but also for me and the members of my staff as the interns share ideas on various issues and procedures used in our office.

For the past 2 years our office has enjoyed those 2 weeks in May when representatives of our senior citizens in North Carolina have come to Washington to join in a learning internship. This year, I had the good fortune to have Mr. and Mrs. Bob Rosebro of Gastonia, N.C., serve on my staff. Their active participation, comments, and general enthusiasm for the program made their stay most rewarding for my staff and me.

Mr. Rosebro, a retired banker, commented that:

After being up here, I realize that the shape this nation is in is largely due to the people asking so much of their government.

Demonstrating this discovery of the need for self-reliance, the Rosebros plan to continue their interests in good nursing care for the citizens in their community, a senior citizen center; better transportation for the elderly, especially the handicapped; and additional help for those senior citizens who really need it. After their stay here, though, they know a little more about these programs. And, if they do not know the answers, they have the names of the people who do.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying how delighted I am to have participated in this program. I commend my colleague, Mr. HILLIS, for his initiative in implementing the program and urge the continuation of the internship.

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, each year around the first of May, I begin to look forward to the arrival of the Capitol Hill senior citizen interns. This year, I was privileged to sponsor two Eighth District residents as interns. Once again, I was enormously pleased by the program and by the participation of our Eighth District interns.

In the months since then, the interns have fulfilled an essential function of the program—they have brought the message back to their fellow seniors in their communities.

While we can have only a limited number of interns—I wish it could be more—it is essential to have articulate, energetic interns who will communicate their experience to other senior citizens, make them aware of what the Federal Government can do for seniors, and encourage them to become actively involved in the political process.

I want to commend and thank the two Eighth District interns—Arnold Kelling

of Lino Lakes, and Emily Pongratz of Duluth.

My staff and I were doubly blessed because each of the interns brought their spouse to Washington to join in the program.

Since their return to Minnesota, Mrs. Pongratz and Mr. Kelling have been the subject of a number of newspaper articles reporting on their internship and on their impressions of Washington.

I know my colleagues who have participated in the program will join me in urging our other colleagues to consider sponsoring interns next year.

We owe a debt of gratitude to Congressman BUD HILLIS for his leadership in nurturing and administering this program. He and his staff assistant Donna Norton have done just a great job in developing the intern program.

I would like to share with my colleagues articles on Arnold Kelling and Emily Pongratz which appeared in the Duluth Herald and the Circulating Pines.

[From the Circulating Pines (Circle Pines, Minn.) June 7, 1979]

**KELLING'S BRING MESSAGE FROM D.C.—
SENIORS SHOULD TAKE PART IN POLITICS**

(By Grace Gibas)

Arnold and Marcella Kelling, Lino Lakes senior citizens who spent two weeks in Washington D.C. as participants in the Capitol Hill Senior Citizen Internship Program, are home. Sorting out the mountain of information they received in twice-daily sessions they come to a rather pessimistic conclusion:

There are many agencies and programs in Washington working to improve the economic security of the elderly. But unless something is done about inflation their efforts will be futile. They picked up the general feeling that while President Carter was tending to the Middle East the big oil companies made an end run. The resultant high gasoline prices are fueling inflation. And that is especially bad news for the elderly who comprise 45 percent of the poor or near poor.

There is no funding for the Senior Citizen Internship Program which this year brought 165 internees to Washington, D.C., so Kelling went as an employee of Eighth District Congressman James Oberstar. Marcella accompanied her husband and absorbed as much information as possible.

The congressman proved to be a very busy man and was able to spend only a half hour with them. "Oberstar is a good listener," says Kelling. "In that half hour we were able to give him the basics of what senior citizen concerns are." They also discovered that Oberstar does his homework. They felt he was very well informed on issues.

Marcella can't say too many good things about Oberstar's staff. They work under tremendously crowded conditions but are dedicated workers. "They were very helpful and gave us all the information we wanted."

One of their favorite speakers, in a field of speakers who covered such diverse topics as physical fitness and housing for older America, was Congressman Claude Pepper from Florida. Pepper, a 78-year-old who lost his seat as a Senator in 1950 because he favored comprehensive health insurance and then regained a seat as Congressman 12 years later, is an outspoken opponent of mandatory retirement. He is still plugging hard for comprehensive health care and thinks victims of crime should get compensation.

The Kellings didn't get to shake President Carter's hand during a tour of the White House but they did meet Speaker of the House, "Tip" O'Neill, whom they describe as

"a huge man, so ugly he's attractive." They also saw California's Governor Brown being interviewed.

They were pleasantly surprised in a session on Social Security to learn that it is not about to expire, an impression dependence on the mass media gives. Social Security is alive and well, and has a healthy 50 years ahead of it at least. Medicare looks good for at least 70 years.

But people must keep a sharp eye out for legislation that would weaken these two basic programs for senior citizens. It would be political suicide for a politician to attack Social Security head on. But the public must be on the look-out for side-swipes.

For example, there is a move on to eliminate the \$255 death benefit. Opponents say that \$255 is an insignificant amount, so let's save money by eliminating it. A better alternative, since the amount is so small, is to ask Congress to increase the death benefit to \$1,000.

Another tactic is to push for the elimination of the Social Security floor payment, which is now \$121.80, and pay a sliding scale. This could mean that an elderly person who had never earned much might get only \$10. It's another swipe at the elderly poor. Another gimmick to watch for is a move to limit the cost-of-living increase to five percent even though inflation might be at 10 percent.

"It seems like when the government economizes it picks on the elderly and the poor," says Kelling. The United States and South Africa are the only countries that don't have some form of health insurance. Also the people of the U.S. have the lowest percentage of savings of any Western nation. People see no reason to save. The elderly who have saved sit and watch inflation wipe out their savings, and the young have no incentive to save.

On the health front the Kellings found that government policies are often in conflict with the needs of the elderly. The people who briefed the interns were completely frank and open. "They didn't give us a lot of hogwash," says Kelling.

For example, most senior citizens are happier if they can remain in their own homes. Nursing home costs are astronomical. For an elderly person who is mobile—and this is six out of seven—about \$5 would pay someone to look in on them daily. So what does the government cut? Home health care!

And Social Security supplements are not given if a person is cared for by a relative. Supplements go to nursing homes, and that's a way if driving folks into nursing homes when there are less expenses and better alternatives.

"Sometimes we senior citizens feel powerless," says Kelling. "We see things that should be done but to wade through bureaucracy to get them done is another matter."

A brighter spot in the health care scene is the growing willingness to consider socialized medicine. "The time has come for socialized medicine. It may take us some years. But it is an idea whose time has come," says Kelling. Few can stand catastrophic illness.

The Kellings enjoyed speakers on physical fitness and nutrition. "Food is mighty important to health," says Kelling. Too many times we don't know what is in the food we eat. We need to watch for additives and for sodium, especially in processed foods. And we need to watch our fat intake, since too much cholesterol can bring on a heart attack.

Kelling notes that the elderly make up only 10% of the population, but they cast 16 percent of the vote. "We are a mighty force in the state and local level. However, Congress is economy minded, and we cannot expect many added appropriations."

Perhaps the chief advice the Kellings would give after their Washington visit is this: "Be vigilant." Take part in politics.

Write your congressman about things that concern you. Find out all you can about benefits for senior citizens. And keep your eye on your government so it won't take things away from you.

"Seniors are more part of solutions than they are of problems," says Kelling.

[From the Duluth Herald, June 27, 1979]

SHE HAD "SEAT" IN CONGRESS

(By Jim Davidson)

Most visitors to Washington, D.C. are outsiders looking in, trying to catch glimpses of the federal government at work, while touring the museums and other points of interest.

A retired Duluth schoolteacher wasn't a typical visitor during her two-week stay in Washington last month. She had one of the better seats in the House.

Emily Pongratz, 2016 E. 3rd St., was one of 165 senior citizen interns who participated in a series of briefings by congressional committees and administrators on federal and private programs for older Americans.

The congressional internship program for senior citizens has existed for seven years, but only one other Duluthian, Joseph Wiesinger, has participated in it. However, several other area senior citizens have participated.

Pongratz sent in her application at the last minute to the office of Rep. James Oberstar. He chose her from a long list of applicants, and through his office's funds provided a round-trip air ticket as well as a \$300 per-week stipend for food and lodging.

Congressional committees scheduled special sessions for the benefit of the interns. Together they discussed issues affecting senior citizens—Medicaid, consumer problems, housing, nursing homes, health, Social Security, transportation and volunteering, among others.

Interns in the audience would get up and ask questions like "Could there be a housing program for moderate-income senior citizens?" Pongratz said, adding "They (committee members) couldn't answer that."

While staying in Washington with her husband Frank, Pongratz also witnessed congressional budget hearings, the debate over gasoline rationing and other energy conservation measures, and part of Senate investigation into the finances of Sen. Herman Talmadge, D.-Ga.

One highlight was a meeting with President Carter in the White House rose garden, where the president assured the interns that the Social Security system would remain sound for another 50 years, Pongratz said. The health of the Social Security program has been a source of concern in recent months.

"The internship program educates senior citizens. The information I get, I scatter around," she said.

Since returning to Duluth, Pongratz has given speeches at meetings of the Senior Citizens Coalition, the American Association of Retired Persons, the Central Body of the AFL-CIO, and the Nutrition Council.

She has also spoken at the Senior Citizen Community Center, 211 N. Third Ave. E., where she is a member of the advisory board.

Pongratz retired in 1977 after teaching 44 years, first in Wisconsin and then for 25 years at Endion Elementary School. She last taught kindergarten at Endion.

She is a member of numerous senior citizen organizations and does volunteer work for the Senior Citizen Community Center, Miller-Dwan Hospital and the Meals on Wheels program. ●

● Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today, I wish to express my support of House Concurrent Resolution 15 which

would establish a permanent and official senior citizen intern program that would be known as the Claude Pepper Senior Citizen Congressional Intern Program.

The present senior citizen program, organized by Congressman ELWOOD "BUD" HILLIS, began rather informally with only a very few participants. However, this year, nearly 150 senior citizens, representing virtually every region of the country, came to Washington to personally confer with Government officials involved in the special problems of senior citizens, and to have the experience of working with our staffs, and learning about the legislative process. These interns have returned to their home communities and are presently sharing the internship experiences and information with local leaders and other seniors who work together to resolve common problems. Ultimately, it is our communities who benefit from this program through these interns and their experiences.

The senior citizen program is one of the most useful exchanges between a constituent and a Member of Congress that we could have. This program would be enhanced if it were officially recognized and authorized by the Members of the House. I, therefore, urge favorable consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 15.●

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, we strive diligently in the U.S. Congress to fully understand the problems confronting America's elderly and to find appropriate solutions to those problems. Our objective or ultimate goal is understandably to make life better for our senior citizens.

Several years ago, under the careful direction of my colleague BUD HILLIS, the congressional senior intern program was born. Recognizing the acute need to bring together involved citizens who were aware of the needs of their contemporaries, I was one of the early sponsors of the program, and its merits have been well proven over the past few years. The program began in 1973 with less than two dozen participants and I am proud to say that, in comparison, 164 active older Americans participated this year.

The program is designed to bring representative seniors to the Nation's Capital for a 2-week period, involving themselves in the legislative process and studying various Government programs affecting the senior citizen. Any program that facilitates communication between the people and its representatives can only strengthen our democracy.

We were fortunate to have had two very special senior citizens from the Fifth Congressional District of New York representing us in Washington this year. Mrs. Rosalie U. Rosenberger is a practicing attorney active in senior citizen affairs in Rockville Centre, N.Y. Mr. Henry Polk, a retired employee of Union Carbide Corp., makes his contribution to the senior effort in Franklin Square, N.Y.

Every senior citizen club in the Fifth Congressional District was invited to nominate one or two persons who had been active members of their group and who would be interested to serve as in-

terns representing our district. The recommendations of the senior citizen organizations were then referred to an impartial panel of judges consisting of active senior citizen leaders in the area.

The Fifth Congressional District interns, Rosalie and Henry, brought honor to themselves as well as to the district, and I am extremely proud of the effectiveness of their contributions to the program. They were kind enough to submit reports on their activities and impressions of the 2 weeks they spent in Washington and the texts of their reports are as follow:

REPORT OF ROSALIE U. ROSENBERGER

Senior Intern—what a privilege to be selected for this outstanding program! And who is responsible for my participation but our own Congressman John W. Wydler, Congressman of the Fabulous Fifth. Comparatively few of our Congressional legislators—House and Senate—participate in this program by which one to two Seniors, chosen by a committee, meet in Washington for two weeks to attend seminars to learn about every aspect of plans, projects and legislation affecting senior citizens. In addition, participants associate with seniors from other areas in the Nation and exchange views, plans, and reports of activities and developments elsewhere. This gives the participants a greater awareness of our special concerns and how to solve them.

However it is necessary to have a legislator who is far sighted, generous and public spirited to share in this program, for it means he must donate a part of his budget toward the expenses of the seniors selected. Such a one is Congressman Wydler, only one in five in New York State to participate. There were 164 seniors from the entire United States—a small number when we realize how many Senators and Representatives there are in the nation.

One of the important pieces of legislation of special interest is called Medi-gap, which would provide that insurance companies that sell seniors supplemental medical insurance be required to spell out in detail exactly what their policies will provide, for it has been shown that many seniors expend considerable money out of meager incomes for policies from which they can derive no benefit. Other proposals include further health services under Medicare, such as payment for physical examinations which may disclose ailments that can be cared for immediately instead of waiting until severe illness develops and requires expensive hospitalization; and other services such as dental care, etc. which are not compensable at the present and such other services affecting health which Medicare does not cover.

Considered by Committees specially geared to study the problems of the elderly are proposals to permit outside earned income in determining social security payments since it is inequitable to permit income from investments while limiting earnings. There are also studies to eliminate age in the matter of forced retirement.

Many of us do not know of the Federal government's participation in the R.S.V.P. ACTION program (Retired Senior Volunteer Program) which provides for Foster Grandparent, Senior Companion Programs, Peace Corps, Vista and others. Senior Companions usually serve 20 hours a week. As low income volunteers they receive a tax free stipend, transportation allowance, etc. There are currently 3,500 Senior Companions assigned to more than 60 projects throughout the country. For further information contact ACTION, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 1611, New York, New York 10007.

Housing is desperately needed for our seniors, and we must ask our legislators to enact

laws to provide such housing including congregate housing in such facilities that will provide meals and necessary services. Funds are being appropriated for congregate housing programs administered by H.U.D., and we must be alert to request these funds. The object is to provide these services in a home atmosphere and not to incur the huge expenses of hospitalization for those incapacitated. It is actually an economy measure.

We must also be alert when it comes to budget time at the Federal and State level, and see to it that funds previously appropriated are not cut off and curtailed, e.g. the proposed elimination of the \$255.00 payment upon death, which was contemplated.

These are a few of the important matters which we learned, and it is up to each one of us to study, ask questions and take action by notifying our legislators on matters of great concern to seniors. Action is of the greatest value. The 75 plus age group is the fastest growing group in America. There will be 30,000,000 elderly Americans in the year 2,000. Legislators need our votes. If we do not help ourselves, who will.

REPORT OF HENRY POLK

My trip to Washington, as your Senior Citizen Intern, was a challenging and demanding assignment, but inspiring and educational. I brought back to my senior citizens in Franklin Square a wealth of information on many subjects of particular interest to them, and I shall discuss them later in this report. I was also exposed to much pending legislation as concerns us senior citizens. Contrary to popular belief, there are those of you in Washington who are concerned with senior citizen problems, and most heartening of all is the fact that there are no party lines where our welfare is concerned.

Being in Washington for two weeks as a Senior Citizen Intern solved no particular problems, but it did give me an insight as to how legislation is originated, how it is followed through, and the importance and necessity of letting your Representative in Washington know how you feel on certain matters.

Health, I believe, is the most important concern of the older American. Medicare does not cover prescription drugs, hearing aids, dentures, eyeglasses. Consequently, so many indigent seniors suffer because they cannot afford these "luxuries". Mr. Pepper's bills H.R. 646 and H.R. 2567 should be passed overwhelmingly. They would solve many of these problems.

Since the government has no age limit on retirement, industry should have the same privilege. As long as one can produce, and be an asset to his company and/or his country, he should not be penalized because he has reached the age of 70. I will be 69 next month and, while I am retired, I resent the implication that I am over the hill. Good luck to Mr. Pepper.

Housing for the golden agers is so inadequate. I hope we can do something about it real soon.

Upon my return to Franklin Square, from Washington, I discussed with several senior citizen groups, with which I am affiliated, Social Security updated, Medigap insurance, preventive health care, the Hospital Containment bill, and physical fitness exercises for the elderly. I reviewed the Consumer News Bulletins, housing, public transportation for the elderly disabled, nursing homes vs. home health care, etc.

My senior citizen friends sighed with relief when they learned that the President's recommendations to reduce benefits to Social Security recipients were shelved for at least a year. This may not be the place or time to say it, but I could not find one senior citizen who could understand the President's motives.

Mr. Wydler, I do honestly believe that the Senior Citizen Intern Program is one of the most important programs ever established, and I urge you to support Congressman Hillis' bill H. Con. Res. 15 and Senator Roth's bill S. Con. Res. 1, to continue the Senior Citizen Intern Program.

I do sincerely thank you for making it possible for me to have participated in the Intern program.

Mr. Speaker, Rosalie and Henry have now returned to the district and because of the unique opportunities they have shared I have requested them to work closely with me as senior citizen advisers. It is my hope and expectation that they will, in turn, share their experiences and personal involvement in the workings of Government with the community. Working together in this fashion, it will be possible for me to keep more closely attuned to the needs and desires of the seniors in my congressional district and to best assure that the views of area residents are carefully considered in future deliberations before the Congress.●

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, since its beginning in 1973 the congressional senior intern program has emerged as a major event in May—the month designated to honor our Nation's older citizens. Although the program has expanded from nine interns in 1973 to 165 participants this year, representing 115 Members of Congress, we still do not have a formal internship program. The 1979 program has run its course and it is my hope that congressional interest in this effort will not depart with this year's interns. The need for a formal program exists, and I urge my colleagues to consider the advantages that such a program offers.

There has been much said of the success and usefulness of these internships both for the participants and the sponsors. The program provides an opportunity for older citizens to develop a better understanding of the executive and legislative branches of Government. The participants, leaders in their communities, will take what they have learned and put it to practical use when they return home.

Given the abundance of Federal legislation and programs affecting the older population, it makes sense to offer this type of exposure to the workings of Congress and the agencies which administer older Americans programs. Much attention is given to statistics showing the growth of our older population and much tribute paid to the growing political force which this segment of our society represents.

Older Americans are uniting to bring about an end to age discrimination, an end to both social and economic isolation, and an end to the alienation which confronts all too many citizens when they are forced to withdraw from the mainstream of life. A program such as this puts substance behind our words, for although short in duration, it provides a familiarity with the processes of Government which must be used in bringing about change in the treatment of older citizens.

This year I am pleased to have sponsored Mr. Harold Williams, a retired attorney and businessman from Waban,

Mass., as a participant in this program. As an active participant in the Newton Council on Aging, the West Suburban Elder Services Home Care Corp., the Newton Highlands Senior Drop-In Center, and the Newton R.S.V.P. Advisory Board, Mr. Williams brought with him a wealth of practical knowledge on the problems that older Americans face. His recommendations and suggestions provided myself and my staff with a great deal of insight into the issues and interests that affect older Americans.

I would also like to commend my colleague Congressman Hillis for his intense dedication to this effort. Without his support and that of his able and dedicated staff member, Ms. Donna Norton, this program could never have met with the level of success that it has, both this year and in the past. Ms. Norton deserves our deepest admiration and appreciation for the truly splendid job she has done each year in organizing and coordinating this program.

Progress has been made toward formalizing the senior internship program, but we must push for more. It is my hope that we can adopt a formal internship program so that older citizens, just as the many students who participate in Washington internships, will have the opportunity to receive firsthand knowledge and experience about the workings of Government.●

● Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in support of the senior intern program.

This is the third year that I have participated and I am glad to report that the husband-wife teams I have brought to Washington for the intensive 2 weeks of activities have given their wholehearted endorsement to the program. They have all felt that the experience has been rewarding, extremely interesting, and well worthwhile.

I would like to quote from a letter I received from Mr. and Mrs. Jack G. Cornett of Neosho, Mo., who served as my senior interns this past May:

A final word to say thanks again to you for the "Senior Internship" to which you invited Ruth and me. We absorbed a great deal of information in the field covered by the programs; and in addition came away from Washington very much updated about the government and about the city. We both appreciated the chance to spend some time there and are grateful to you for having arranged it.

I would further like to commend my colleague Bud Hillis for his sponsorship and give a special word of thanks and praise to Donna Norton of his staff who was chiefly responsible for the well coordinated schedule of events.

Our colleague, TONY COELHO, also loaned a member of his staff who provided valuable assistance as well as our colleague from the other body, BILL ROTH.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the senior intern program to be a most worthwhile effort. I urge participation next year by every Member of this body as a way of letting our older Americans know that we are interested in their well-being and are willing to give them an opportunity to be heard at the highest levels of Government.●

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share my views on the senior citizen intern program with my colleagues. After participating in this program, I would like to congratulate Mr. Hillis on instituting this worthwhile activity. Our two senior citizen interns gained firsthand experience in the electoral process and obtained new insights into the mechanics of a congressional office. Additionally, they were able to meet and work with other older Americans from the rest of the Nation. In a sense, this group of senior citizens met as a sort of congress representing the various regions of the Nation, comparing topics and programs of mutual concern.

From the viewpoint of the congressional office, it was a very enlightening experience for my staff and me. With the hectic pace of Washington, it is easy to overlook our responsibilities as educators of constituents. Although the interns possessed a good understanding of the legislative process upon arrival, it forced us to stop speaking in our own jargon of markups, suspensions, and sine dies and explain what we were doing in an intelligible fashion. In this sense the interns educated us on how to keep people informed about the process of their legislative democracy.

One of our interns, 81-year-old Luther Randall of Gilman, Iowa, has been active in agricultural matters for years. He still is. Mr. Randall has served as president, vice president, and treasurer of the Iowa Farm Bureau Board; delegate to the American Farm Bureau; secretary of the Ferguson School Board; and an active worker in Marshalltown senior citizen programs.

Our other intern, Viola Janssen of Ackley, Iowa, is president of the Ackley Women's Club; chairperson of the shut-in program at St. John's Church of Christ; coordinator for Ackley transportation for the elderly; and an active participant in the Hawkeye area agency on aging.

In addition to seeing the sights of Washington, these seniors were on a busy schedule involving topics of concern to other older Americans throughout the United States. The interns attended seminars on the actions of the House and Senate Committees on Aging, the basic functions of the Administration on Aging, consumer protection efforts on the part of the elderly, health programs (medicaid/medicare) and ACTION. Moreover, they were involved in symposiums on various topics: Organizations representing the elderly; a look at social security; nursing homes/long-term care; housing and the older American; physical fitness; and transportation.

Mr. Hillis and his competent staff are to be commended for their time and effort in compiling such an informative schedule for the interns. I am confident that the interns who were fortunate enough to participate in this program will return to their district with a sound understanding of the major Federal programs which affect their lives. When they communicate their knowledge to their peers, a greater percentage of our older Americans should have increased

awareness and accessibility to the Federal programs set up to help them.

The interns should become conduits to the participating congressional offices—keeping them informed on the success and possible improvements in specific programs. As ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Aging, I am particularly concerned with public knowledge and feedback about Federal senior citizen programs. Maintaining a link between older Americans and Congress is vital. This program has provided us with a sound means for judging the efficacy of our programs. It also enables us to have "field representatives" giving us insight into our legislative shortcomings and suggestions for future initiatives.

I urge all Members to participate in this worthwhile program next year. As the average age of the population is increasing, it is imperative that all elective representatives and their staffs are aware of the needs of elderly and that plans are made on the basis of this information for the future.●

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to have the opportunity again this year to comment upon my experience with the senior citizen intern program. This was the third year that a constituent from my district and I were able to exchange ideas, share experiences, and partake in this valuable and worthwhile program.

In the past, many intern programs have been characterized by lack of coordination and actual substantive results. This has not been the case with the senior citizen intern program.

My intern this year, Irene Dunkly, and her husband Walter, felt that the intern program was very worthwhile. They not only saw our Federal Government in action firsthand, but were able to participate in seminars given by representatives from the Department of Aging, Social Security Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and other organizations that are of special interest to our senior citizens. Irene and Walter Dunkly have now taken the knowledge they gained here and are sharing it with citizens of Arizona.

I plan to participate in the senior citizen intern program again in 1980, and urge every Member to consider joining in this extremely worthwhile program.●

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last May two outstanding senior citizen leaders from my congressional district participated in the congressional senior internship program which I helped to establish. They wrote an exceptional report on their experience which I would like to share with my colleagues:

CONGRESSIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN INTERN PROGRAM, MAY 6-18, 1979

(By Miriam and Sam Schmuckler)

Two vital weeks in May 1979 will become a time to remember for 165 older Americans from 46 states of the United States who have assembled in Washington, D.C. for participation in the 7th Annual Congressional Senior Citizen Intern Program. Over 100 House and Senate members have sponsored this group, whose members comprised senior power and leadership from the grassroots. They are here to learn from top government officials what can be done legisla-

tively to remedy problems facing the Nation's aging population.

A red carpet welcome was afforded us by Congressman Richard Ottinger and his office staff. We were to begin an enriched series of meetings with top government agencies and Congressmen. This has been a "filled to the brim" learning project; as former educators, we feel this intern program to be an example of excellent teaching. It is an entirely creative action-oriented project, focusing on future positive accomplishments. Numerous concomitants have evolved as a result of this education. Discussions through questions and answers; suggestions; collecting and researching materials; interviewing members of our intern group; getting to see some Senators and Representatives all became daily procedure.

Indicative of the positive aspect of internship enthusiasm is the seven-year period over which this yearly two-week spring session program has occurred. Starting with the sponsorship of four members of Congress, nine interns participated; this year many more senior advocates applied for internships than could be accommodated. Congressman Elwood Hillis, a sponsor of the program, is seeking support for legislation which will make the plan an official and permanent function of the House and Senate. Identical bills in the Congress are S. Con. Res. 1 and H. Con. Res. 15.

The need to establish communication between older Americans and lawmakers is a significant fact when one considers that the elderly population has more than doubled since 1900, growing from 4.1% to a projected 10.6% by the year 2000. By then senior power might well become viable enough to elect a President of the United States!

SERVICES TO THE AGING

Increased services to the aging have been provided, particularly under provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended. New emphasis in gerontology has the goal of improving the quality of life for a graying population who do not want to count the years but rather make the years count.

An "Aging Overview" was presented by a panel of speakers, who keynoted our sessions. The Honorable Claude Pepper, chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging; Nelson Cruikshank, Counselor to the President on Aging; and Dr. Clark Tibbets, Special Assistant to the Commissioner on Aging, proposed the following legislation: elimination of requirements on earnings by seniors on Social Security, expansion of Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs), increased availability of part-time work, and extension of mandatory retirement beyond 70 years. We have heard that seniors are becoming a new national resource as advocates for better living and humaneness. Our achievements can negate stereotypes of the older population. We are being challenged to accomplish good for all citizens. Edmund Burke said it well, "All that is necessary for evil to triumph in this world is for good men to do nothing."

Unfortunately, one-sixth of our aged live below the poverty line. Further, 23 million older people have vital needs for health, social services, nutrition programs, counseling, housing and transportation. Expenditures on Social Security have been referred to as a "graying of the budget," when, in fact, elderly persons themselves have contributed to the benefits they receive.

"Older Americans have given more to our society than any other age group. Yet they have less than one-half of the national median income and often are forced to retire at 70," said Congressman Pepper. He urged an end to age discrimination in retirement, expanded home health and mental health care under Medicare, protection in the sale of "medigap" health insurance, elimination of Social Security earnings limitations, and

improved nursing home care by setting up stricter standards. Inflation is enemy number one for older persons, especially those on fixed incomes. There has been no containment for soaring hospital costs; this is evidenced enough in inflation effects. A strong example of tremendous medical price increases can be noted in a General Motors statement that it paid more for hospital bills of workers than is paid out for steel in its cars!

THE CONGRESSIONAL SCENE

Another session explored the Congressional scene, during which we heard the Honorable Lawton Chiles, chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, and others speak on the prevention of fraud and abuse in the sale of private health insurance to supplement Medicare which has been proposed by the "Medigap" bill, H.R. 2602; abolition of mandatory retirement for all ages is the essence of H.R. 4; H.R. 638 which would permit Medicare payments for HMOs; H.R. 640 would sanction Medicare payments for mental illness and H.R. 2565 would expand counseling for the elderly under the Older Americans Act. Naturally, priorities will be decided by the Appropriations Committee.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

The need for comprehensive data in the area of aging has been growing for many years. The Older Americans Act of 1965 specified that the Administration on Aging should serve as a clearinghouse for materials relating to problems of the aging. Donald Smith, director of the National Clearinghouse on Aging, cited Congressional interns as a group of perceptive seniors who could utilize the services of a data center. With the 4th White House Conference on Aging set for 1981, materials on income, taxes, energy, inflation, home care for ill, health, crime, consumer aids, employment, etc. will be compiled by the clearinghouse. We made a visit to Mr. Smith's office, where we had the opportunity to have a further discussion with him and receive considerable statistical data.

CONSUMER PROBLEMS

There is no dearth of information in the halls of government. Midge Shubow, director of consumers information and education for the White House, suggested we write the Consumer Information Center in Pueblo, Colorado 81109 for a free copy of "National Consumers' Buying Alert." This is a must publication for seniors, containing tips on auto repairs, hospital costs, energy, simple language for insurance policies, boycotting of high priced items, etc.

HEALTH/MEDICARE/MEDICAID

Continuing our group meetings we attended a session on Medicare, Medicaid and health. Patricia Schoenl, director, Office of Public Affairs, Health Care Financing Administration, explained the high costs attributed to doctors' services to be caused by lack of competition among doctors. We do not shop for doctors. While Medicare won't cover costs of catastrophic illness, such insurance is being considered in a National Health Plan proposed by several representatives. The possible alternatives must be studied. Would a national health plan cost less in a time period? Are the Administration and Representatives ready for a complete change-over in health care? Are medical lobbyists blocking national health insurance? How much assistance would catastrophic illness insurance offer the average person? The questions are many.

The costs of health care, according to our research, have increased over 275% in the last 10 years and, if present rates continue, 10.2% of the Gross National Product will be committed to health care by 1985. At these rates, cost increases are averaging \$1 million per hour! Within the last 2 years, the costs of the Medicare and Medicaid programs have risen over 40%, mostly due

to inflation and not to the cost of new beneficiaries or new benefits. Out-of-pocket costs for the elderly have more than doubled in the 10-year period from 1967-77. The Medicare hospital deductible has almost quadrupled in the years from 1969-79. These costs have outpaced the increases in prices of other goods services. The Hospital Cost Containment Act of 1979 would allow hospitals to bring their costs down voluntarily during 1979, with mandatory controls imposed only if the voluntary action fails to meet the reasonable goals established in the bill.

Our further research concerned catastrophic coverage needed by the elderly. The National Retired Teachers Association and the Association of Retired Persons would like a restructuring so that more money is diverted to less expensive alternatives, such as home health care and health maintenance organizations. The opinion expressed is that catastrophic plans would not cover the costs of nursing home care. In the long run the cost of providing catastrophic protection would inevitably exceed the cost of providing the same protection under a national health plan.

TRIP TO THE WHITE HOUSE

As a rare interlude between the end of our first week of meetings and the beginning of our second week of sessions, we were privileged to meet with President Carter in the Rose Garden of the White House. Hemmed in by security guards, the President greeted us most graciously. He stressed the solvency of Social Security funds; this would be true for many years to come. Urging our support for passage of the Hospital Cost Containment Act and S.A.L.T. agreement, he told of their impact on older people. As a first group of senior interns to be greeted by a President of the United States, President Carter hoped we would continue to learn about government and work with our constituencies. Lawmakers would have the benefit of our educational experiences here. The President considered us a vigorous and aware group of concerned citizens. Younger generations can benefit greatly from what we can suggest. He cited his 81-year old mother for her activities. As he talked, we were reminded of that quotation from Oliver W. Holmes—"I had much to learn at 85 and found new business opening all around me."

VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

While all older citizens are aware of the soaring cost of living, some "well-heeled" seniors comprise a group of persons relatively better off than their predecessors; nevertheless, retirement for many persons still significantly increases the probability of severe income loss, decline in living standard and impoverishment. Six million older citizens exist at the poverty level. Twenty states do not offer supplementation of SSI. Poverty among America's aged, as researched by Rep. Pepper's Committee, deserves Congressional action to alleviate this situation.

Yet economic trials do not keep seniors from their vital work as volunteers in so many public service areas. The federal agency ACTION sponsors older American volunteer programs. These include: Foster Grandparents (FGP), Retired Senior Volunteers Program (RCVP), Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE) and Action Corps of Executives (ACE). Erna Bombach, in a serious vein, calls the volunteer program, "the last dream of a decent civilization." Perhaps, the way to really transmit values in our society is through our senior volunteering. What better way to work with intergenerational groups of individuals, offsetting stereotyping of older people. It is significant that senior volunteers save our taxpayers thousands of dollars through their efforts in assisting others. "Seniors have

been becoming inflation reducers," said Congressman Elwood Hillis. Older citizens can claim to be non-self-serving. Aristotle said it meaningfully, "The measure of a man lies in that part of himself that he gives in service to his fellow-men."

HOUSING

One more primary illustration for improving senior living conditions was given by HUD. Housing is one of the major expenditure items in the budgets of older Americans. With demand outstripping housing supply, adequacy of housing has become an issue, particularly for the low-income elderly. Federal loans are being made for construction or rehabilitation of multi-family rental housing for the elderly (age 62 and over). Tenants may qualify for rent supplements under the Section 8 program of the amended 1959 Housing Act—Section 202. The federal government insures against loss on mortgages for construction and rehabilitation of multi-family rental housing for the higher income elderly (section 231, of the 1959 act). The federal government makes direct and guaranteed insured loans to construct, improve or repair rental or cooperative housing in rural areas for low-income seniors. Local housing authorities receive federal loans to aid in purchase, rehabilitation, leasing or construction of multi-family housing for low-income families or individuals 62 or older. Rents may not be more than 25% of the family's income (1937 Housing Act, amendment, section 504). Federal loans and grants are given low-income homeowners, age 62 and over, to repair or rehabilitate their homes so as to remove dangers to health and safety. (Housing Act of 1949 as amended, sec. 521). Helen Holt, Departmental Advisor for Consumer Affairs and the Elderly, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Robert Wilden, Director, Program Development of the same department were our speakers on housing.

TRANSPORTATION

Still, another illustration for improving senior living conditions lies in the transportation area. Kay Regan, of the Urban Mass Transit Authority, spoke to us. She felt adequate transportation is an essential service and must be part of all state-funded programs for the elderly. The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, authorizes UMTA to make capital grant funds available for equipment for the elderly. Under the Capital Assistance Program (sec. 3) grants are made to states and local public agencies to provide transportation. Applications for such grants may be made to UMTA regional offices. Grants are also made under Section 16(b)(2) of the UMTA for private non-profit organizations. These funds are only made available through the states. Under the act, mass transportation companies receiving federal funds for either capital or operating expenses must charge elderly no more than 1/2 fare during off-peak hours. A listing of state contacts may be received from the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, 400 7th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590.

CLOSING BREAKFAST

Robert Ball, senior Scholar, Institute of Medicine National Academy of Sciences and former long-term Social Security Commissioner, gave us good and bad news concerning the future of Social Security. Echoing President Carter's optimism, he said the Social Security system is on a sound financial basis for 50 years, at least. But tension, he feels, exists between the desire to improve the system, on one hand, and to fence it in, on the other.

There are four categories that can influence negative results for the elderly:

Reduce rights of seniors by direct reduction of benefits.

Increase age of eligibility.

Lower paid people on Social Security to be paid minimum amount, regardless of earnings.

Stabilize benefits to recent wages.

Dr. Ball says that seniors sustain losses of many kinds as they age, why add more through Social Security losses. There is a real danger of pitting workers against the recipients—this must be avoided.

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

It has been gratifying to hear how many of the speakers who addressed our group showed genuine concern for human needs. It's as though there is a Renaissance, an awakening to age and its dignity. Following passage of the Older Americans Act amendments, the Administration on Aging considered its major objective to be the provision of a network on aging, offering the opportunity for those who wish to voice their needs and concerns. These could be considered when drawing up regulations for implementing new amendments. Since it became law, almost 14 years ago, the Older Americans Act has become the focus of federal activity on behalf of the elderly.

As seen by the National Aging Clearinghouse, the outlook for senior priorities over the next two years include: (1) restructuring Social Security, (2) insulation of financing of programs and incomes for seniors from present high inflation, (3) discouraging of early retirement and elimination of age discrimination, (4) humane and cost-effective health care for all, a national health insurance program, and (5) home health care implementation, drugs, lab tests, costs supplementation under Medicare.

Certainly implementation of the priorities listed above would offset the Catch 22, 1984 Orwellian situation that older Americans on limited incomes are now facing. A 206% increase in hospital costs in the last 10 years is a prime example of an "Alice in Wonderland" America.

As Senator Ted Kennedy has said, "Special interests are doing their best to buy every Senator and Representative on issues. Corporations have been creating political action lobbies this year at the rate of one a day." With a growing over 65 population, for example, it is unbelievable to find only one endowed chair of geriatric medicine in the United States; it is established at the Cornell Medical Center in New York. It is also startling to realize that drug companies spend \$2400 per doctor in their advertising and in advising the medical profession to use brand name drugs rather than their generic equivalents in prescribing medications.

"If I want to know what the future will be, we had better have a hand in shaping it," said Eric Hoffer, longshoreman philosopher. Certainly our two-week Congressional Senior Citizen Internship program has offered us the knowledge and inspiration to reach out to other seniors in arriving at enriched living for all Americans.

Certainly our people-to-people conferences with government leaders and local community workers for senior citizen's welfare have generated our increased interest and enthusiasm to bring back to our community the many facts and ideas we gleaned for the purpose of keeping our older citizens young. It has been especially gratifying to note how much our Representatives and interns care about building a better society for seniors, strengthening senior rights thereby. This has been the humanities in action.

May we express our deep appreciation to Congressman Richard Ottinger for inviting us to participate in this unique and excellent Congressional Senior Intern program. We are most grateful to Jo Merrill and Oren Telcher for their gracious welcome. They assisted us beyond the call of duty during our stay here. The experience has motivated us to implement the many ideas gathered here. T. S. Eliot's poem has lines in "The Hollow

Man" which might be rephrased to describe an optimistic attitude expressed by many in our group, as our sessions here conclude: "The world ends not with a whimper but with a bang," for we are not apathetic but eager to accomplish results.

MAY 18, 1979.●

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleagues in expressing my appreciation for the diligence and hard work by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS), whose office coordinated the 1979 congressional senior citizen intern program.

A group of us in the Congress have joined under the able leadership of Mr. HILLIS in participating in the yearly program of bringing a senior citizen intern to Washington for a 2-week period.

I have been fortunate in having a senior citizen consultant serve as a member of my staff for the past 6 years. At the present time I have two consultants: Mrs. Mary Delaney, of Pomona, N.Y., who works with me in Rockland County, and Mrs. Ruth Schrauer of Middletown, N.Y., who works with me in Orange and Ulster Counties. Mrs. Schrauer attended the 2-week intern program in May of this year, while Mrs. Delaney had attended it in a previous year.

The 26th Congressional District of New York has a senior citizen advisory committee which works closely with me on the senior citizens related problems in my district. In the past our advisory committee has annually selected the senior citizen consultants, who serve on my staff as liaisons to the senior citizens in my district. To qualify, the consultants must be retired senior citizens, 62 years or older, and a resident of our 26th Congressional District.

Our senior citizen consultants keep me abreast of individual views and problems, and, in turn, keep the senior citizens advised of Federal legislative programs affecting them. They are also given assistance on where to seek help when they are unable to resolve problems themselves.

The Washington senior citizen intern program, held each year, has been extremely helpful in enabling my senior citizen consultant to meet with Federal officials, who deal with problems of senior citizens, and to attend various legislative briefings, giving the consultants a broader insight for dealing with senior citizen issues back in my district.

The yearly visit to Washington by my senior citizen consultants has brought about a deeper understanding between me, my Washington staff, and my consultants regarding the problems of senior citizens and how to resolve them.

Mrs. Schrauer has very aptly expressed her views about the program, stating:

Two weeks in the National Capital as a Senior Citizen Intern has been interesting, informative, and exciting. It has been a beautiful experience and I want to, sincerely, thank you and all your staff for being so gracious and helpful.

The purpose of having this program is well founded as it brings the aging population into the legislative process to see how it affects their lives in housing, economics, health, and transportation. This segment of

the population makes up 16½% of the voting power and they should be involved in the policy making. As your consultant I intend to bring this information back into our community and keep you informed of our needs and interests . . .

The trip to Washington was exciting. I shall endeavor to participate in activities, programs and legislation that will benefit our communities and bring the weight of the Congressional 26th District voters in support of such endeavors.

As an active sponsor of this program, I am also a sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 15 which would authorize each Member to hire for 2 weeks each year, one senior citizen intern, who will serve for that period in Washington, with expenses.

The adoption and implementation of this resolution would enable many other Congressmen to take advantage of the opportunity of having these outstanding senior citizens become more actively involved in the process of how our Government is run and it will give the participants an understanding that can be utilized to help other senior citizens in their districts.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, because of the success with which the senior intern program was greeted in the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois during the past 5 years, it was my pleasure to again invite representatives from senior citizen clubs to participate in this instructive exchange.

I regard the senior citizen program as an excellent method by which our senior citizens develop a better understanding of the role and responsibilities of the Federal Government. I believe that every Congressman who participates in this program comes away with a better insight into the concerns of our older Americans, who really are one of the Nation's most valuable assets.

Mr. and Mrs. Frank L. Dyer of Palos Park, Ill., were my senior interns this year. They both are very active in senior citizen organizations in their community. They came to Washington to learn about our Government and to receive a firsthand understanding of how it works. As this was their first visit to our Nation's Capital, they found this opportunity even more exciting and were especially enthusiastic about sharing their experiences with me and members of my staff.

During their short stay in Washington, Mr. and Mrs. Dyer and the other senior citizen interns were given a well-rounded view of the operation of the Federal Government with special emphasis on programs that affect our senior citizens. Question and answer sessions enabled all the participants to make a direct input into the discussions.

My staff and I had an opportunity to benefit from their experiences as they learned something about the operation of a congressional office in handling constituent inquiries and opinions. This provided them with a ringside view of a congressional office in action. When they returned to their community, Mr. and Mrs. Dyer were able to share their experiences with their fellow members of their senior citizen club from the unique

perspective of personal involvement in the workings of the Government.

During my discussions with Mr. and Mrs. Dyer, I was pleased to learn that they considered the program very beneficial in providing them with an opportunity to learn how our Government administers programs of special interest to them and their fellow senior citizens. In addition, the senior citizen intern program gives us the necessary feedback to become more responsive to the specific needs of seniors.

My interns and I agree that this year's program was a tremendous success. We take this opportunity to thank Congressman HILLIS and his staff assistants who again did such a fine job in coordinating the seminars and other activities and whose dedicated efforts made it a successful, well-run program. This program deserves our continued and enthusiastic support, and I sincerely hope that more of my colleagues will join in the senior intern program next year.●

● Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to join my colleagues in saluting the Senior citizen internship program.

This is the fifth year my office has participated in this program, and I want to tell you that it is one of the single most outstanding experiences offered to constituents. This year my two interns, Lester Hauck of Perkiomenville and Frieda McMullan of West Chester, were chosen by my senior citizen board, which is comprised of my former interns. Over 30 applicants were interviewed, and the competition was extremely tough. I have found over the last 5 years that many of my district's senior citizens are very concerned with the role of the Federal Government in their lives, and more importantly, in the impact they can have on Government programs.

During these weeks my interns were directly involved in the functions of my office, ranging from opening mail to attending Mushroom Day as my representatives. In addition they attended briefings, legislative hearings, and generally received a comprehensive view of Government programs for senior citizens. After their 2 weeks in Washington my interns went home and spoke at a breakfast of all of the applicants for this year's program, to give them an idea of what they learned and how Federal programs affect their lives. I can honestly tell you that Lester and Frieda gave the senior internship program rave reviews, and it gives me great pleasure to join them in lauding BUD HILLIS and his staff for all of their work to make this year's 2 weeks an exceptional experience.●

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to have the opportunity again this year to comment upon my experience with the senior citizen intern program. This was the third year that a constituent from my district and I were able to exchange ideas, share experiences, and partake in this valuable and worthwhile program.

In the past, many intern programs have been characterized by lack of coordination and actual substantive results. This has not been the case with the senior citizen intern program.

My intern this year, Irene Dunkly, and her husband Walter, felt that the intern program was very worthwhile. They not only saw our Federal Government in action firsthand, but were able to participate in seminars given by representatives from the Department of Aging, Social Security Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and other organizations that are of special interest to our senior citizens. Irene and Walter Dunkly have now taken the knowledge they gained here and are sharing it with citizens of Arizona.

I plan to participate in the senior citizen intern program again in 1980, and urge every Member to consider joining in this extremely worthwhile program.●

● **Mr. PANETTA.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my enthusiastic support for the congressional senior intern program and to commend my colleague Mr. HILLIS and his staff for their efforts in making the program a success again this year.

This was the second year my office has participated in the program, and I am more convinced than ever of its positive educational value, not only for the interns themselves, but also for the many Members and their staffs who have had the opportunity to work with these dedicated individuals.

Unfortunately, this year's program ended on a sad note for me, due to the recent death of Arthur Carstens, one of the two interns from my district. Art was a true crusader in the field of programs and services for the elderly, and he will be sorely missed by those of us who knew and benefited from his extraordinary wisdom and character.

Nevertheless, I was very pleased to be able to take part in the program again this year, and the reports I received both from Art and from Kitty Shaffer, who also participated from my district, indicated that the experience far surpassed their own expectations.

But just as important as the experience for each individual intern is the knowledge they will take with them to share with others in their communities who are involved in advocacy programs for the elderly. And for the rest of us who have had the opportunity to become involved in this program, the congressional senior internship will contribute to a better understanding of both the needs and the potential of our Nation's older citizens.●

● **Mr. BARNES.** Mr. Speaker, the senior citizen intern program provides an opportunity for valued members of our communities to make a contribution to the process of government. My office was honored for 2 weeks in May to work with Mr. Louis Landesman of Rockville, who participated as a member of my staff in concerns relating to older Americans.

Mr. Landesman has written his impressions of his participation in the senior citizen intern program. I would like to share them with my colleagues:

SENIOR CITIZENS INTERN'S IMPRESSION
OF THE PROGRAM

It was, indeed, an honor for me to have been appointed a member of the 1979 Congressional Senior Intern Program by Con-

gressman Michael D. Barnes of the 8th District of the State of Maryland.

I was just one of a group of 165 senior citizens selected to learn first hand what the federal government is doing in policy areas of special interest to the elderly.

I found the program to be a productive learning experience about the workings of the federal government and the legislative process. It has enabled me to be better equipped to serve the needs, and to use the knowledge I gained, in my reports to the senior citizens groups in my communities of Rockville and Bethesda, Maryland.

We were most cordially received and welcomed, not only by Senators, Congressmen, but also by the efficient and most helpful staff people from all committees that we were invited to attend.

The fine people such as guards, cafeteria workers and other government people that we came upon were most courteous and helpful.

Our meeting with President Jimmy Carter, who greeted each and every one of us personally, was indeed a highlight of our program.

Many of us were indeed fortunate to be able to present our ideas to various committees. I particularly had the opportunity to discuss with Congressman Claude Pepper and Counselor to the President on Aging, Mr. Nelson Cruikshank, programs for Senior Citizens, such as higher rate of interest to be paid on savings accounts and accessibility to buy high interest United States Government bonds and savings certificates in smaller denominations. Also, for certain Senior Citizens, reduction of Federal Income Taxes on savings bank interest. I also discussed Medigap Insurance with the intent that Congress should carefully keep an eye on unscrupulous insurance companies that are cheating Senior Citizens with unnecessary and falsely worded health policies. The panelists were attentive and most willing to try to solve the many problems facing the elderly.

We left with high hopes that solutions shall be found and with grateful thanks and appreciation to all for having had the opportunity to be of service to our beloved country.●

● **Mr. ATKINSON.** Mr. Speaker, the senior citizen population is a vital segment of U.S. society. Their knowledge and wisdom has enabled us to grow and move forward with a reassurance and a pride in our past. We can learn much from them and it is vitally important that we continue to work with and for them. Yet as our society grows increasingly complex, so do the needs of our senior citizens. As a member of the House Select Committee on Aging, I am continually made aware of the pressing concerns which senior citizens of our country face daily. As legislators, we cannot turn our backs on the ravages of double digit inflation upon fixed incomes, inadequate housing facilities, insufficient transportation, and rising health costs.

The congressional senior citizen intern program, sponsored by our distinguished colleague Congressman "Bud" HILLIS, has proven to be one means of addressing the problems besetting older Americans. The program has fostered communication between legislators and senior citizens. As the senior interns met in Washington this past May, they brought with them the concerns and hopes being voiced by a cross section of senior Americans.

Mr. John "Cy" Hopkins, of New Brighton, Pa., a retired school teacher

with 34 years experience in the Pennsylvania school systems and an active member in local community organizations, represented the senior citizens of Pennsylvania's 25th Congressional District. Mr. Hopkins found the internship to be a tremendous learning experience as well as an opportunity to make input into the legislative process. He reported to me that the scheduled briefings targeted the most crucial problems facing our older Americans. Our discussions concerning the conditions affecting senior citizens in Pennsylvania were truly informative. I know Mr. Hopkins found his internship in Washington to be singularly helpful in his dealings with other senior citizens back home.

I commend Congressman HILLIS and his staff, participating Congressmen, and all of the chosen senior citizens for contributing to one of the most effective programs on behalf of senior citizens. I hope this program will continue for many years. I intend to support it in every way I can.●

● **Mr. JONES** of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak today in behalf of the senior intern program.

This year is the first time my office has participated in the program. I believe that my intern, Mrs. Lu Patrick, benefited almost as much as I and my Washington and district office staffs did from her participation.

Lu was an ideal candidate for our first senior intern. She is active in the Tulsa Coalition for Older People, the Tulsa Area Council on Aging, and a myriad of other organizations that benefit the elderly citizens in my district. In addition, she is moderator of a weekly senior citizen radio program. Lu is acutely aware of the problems of the elderly and is able to disseminate information to assist them through this program. Since serving her internship, Lu has continued her work with my office and the community and appears tireless in her duties.

I wholeheartedly recommend the senior program for interns and urge my colleagues to do the same.●

● **Mr. CLAUSEN.** Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm that I rise today to salute the 1979 senior intern program; 1979 was the second year I participated in the senior intern program, and I have found it to be an enormously worthwhile and productive experience. This year, my staff and I had the good fortune of having the Rev. Ralph Shanks and his wife Viola as our senior interns, and this fine couple from Napa, Calif., enriched our office greatly with their enthusiasm and valuable insights.

Ralph and Viola came to Washington with a desire to gain a better understanding of the legislation and agencies affecting our older Americans—a perspective already sharpened through active involvement in various Napa County services for senior citizens. The benefits of their experience, including Ralph's tenure as chairman of the Napa County Commission on Aging, proved both enlightening and informative to myself and my staff, and the intern's opportunity to work and interact in a congressional office was mutually rewarding. The addition to my staff of two such

fine people as the Shanks, even for the limited 2 week duration of the senior intern program, could only be an asset, and their ongoing input has proved invaluable. I am sure that the older people of the Redwood Empire will reap many positive benefits from the more detailed knowledge and better appreciation gained from the senior interns' experience.

It is difficult to emphasize enough the importance of the senior intern program, for it recognizes the special needs and concerns of our older Americans—a segment of our population which definitely warrants such consideration. The senior citizen intern program has a dual benefit, advantageous to both the interns and members of the Washington Government community. Not only do the senior interns have the opportunity to come and actively participate in the legislative aspects of our Government, but Government officials have a highly motivated group of senior citizens upon whom to test ideas for legislation. This "sounding board" function may very well be one of the most important attributes of the senior intern program, for these discerning, erudite senior citizens do not hesitate to honestly and intelligently evaluate proposals or field questions put to them. Thus, these senior intern evaluations can result in better legislation and programs which will benefit all senior citizens.

The opportunity for senior citizen leaders to come to Washington and observe the Government firsthand and to return this firsthand knowledge to their communities establishes an essential link in constituent communications. Americans over the age of 62 comprise 13.5 percent of our national population, and this is a steadily increasing figure. The desire and willingness of older Americans to participate in national affairs is evidenced by the fact that this age group is among the highest in terms of voter registration and voter turnout.

The steady growth of the senior intern program, which was the largest ever in 1979 with 165 interns from 34 States, reflects this interest in participation. No longer will our senior citizens allow decisions to be made for and about them without their input, and it is "high time" we accorded them the recognition they deserve.

The senior intern program is a valuable method of directly involving them in the operation of the Congress, and it has been my privilege to participate in it for the past 2 years.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HILLIS. 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 and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from

California (Mr. DANNEMEYER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which addresses a problem that is fundamental to the energy dilemma facing us today; namely, nuclear waste disposal. The disposal of waste from nuclear powerplants and other nuclear facilities is an essential step in the process of developing viable alternative power sources for this country. At the present time, we are producing about 12 percent of all the electricity used in the United States from nuclear power. By 1985, this figure should double as larger nuclear power units scheduled for completion in the early 1980's are expected to become operational. If we are to become energy independent in the 1980's we must employ nuclear power and in order to do so we must build facilities to accommodate the waste materials.

The legislation that I am introducing today recognizes the political impasse that has developed at the Federal level. Notwithstanding the delegation of implicit authority to the Department of Energy (DOE) or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), neither of these agencies is really exhibiting much of an interest in developing a program for the long-term storage of nuclear waste. The legislation is designed to avoid fragmentation of agency responsibility which is encountered when the NRC gets involved in the licensing process.

To illustrate to you the degree to which this inaction at the Federal level has affected the energy issue down to the State level, let me share with you what has happened in California. As a member of the Resources, Land Use and Energy Committee of the California State Legislature, I was close to the energy issue and the questions surrounding nuclear power generation in particular. In 1978, the California State Assembly considered a bill which would have exempted the San Diego nuclear reactor near Blythe from the law which the legislature adopted in 1976, while precludes the further licensing of nuclear powerplants in California, until the Federal Government has demonstrated the technology for long-term storage of nuclear waste.

The State senate overwhelmingly passed the legislation to exempt this particular project from the State law, but the bill became bogged down in the assembly energy committee. In my opinion, the evidence had little to do with the result which developed for the reason that a substantial majority of the members of this particular committee had been handpicked by the speaker of the California State Assembly, Leo McCarthy, to give life to his basic bias that the development of energy sources in the country should be slowed down. This majority had been placed on this particular committee by the speaker in order to pay allegiance to the no new job philosophy, which many in the State are not aware is controlling the development of energy in California.

The State of California created an

energy commission in 1973 for the purpose of expediting the processing of powerplants in order to more expeditiously advance the energy needs of Californians. In point of fact, there has not been a powerplant in California approved since the energy commission was created. It is not accidental that the members of the energy commission are all appointees of Governor Brown, who has done a substantial amount of damage to the future energy prospects for Californians because of his myopic no new job philosophy.

This situation in California illustrates two problems created by this Federal inaction. The absence of a demonstration program has placed many States in the position of uncertainty regarding long-term nuclear waste disposal. Second, the lack of progress on this issue has created an aura of doubt surrounding the disposal of nuclear wastes that has spilled over into the total question of the use of nuclear energy. This baseless fear has acted to delay the development of a sorely needed alternative energy supply.

In 1973, the Arab oil embargo brought to the attention of the American people that energy was a very serious problem. At that time we were importing about 26 percent of our oil and in the intervening 6 years, this figure has climbed to an excess of 45 percent. The following table illustrates the dilemma facing this country in terms of where we are going to be getting our energy between now and 1990. The numbers express the equivalent energy value of a million barrels of oil per day.

	[Million barrels]	
	1978	1990
Domestic oil.....	10	---
Domestic gas.....	9	*19
Coal.....	7	10
Nuclear.....	1	2
Other.....	1	2
Total.....	28	33
Import.....	8	8-14
Total.....	36	41-47

*Domestic gas and oil combined.

Five years ago, oil at \$12 a barrel was considered very high in price. Today we hear talk of \$20 to \$22 per barrel on the spot market and it does not take a great deal of speculation to lead one to conclude that in the foreseeable future we may see oil producing nations demanding \$30, \$40, or \$50 per barrel. Considering that our balance-of-payments deficit in 1978 was in excess of \$34 billion, much of which was created by our dependence on the importation of oil, to consider further increasing the quantity of oil that we will import at an ever increasing price, which will only increase the adverse balance of payments of our international trade, is a course which our country cannot pursue if we are serious about maintaining our economic viability as a national power. These figures demonstrate that we must exercise every opportunity that we have to continue our options for energy development in order to achieve our national goal of energy independence. In order to keep the nuclear option open, it

is vitally important that we specifically, politically, solve the question of the long-term storage of nuclear waste.

Ample testimony was presented to the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production of the Committee on Science and Technology in hearings held in May of this year to establish that the technology to solidify nuclear wastes exists and is economical. Dr. Larry Hench of the University of Florida said:

In our judgment, there exists sufficient confidence in glass as a waste encapsulant system that it should be used to begin a national waste solidification program as soon as possible.

Further testimony by Dr. Raul A. Deju, Director of the Basalt Waste Isolation Program at the Hanford site in Washington read in part:

In conclusion, investigations to date give further confidence that dry storage of various waste forms is feasible and that ultimate disposal of nuclear waste can be ascertained regardless of the solid waste forms being considered for disposal.

It is incumbent upon us to proceed with this necessary step in determining a suitable medium at a proper location for the long-term application of this existing technology that will enable us to isolate nuclear wastes.

Since the mid-sixties, implicit authority has been in the law for the building of a facility for the long-term storage of nuclear waste, but for a variety of reasons the project has not gotten underway. In the early sixties, some salt caverns in Kansas were explored for this purpose, but the effort was not successful.

In 1976, Congress adopted a program called waste isolation pilot program. It was signed into law by the President. It required that military waste be stored long term. Military waste comes from the reprocessing plants at Savannah River, S.C. and Hanford, Wash. The proposal to develop a facility for the long-term storage of military waste was clouded in 1978 when the administration proposed to store 1,000 spent fuel assemblies from commercial usage at the facility. These spent fuel rods require 2½ times more volume than would their disposal in reprocessed form. The Armed Services Committee, which had jurisdiction of the project, discontinued any funding for the program when it became known that it was desired to store spent fuel rods from commercial usage at the facility. It was feared that if civilian spent fuel rods were stored in the facility, it may entail a licensing process which could seriously impede and delay the entire project.

In 1978, the House passed an act called the National Terminal Storage Facility for Civilian Storage. This was a construction item and did not contain any timetable for when the facility was to be constructed. The measure was not taken up in the Senate for a vote.

In the Carter administration, an inter agency review group (IRG) has been established and it looked at the nuclear waste disposal issue. In 1979, it came up with the conclusion that perhaps by 1995, a long-term storage facility could be in operation. The IRG, operating under the direction of President Carter, is a puzzling group, to say the least. On the one

hand, it acknowledges that there is technological feasibility at the present time for long-term storage, but at the same time it suggests that the whole matter be put-off until later. The report contains an inference that the problem of nuclear waste management may still be of such a complexity as to eventually preclude the future use of nuclear power. Although one cannot be sure, written between the lines of the IRG report is the inference that if organizations with respectable credentials, such as itself, can cast enough doubt on the viability of nuclear waste disposal that the public will come to oppose nuclear power altogether. In other words, one gets the feeling that the IRG seeks to swell the minority constituency today which holds to the view that we should stop all use of nuclear power. Or if you prefer, IRG seems to be using a basically scientific question for the purpose of producing a political result which has been predestinated by the group itself, namely, to discontinue the use of nuclear power in the United States. The tragedy of this approach is that it has been estimated that if we would get on with the reprocessing of spent fuel rods from commercial reactors in this country, by 1985, the usable energy from spent fuel rods, now wasted, will amount to the equivalent of 200 billion barrels of oil.

So it is clear to anyone who takes the time to review the facts that this country needs nuclear energy if it is to maintain its position as a major world power. Without alternate energy sources, we are simply at the mercy of the nations who supply us with our power. Let me explain in greater detail how this bill will enable us to more readily respond to this growing challenge to our national integrity.

This legislation would delegate to the DOE the authority to act as one agency to coordinate all activities of other agencies of government in the process. An environmental impact statement would be required, but the licensing procedure of the NRC would not be necessary because this is a demonstration project. The licensing process itself is just one element to be considered in the entire picture, but this approach will speed the process. In the past, dissidents who were unsatisfied with the granting of a license at some stage in the licensing procedure have felt inclined to go into the court system to litigate the public policy question of whether or not the energy source is actually needed and if the environmental quality laws have been properly pursued.

Within 6 months after the adoption of the act, the DOE would be required to select the location from one of three sites: First, basalt media on the Government reservation, Hanford, Wash.; second, salt media on Federal land in the State of New Mexico; third, granite media on Federal land on the Nevada test site.

Within 90 days after the site selection, the DOE would be required, after consulting with other Federal agencies, to select the specific site and to go forward with the construction and operation of a demonstration facility. Title to the nuclear waste would pass to the Federal

Government and the DOE would be required to assess a fee against those delivering waste to the facility, which would reflect the cost to the Federal Government of the building and the operation of the repository. The bill contains a completion date for the facility of January 1, 1983, which is ample time to do any of the work that is required.

The entire premise of this legislation is that existing technology has proved itself capable of providing encasement for the safe long-term storage of nuclear waste. This process is sometimes referred to as vitrification. Of the three sites mentioned, the one in Nevada has a facility that would not require a great deal of modification to adapt itself to the long term safe storage of nuclear waste. Tunnels are now in existence on Federal land at the Nevada test site, which has already been contaminated by nuclear tests which have been conducted there. At a fairly modest cost, the facility could be converted to the long term safe storage of nuclear waste. There is plenty of room for more tunnels beyond any conceivable need.

It is my hope that this proposed legislation will serve as an impetus to discussion and action on this matter. As I have stressed earlier, this bill is directed at a major roadblock to a portion of the ultimate solution to this country's energy problems. The importance of prompt positive action on this proposed legislation cannot be overemphasized.

□ 1900

PESSIMISM MUST GIVE WAY TO CONFIDENCE ON ENERGY ISSUE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WHITTAKER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WHITTAKER. Mr. Speaker, in his address to the Nation Sunday evening, President Carter sounded a stirring call to action and sought to rekindle the flickering American spirit.

The President was right when he observed that this Nation is now darkened by a gloom and disillusionment unprecedented in modern times. Even during the darkest days of the Vietnam war and the Watergate crisis, more Americans had faith in the future of our country than they do on this day.

This crisis of confidence and pessimistic outlook must be reversed. America is not a Nation to hang its head; we are not a people to accept defeat. Throughout our history, the American people have always rallied around our leaders and even the most formidable of mountains have been scaled.

We are not a people to shrink from battle, when adversity threatens our very way of life. Even during the darkest of moments, we have always found a shaft of light which led us back to the health and prosperity which forms the bedrock of our land.

This is why I am confident that once again the American people will rally together in a spirit of cooperation to solve this Nation's energy woes. And as we have done in all national crises, I am

sure that Americans will work together for the good of all, without regard for party labels. For the energy problem is not a Republican or Democratic crisis, it is an American crisis. And we must respond to this threat not on the basis of our political party affiliation, but on the basis that all of us share as Americans.

While much can and has been said regarding our President's lack of leadership in the field of energy, he has now sounded the call to arms, and left little doubt that as Chief Executive, he is ready to use his powers to their fullest to lead this Nation out of its crisis of confidence and energy dependence.

But this fight cannot be led by just one man. For, when the Founding Fathers developed the framework for this great land, they included assurances that the awesome power of leading our Nation would not fall solely on the shoulders of one man. In creating a government with three separate but equal branches, the Founding Fathers insured that during times of great national stress, that the leadership of our Nation and its burdens could be shared by a group of wise men, all acting together for the good of America.

Therefore, I believe that the U.S. Congress cannot sit back to wait and see if the President's new energy program will succeed or fail. To do so, I believe, would be contrary to the spirit in which this Nation was founded and has prospered.

Instead, I believe that the Congress must join with the President in taking the lead to solve this Nation's energy crisis, and that it is the responsibility of each and every Member of this body to do his part in working to restore American confidence. Instead of hanging our heads, or shifting the blame for our current energy problem, it is time for Members of Congress to take the lead; to hold our heads up high, and to show not only this Nation, but the entire world, that America is still as proud and strong as it has always been, and that we can and will solve the energy problem. The strongest and most advanced nation in the world is not going to be brought to its knees over a barrel of oil. We can, and together we will, overcome.

It is time for Americans to be proud again, and together show the world and each other that the blood and sweat of our ancestors was not expended in vain; for indeed, it is time to realize and prove to all doubters that it is going to take a lot more than an energy shortage to cripple the United States of America.

As the first step on the part of the Congress to join the President in leading this fight, I am now introducing a resolution calling for the establishment of a select committee in the House of Representatives to deal specifically with the present energy goals that the President has laid before us.

I believe that the energy problem is of such great magnitude that it deserves special consideration on the part of the Congress, and that the President's proposals and goals deserve expeditious consideration. The Select Committee on Energy would give us a quick and comprehensive mechanism for handling the President's proposals—while using our present committee system could only

lead to a slow and fragmented response to these proposals in this time of national urgency.

This committee would examine and frame the President's Energy Mobilization Board, would develop a quick and economical means of developing alternative energy sources, and would set up a framework for the proposed Energy Security Corporation. In addition to dealing with other specific energy proposals, the Speaker would also have the power to broaden the scope and duties of this committee.

I urge my fellow colleagues to join me in this effort to see that the Nation's energy situation remains on the front burner, and that possible solutions are considered fairly and quickly. This committee would be able to devote its sole and entire attention to the solving of our energy problems, and would not be subject to the delays and splintering of attention that often occurs in our standing committees.

I believe that this is an effective way to show the American people that we are ready to take responsibility for this Nation's energy woes; and that we intend to do something about them right now; not next month or next year—but today.

For if we will all join hands and begin to move forward together from this moment on, with God's help, we will emerge victorious.

THE NUCLEAR SPOOK

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it was early in the morning of March 28 that the great nuclear accident at Three Mile Island began. In its aftermath, the accident brought forth all the old and haunting questions about nuclear power.

Now that Three Mile Island has faded from the headlines, the nuclear industry is moving to exorcise the troublesome spirits that it left behind. Now we are being told that nobody was killed, so it was not such a bad thing after all. Left unsaid is the fact that the powerplant is a useless wreck which, if it ever can be repaired will have first to be cleaned up and then rebuilt, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. As for the injuries, we do not know about that yet; as a matter of fact, nobody is even certain how much radiation was released from the plant.

We are being told, too, that nuclear power is best and cheapest, as for example, in the testimony of Charles F. Luce to the House Energy Subcommittee last week. Nothing could have been more reassuring than the smooth words of this great industrialist. An account of his statement is illuminating:

ATOMIC POWER URGED AS CHEAPEST OPTION (By Jaonne Omang)

Electric utilities like atomic power so much they would accept government ownership of nuclear plants in order to hang on to the nuclear option, a utility executive said yesterday.

Charles F. Luce, chairman of the board of Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, told a House energy subcommittee that the future

of the industry hinges on regulatory decisions about the costs that result from breakdowns at atomic plants. If utilities are not permitted to recover those costs by raising rates, he said, government financing will be the only way to build new plants.

That, Luce said, "would present a large new set of problems . . . but it would be preferable to abandoning the nuclear option altogether."

The regulatory climate is so bad for the industry right now, Luce said, that if he had to recommend a new power generating unit to his board of directors he would recommend coal. This is in spite of his belief that nuclear power is 20 to 30 percent cheaper, even counting all the so-called "hidden" costs of nuclear power such as decommissioning old plants, spent fuel and waste disposal, tax breaks and so on, he said.

Regulators have not agreed that consumers who benefit from nuclear power's relative cheapness when the plant is running should shoulder the costs when it is not, Luce said. "I couldn't take that kind of risk for my investors . . . on a \$2.5 billion investment" in a new plant.

Luce was one of several witnesses who strongly defended nuclear power as the best available. One who disagreed was New York energy consultant Charles Komanoff, who said costs of nuclear plants had risen three times as fast as inflation before the March 28 incident at Three Mile Island.

Since that accident, he said, all figures must be readjusted skyward because of unknown safety changes that will be imposed in the future.

Komanoff attacked industry costs calculations as inaccurate. He said the lower numbers omit figures from poor-performing reactors, understate the costs at some plants, guess too low on the still unknown costs of decommissioning and assume that coal plants run less than they actually would if they replaced nuclear plants.

"Nuclear and coal plants today have about equal total generating costs . . . [but] new nuclear plants are more expensive overall than new coal plants," Komanoff said.

L. F. Sillin, chairman of Northeast Utilities, Inc., which provides a higher proportion of its power from nuclear generation than any other utility (58 percent), emphasized that nuclear power saves oil. "A single new nuclear facility . . . can reduce oil consumption by 10 to 12 million barrels per year," he said. "There is no better way to reduce New England's debilitating dependence on foreign oil."

Luce was asked about proposals to remove the \$560 million ceiling that the Price-Anderson Act placed on nuclear plants' liability for damage claims in case of accidents. "The financial community would be very concerned" and the industry would find it very hard to raise funds if the ceiling were lifted, he said. Doubling the limit, to \$1.3 billion, "would make electricity more expensive," Luce said, since consumer would have to pay the higher premium costs, "but it would still be a lot cheaper than oil."

Meanwhile, on another front, representatives of the American Nuclear Society conducted briefings on both sides of the Hill to recount what happened at Three Mile Island. In essence, these missionaries of nuclear power assured their audiences that nothing much really happened. They explained carefully what had happened, as well as can be determined. But they could not explain why things went wrong.

And on a third front, the nuclear lobby sent every Member of Congress a letter that said in essence we have to have nuclear power, because the Russians say so. If it is good for the Russians, it is got to be great for us, they seem to be arguing. But they leave unsaid the vast differences between our resources and those the

Russians have, and the fact that this country, hopefully, places a little more value on human life than that one does. A glimpse at the "Russians are coming" argument should amuse those who have not seen it:

JULY 13, 1979.

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GONZALEZ: The July 4 edition of the Washington Star contained a page one article of major importance to world energy policy: an interview with a director of the USSR's Kurchatov Institute for Atomic Energy about his nation's attitudes toward nuclear power. Because of shortages of fossil fuels, Anatoly Alexandrov said, "we must therefore build nuclear power reactors in all parts of the world, otherwise wars will one day be fought over the remnants of oil and gas deposits. There will be wars, however peculiar this may sound, between the capitalist countries, because the Soviet Union will have concentrated on the production of nuclear power and be ahead of everybody else." Because July 4 was a holiday and you may have missed the article, I am enclosing a copy.

Sincerely,

CARL WALSKE.

**SOVIETS CONSIDER NUCLEAR POWER VITAL—
ENERGY SCRAMBLE SEEN RISKING WAR**

(By Henry Brandon)

Moscow.—Without the development of nuclear power as a source of energy, the competition for energy sources in the world could ultimately lead to war, the president of the Soviet Academy of Science warns.

Resistance to the development of nuclear power as an energy source, Anatoly P. Alexandrov said in an exclusive interview, poses more danger for mankind than the original splitting of the atom.

Alexandrov, a nuclear physicist and director of the I.V. Kurchatov Institute for Atomic Energy, blamed regulations in the United States, inadequate safety standards, incompetent supervisory personnel and the news media for the harm done to the use of nuclear energy.

Also present at the interview was Nikolai Inozemtsev, the director of Moscow's prestigious Institute for World Economics and International Relations.

A member of the Academy of Sciences and, like Alexandrov, a member of the Communist Party's Central Committee, Inozemtsev cautioned that a shift of priorities from military to civilian production cannot even begin until the SALT II treaty has been ratified by the U.S. Congress.

The influence of scientists in the Soviet governmental decisionmaking process, Inozemtsev said, exceeded that of their counterparts in the United States.

Alexandrov was interviewed in his spacious office at the headquarters of the Academy of Sciences, located in a well-kept 18th century mansion built for Catherine the Great.

On the future of nuclear power plants, Alexandrov opened his discussion with a reminder that even early in the Middle East conflict, when there was no energy crisis, the United States began talking about the possibility of having to protect its oil imports by force of arms.

"You know that all gas and oil deposits are likely to run out in 30 to 50 years—Russia's may last close to 50 years—but in 30 years it is impossible to reorganize the world in terms of energy from coal," Alexandrov said.

"We must therefore build nuclear power reactors in all parts of the world, otherwise wars will one day be fought over the remnants of oil and gas deposits. And they will be wars, however peculiar this may sound, between the capitalist countries, because the

Soviet Union will have concentrated on the production of nuclear power and be ahead of everybody else," the Soviet scientist declared.

Alexandrov suspects opponents of nuclear power fear it because they believe a nuclear power plant failure can lead to an atomic bomb explosion akin to that of Hiroshima.

"They have no real idea of the modern safety devices imposed on the risks involved," he said.

Alexandrov voiced strong criticism of the handling of the Three Mile Island nuclear accident, claiming that from the beginning there were faults with the operating methods which accounted for the trouble: negligence regarding security measures taken by the plant management, inferior operating personnel and inadequate technical safeguards built into the plant against accidents.

He said that only specially trained engineers are allowed to operate Soviet nuclear plants, and that at the central control panel two men must always be on duty.

"I can't imagine the kind of (accident) in the Soviet Union, where pump valves remain closed when they were supposed to be open."

(Among other problems, a pump valve remained closed at Three Mile Island and prevented cooling of the reactor.)

Alexandrov added: "And yet, despite all that happened, there was no serious danger, and whatever danger might have existed, was exaggerated."

On the issue of storing radioactive waste, one aspect of the nuclear power problem that troubles the American public, he said he was certain this could be solved.

"There are many ways to go about it because there exist 'hermetic structures' in the outer layer of the earth which are safe storage places," Alexandrov said.

In a reference to the youthful character of the anti-nuclear movement in the United States Alexandrov countered that he had three sons who were all in favor of it.

The Soviet scientist insists that nuclear energy production is safer than coal mining or production of chemicals.

"People in the vicinity of nuclear power plants are not exposed to greater radiation than that which comes from natural radiation sources. And a worker in a nuclear power plant does not absorb more radiation in a year than you get from one x-ray examination," he said.

"For all practical purposes, we in the Soviet Union have today the same technical know-how as the United States. The United States was ahead at the start, but her nuclear energy development has slowed down, while ours has accelerated," Alexandrov contended.

"All people with common sense should realize that by the end of the century the United States will be compelled to create new great nuclear production facilities, possibly nuclear fusion plants, otherwise she will find herself desperately short of energy. There is no other way to preserve the modern way of scientific development," Alexandrov said.

Inozemtsev, the Soviet economist, was asked whether the Soviet Union would begin shifting the economic emphasis from military to civilian production now that the SALT II agreement has been signed.

Without hesitation, he seized on the occasion to sound still another Soviet call for the U.S. Senate to ratify the agreement.

His reply: "We live in a very important period when decision as regard industrial production can move in either direction. The Vienna meeting opened the way for decisions to be taken in favor of civilian production, certainly."

"But the history of the last years tells us that progress in the field of armaments can be swift and that newer and newer types of weapons are being invented."

"The only way we can protect ourselves from surprises and a further escalation is through the SALT process, which now in-

cludes not only quantitative but also qualitative restrictions."

But despite these efforts to exorcise the ghost of Three Mile Island, questions keep coming up—questions that remain unanswered. The Washington Star for instance, editorially wondered about the quality of training that nuclear plant operators receive. The editors were surprised to find that the quality of training is nowhere near what you might expect, and the fitness standards are nothing like as exacting as those required of, say, an airline pilot. In fact, the standards are notable by their absence. And the low pay for nuclear plant operators reflects that the industry does not place much importance on the people who are in charge of the monster.

No matter how much the industry wants to ignore this, the question keeps coming up: How good are the operators? The Star commentary is a worthy example of how the ghost will not go away:

NUCLEAR INTELLIGENCE

A subsidiary question to emerge from the accident at Three Mile Island concerns the competence of those who operate nuclear power plants. Who are these people, and may they be counted upon to respond properly in case of an emergency? It is much the sort of question one asks upon boarding an airplane.

A study just completed for the Tennessee Valley Authority attempts to deal with these questions. Indeed, this "task force on nuclear safety" recommends significant revisions in the selection and training of licensed plant operators.

What is novel in the TVA study is the emphasis on intelligence-testing for nuclear plant operators—including those currently employed. The report urges not only that, but also giving operators "the equivalent of a college education . . . and paying salaries that will attract the best people into the program." Salaries for senior licensed operators now average between \$19,000 and \$40,000 nationwide, which makes one wonder if there are parallels between salary and performance.

The emphasis on intelligence comes with this useful working definition: "Intelligence distinguishes those who have merely memorized a series of discrete manual operations from those who can think through a problem and conceptualize solutions based on a fundamental understanding of possible contingencies."

Now, testing intelligence is a strange and controversial business, and so-called IQ tests can't accurately gauge all the complexities and varieties of human intelligence. But such tests can be a reasonable guide as to how someone will react intellectually to certain environments; and few environments have quite the combination of logic and complexity of nuclear power plants.

The report simply proposes that TVA "pursue a long-range goal of having the operator training program accredited as a program culminating in a recognized academic degree or certification"; and it recommends a training and retesting program that goes beyond psychological profiles, simulator training, and written and oral examinations of mathematical and mechanical aptitude. All this, of course, the better to predict an operator's on-the-job responses.

TVA has a special interest here. It not only operates three nuclear plants at Brown's Ferry; it has 14 more reactors either planned or under construction. But the standard proposed seems to us sensible for any utility or, for that matter, any agency charged with regulating nuclear utilities.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which licenses operators and senior operators, is

aware of the TVA study, but its own recommendations for change remain very much in the planning stage. The nuclear power industry, meanwhile, is planning a "national institute" to "establish industry-wide benchmarks for excellence in the management and operation of nuclear power programs," which seems very promising but also a bit vague.

If nuclear power is going to be with us for a while, and if human reaction remains a significant factor in the safe operation of nuclear plants, it is only sensible to ask that those who operate plants be screened as carefully as possible, trained in the most rigorous fashion and licensed only when these procedures set the highest standard.

The recommendations to TVA suggest ways in which the NRC, too, could broaden its examinations for licensing operators—and strengthen its criteria for approving industry training programs.

The nuclear power industry and the NRC ought to take a close look at the TVA report. If nuclear power is to continue to win public support, the industry must be able to guarantee that those in the control room meet the highest standards of intelligence and training.

Even the dispassionate scientists who think nuclear power is fine and that Three Mile Island was nothing to get upset about have to admit that the accident was compounded by two things: Mechanical failures and operator errors.

Theoretically, once a nuclear plant starts going sour, automatic controls will prevent a serious problem. If the controls fail, the operators will know what to do. But at Three Mile Island, things went wrong and the operators did not know what to do. Their instruments gave them misleading information; things got more and more confused, and the problems grew and compounded until the situation became extremely dangerous. Nobody knew what to expect, and nobody knew what to do. The feckless debates of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission clearly shows that.

But now everyone wants to forget, and the industry is trying its best to encourage nuclear amnesia. We cannot afford to forget how close to a catastrophe we came, or how rotten the situation really was, or how badly the accident was handled. Nuclear power is too unforgiving for that. We would do well to keep asking the questions that have yet to be answered, despite the ardent lobbying that seeks to reassure us that everything is all right. Nuclear power is not all right.

EMBATTLED WEST

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. COELHO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted into the RECORD the first of a series of articles dealing with Western States-Eastern States conflicts concerning water, energy, agricultural, and industrial development issues.

The second of these articles explores the fact that because of the East's antagonism toward the western agricultural industry and "subsidies" provided it by the Federal Government, western farmers are now unable to get enough water to even maintain current production.

In addition, the article notes that

easterners (the Federal Government) refuse to recognize the need for a solution to the West's serious saline problem, which, if unchecked, will leave the West as barren as Mesopotamia and parts of Africa are today.

Meanwhile, westerners point out that their irrigated farmland produced \$18 billion worth of crops in 1974, or nearly a quarter of the Nation's agricultural production. Much of the western produce goes toward relieving the Nation's balance-of-trade deficit abroad. (California alone shipped \$1.8 billion abroad in 1976.)

I would like to point out that the entire Nation was drastically affected by the Midwest dustbowl of the 1920's and 1930's. A western dustbowl would be at least, if not more, drastic. I feel the elimination of a significant amount of agricultural lands from receiving water—and, therefore, from production—would be an economic disaster not only for the western region but subsequently for the rest of the country.

At this point, I insert into the RECORD the second of four articles by the Washington Post on the "Embattled West," published June 18, 1979:

AGRICULTURE LOSING THE CONTEST FOR WESTERN WATER (By Joel Kotkin)

CASA GRANDE, ARIZ.—In the 1920s the Caywoods joined thousands of other Texas and Oklahoma families escaping the Dust Bowl on the great trek west. They came to settle in arid central Arizona, grew cotton and watched with pride as the desert flowered with abundance.

Now, more than half a century later, Tom Caywood, 56, born and bred in Arizona, has been forced, like his Texas forebears, to sell off land as his water supplies diminished beneath the rich, dry soil.

"It used to be fun to farm around here," Caywood, a slight, bespectacled man, says as he points to dying fields, a few pathetic stems of cotton plants rising in the brown wasteland. "But with my water costs and all, I just didn't think I could keep it up. Damn, I would have preferred to farm—I enjoyed watching those plants grow and see what the hell they were going to do next."

Tom Caywood is not the only farmer giving up his land this year in the rich farming areas of Pinal County, 50 miles south of Phoenix. Since 1960 nearly 100,000 acres—more than one-third of the area's irrigated cropland—has gone out of production as ground water tables have dropped an average of 10 feet a year. With electrical rates soaring, the cost of bringing this water to the surface has increased as much as 600 percent since 1973 on some farms.

In Arizona and throughout the West today, water—"the testicles of the universe out here," one Utah planner called it—is becoming an increasingly scarce commodity, fought for and bid on by competing interests. In the struggle for the precious fluid, agriculture—traditionally the user of more than 80 percent of all western water—finds itself unable to gain new supplies or even maintain current allotments against the rising needs of the region's burgeoning metropolitan areas and energy developments.

To men like Tom Caywood, diminishing agricultural water supplies, because of the end of an era of massive, subsidized development schemes, means the end of their dreams of keeping the desert blooming. But many in Washington, including top officials in the Interior and Agriculture departments, see the demise of western agriculture as inevitable as scarce water resources seek their true, free-market price.

"The victory of the [administration's water project] 'hit list' was a Pyrrhic victory," says Colorado Gov. Richard Hamm, whose state lost more than 300,000 acres of farmland last year due to mushrooming urban and energy growth. "These projects represent our last best chance to save some water for something other than energy and metropolitan development. We were going to grow crops. It could have been wheat fields rather than a coal slurry pipeline."

Lamm's fears are borne out by a report late last year by the United States Water Resources Council, an interdepartmental federal water planning group, which predicted large increases in western water used by cities, manufacturing and energy developments. Only agriculture was slated to cut back from current consumption.

The water future already is closing in on farmers from California's fertile San Joaquin Valley to the high plains of West Texas. Throughout the West, ground water tables are dropping dramatically, while surface water supplies are diverted increasingly to urban industrial and energy uses.

In Arizona, for instance, the Central Arizona Project, due to be completed in 1985, was designed largely to replace the diminishing ground water supplies in places such as Pinal County. Now, the project, which will deliver more than 1½ million acre-feet (325,000 gallons equals one acre-foot) to the state from the Colorado River, will mostly end up quenching the thirsty, fast-growing metropolises of Phoenix and Tucson.

According to Arizona Water Commission estimates, the state could lose nearly one-third of its approximately 1.4 million acres of irrigated cropland in the first 15 years after completion of the water project, a fact that embitters many farmers.

Similar ground water problems, coupled with an inability to gain new supplies of government-imported water, are also afflicting farmers in California's San Joaquin Valley, which is currently pumping ground water faster than it can be replaced, at a rate of more than 1½ million acre-feet a year.

Recently, the California state government has tried to force farmers to regulate their ground water pumping in the interests of future generations. Agricultural interests, which are battling the proposed regulations in the legislature, claim a move to restrict their pumping would result in the immediate loss of more than 600,000 acres of fertile land with a net value of nearly \$1.6 billion.

California Gov. Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown Jr. has warned the valley's growers that if they don't accept ground water controls their whole region could end up in "the dustbin of history." State officials claim the growers have yet to understand that no public official, whether he is Jerry Brown or President Carter, is going to spend billions of dollars to subsidize agriculture's water needs in the post-Proposition 13 era.

Perhaps the nation's most ominous ground water shortage is looming far to the east along the high plains of Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Kansas, Nebraska and Colorado. For years this fertile region, covering some 98,000 square miles, has drawn its sustenance from the massive underground Ogallala aquifer, which many experts in and out of government believe, is now being depleted to the crisis point.

There is widespread concern that, if pumping of the Ogallala continues unabated, the nation's largest irrigated area, which produced more than \$1 billion last year in crops and livestock, could be gravely affected. In the Texas portion alone, according to state estimates, about half of the current 6.4 million acres of irrigated cropland could go out of production within 20 years.

Deeply concerned about the impact of so drastic a potential economic debacle, the Commerce Department recently initiated a \$6 million, three-year study of the problems facing the Ogallala-fed regions of the West.

But many farmers in the region believe the only help they need is the development of new water schemes that could eliminate the drain on their aquifer.

Among the favorite proposed water projects in the High Plains region is a water pipeline from the Mississippi or Arkansas rivers. There is even some wistful enthusiasm for a \$120 billion scheme by the Ralph Parsons Co. of Pasadena, Calif., that calls for the delivery of water to the dry Southwest from the frigid, but water-logged, wilderness of British Columbia, the Yukon and Alaska.

But despite the farmers' pleas, many western states already have accepted the idea that water is far too valuable a commodity to "waste" on farming. This is particularly true in fast-growing, energy-rich states such as New Mexico and Utah where water once used for irrigation is finding its way to power plants and new subdivisions.

Indeed, estimates by the Western States' Water Council, a regional, 11-state planning group, are that new energy developments—including nuclear plants, coal gasification, electrical generating and slurry pipelines as well as the oil shale projects—will eat up an additional 2.3 million acre-feet of water by 1990, enough to irrigate close to 1 million acres of farmland.

Says Reed Searle, director of Utah's State Energy Office: "Everybody knows energy can pay the higher price. It's something which occurs with industrialization."

Many Utah residents believe they saw the shape of things to come when a California utility, building a large coal-fired power plant in agricultural south central Utah, paid local farmers \$1.750 per acre-foot for water this year. Farmers in the past had paid less than \$25. By removing some 45,000 acre-feet from the land, the plant, known as the Intermountain Power Project, will take 15,000 irrigated acres in the area out of production.

As Utah continues to develop its abundant coal reserves, some observers believe agriculture, which has been declining in the state since the early 1960's, will become anachronistic in the land settled by the hardy followers of Brigham Young.

"If you follow our calculations," says Frank Davis, vice president of Utah Power and Light Co., the state's top utility, "you would end up with our projected energy requirements taking all the rest of the water we have. There wouldn't be anything left over for anything * * *

Interior Department officials insist that reclamation projects have served their purpose—the settling of the West.

"We have created an artificial agricultural economy," claims a top Interior official. "We have to start subjecting it to honest competition in the marketplace."

Such an assessment of their worth is hotly contested by some western farmers who claim the federal government is being totally shortsighted in its view of irrigated agriculture in their states. Irrigated farmland in the western region in 1974 accounted for \$18 billion, or nearly one-quarter, of the nation's agricultural production, according to Agriculture Department figures.

Much of this production, western farmers point out, is sent abroad and helps relieve the nation's chronic balance-of-trade deficit. In 1976, for instance, California exported more than \$1.8 billion in agriculture goods, while Arizona, which sends more than 60 percent of its cotton crop overseas, shipped more than \$300 million worth of farm products to foreign markets.

Despite howls of protest from farmers and western governmental officials, there seems little prospect of any real change in current federal policy toward agriculture in the region. "People here have no sympathy for these western farmers," says one high-ranking Agriculture Department official. "In the East, where the government is run, the bias is completely against western agriculture. We

don't even talk about the products they produce out there."

The federal tilt against western farmers is so great, according to some observers, that Washington is virtually incapable of providing assistance to them on even basic soil conservation problems. These observers point out that federal officials refuse to come up with the money and assistance to help solve the region's fast-growing salinity problem, a condition caused by salts left in the soil after irrigation.

One recent study, for instance, conducted by researchers at Montana State University, claims that federal crop policies—designed for eastern-type farms—have led to "saline seepage" across wide areas of the Dakotas and Montana, ruining the productivity of 250,000 acres of cropland. Other major salinity problems are plaguing farmers from the Rio Grande Valley of Texas to northern Utah.

But perhaps the most serious salinization is taking place in California's San Joaquin Valley, where 400,000 acres are suffering production losses as a result. By the year 2000, according to recent state estimates, nearly 700,000 acres will be severely damaged—enough to cause an estimated \$320 million in cropland losses unless a major new federal and state effort comes along to correct the problem.

In some areas, yields have fallen dramatically, and tomatoes poisoned by salt have ripened a ghastly yellow color on the vine.

Some academic and governmental experts in the West fear that the falling water tables, the dried-up fields, the salt piles growing amid the crops, are signs of a growing tendency toward desertification of the entire region. They argue that, as water, which made the land explode with production, is taken away to feed thirsty cities and power plants, the land will return to its natural, barren condition.

Huey Johnson, secretary of California's State Resources Agency, believes the West is drifting toward a sort of ecologically caused decline in the land, which, he maintains, led to the fall of such ancient civilizations as Mesopotamia and Rome. He claims the western region's soils already have deteriorated to a point reminiscent of the great dust bowls that afflicted the Midwest in the 1920s and 1930s.

The great Arvin, Calif., windblow, which occurred at the end of the severe western drought of 1975-76, could be just a dress rehearsal of worse horrors to come, Johnson believes, unless strict controls are placed on water usage and soil policies. In those dark days in December 1977, residents of the San Joaquin Valley watched in terror as soil, left fallow from prolonged drought, rose in big, brown waves across the sky. The blowing dust tore the bark off trees, and cattle were buried alive in seas of dirt.

A year and a half later, local irrigation officials in the windblown area still are cleaning up the damage to canals and grass cover. With more land apparently doomed to go out of production in the future, and a growing amount of salt-infested wasteland, Johnson predicts that even greater disasters may soon sweep across the broad lands of the West.

"We have the landscape but we simply don't have the water," he says. "We have to stop growing. Sure, we can do it in a wet year, but in another dry period, the winds are going to come along and blow all the topsoil from Colorado to Wyoming. It happened to us in 1977 and it's happening now. The classic symptoms are repeating themselves."

VANIK RELEASES LIBRARY OF CONGRESS ANALYSIS OF OIL IMPORT QUOTAS AND THEIR IMPACT ON ECONOMY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last week I requested a Library of Congress report on the economic impact of the Tokyo Summit goal of limiting oil imports to 8.5 million barrels per day. I am today releasing that report which was prepared by Mr. Lawrence Kumins of the Congressional Research Service. I would like to summarize the report and draw some observations from it:

First, it is based on a number of economic assumptions regarding GNP, oil demand and production, and conservation. Much of the data used is taken from Data Resources Incorporated models. As in any such study, there is an element of uncertainty in predicting the future.

To quote from the report:

It can be seen that—if our projections are accurate—an 8.5-million barrel per day quota will not begin to impinge upon demand until sometime during 1982. By 1983 the shortfall stemming from the quota will be significant and will likely be over 1-million barrels per day.

The report does warn that if there is extensive inventory rebuilding this year, imports may come very close to bumping into the 8.2 level set for 1979, and, to quote,

1980 and 1981 demand might be very close to the import ceiling (of 8.5) examined here.

The report assumes that import tickets would be auctioned so that the "quota premium" is captured by the public Treasury. If quotas are simply allocated to importers, then the importers rather than the public would receive the gain. But it must be remembered that the quota premium will not only apply to imported crude, "but it will affect all products sold in the country" made from either imported or domestic crude.

Applying the various assumptions, the report finds a possible 1982 shortfall in supply of 0.4 to 1.5 million barrels per day which will result in a rise in oil product prices of between \$3 and \$8 a barrel. By 1985, the shortfall is estimated to be 0.8 to 1.2 million barrels per day, which will add \$7 to \$10 to prices paid for refined products.

The report concludes:

Under the approach outlined above, product prices would rise by between \$21.3 and \$52.7 billion annually during 1982. Offsetting this would be import savings of \$3.9 and \$9.9 billion. Similarly in 1985, the quota will cost \$49.2 to \$68.7 billion and result in import savings of between .8 and 2.2 million barrels per day. Since foreign oil will cost an estimated \$36 per barrel in 1985, balance of payments savings of between \$10.5 and \$28.9 billion will occur.

Revenues will flow to the Treasury in 1982, at between \$9.3 and \$23.8 billion and oil producers, and to some extent refiners, will receive the remaining scarcity rents of between \$11.9 and \$28.9 billion. In 1985, similarly, the Treasury would collect between \$21.0 and \$31.6 billion and producers and refiners would gain by between \$28.2 billion and \$37.1 billion.

Let me say that I support the President's quota action to free us from OPEC dominance and to insure that we are able to develop alternative domestic sources of energy. But the study clearly reveals a number of points:

The new quota system will have a major impact on our economy—it will cause dislocations and shortages;

We need to begin preparing now for the impact of the quota and for the equitable allocation of available supplies;

We need to insure that the quota premium is captured by the Public Treasury and we should plan for the use of tens of billions which will be generated by the quota;

We need to insure that the windfall profits tax recaptures a major portion of the so-called scarcity rent which will otherwise provide additional, excessive profits to the domestic industry.

The study follows:

AN 8.5 MILLION BARREL PER DAY OIL IMPORT QUOTA

(By Lawrence Kumins, analyst, Environment and Natural Resources Policy Division, July 16, 1979)

INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared in response to the July 9, 1979 letter of request from the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade. The request asked that CRS analyze the effects of an assumed 8.5 million barrel per day (mbd) oil import quota. In his July 15, 1979 televised speech, the President indicated that he would set a quota at the 1977 import level, which was—to be specific—8.787 mbd. Imports began to decline during the latter part of 1977, due to completion of the Alaskan oil pipeline. This permitted North Slope Crude to offset declining lower—48 state output.

During the first half of 1979 oil imports into the U.S. were physically limited by the world supply situations. They have averaged in the 8.1–8.2 mbd range, but would not doubt have been higher had crude been more readily available.

METHODOLOGY

In order to assess the effects which might flow from an 8.5 mbd quota it has been necessary to make projections to 1985 of some key variables, chiefly real GNP, domestic oil demand, domestic oil production and the rate of oil conservation. Clearly these are not easy to predict. They are subject to numerous, and often random, shifts. While we have tried to make some reasonable assumptions about their behavior during the time frame to 1985, any exercise of this nature is fraught with vicissitudes. These pitfalls must be kept in mind by the reader.

PROJECTING OIL DEMAND

We have projected oil demand as a function of real (1972 dollar) GNP and a conservation factor. Real GNP projections are taken from the DRI Data Resources Long-Term Review, Summer 1979. We used their CYCLELONGOG79 projection, which is a simulation of long term behavior based on business cycle characteristics. It resulted in projected average real growth between 1978 and 1985 of about 2.4 percent annually. From today's perspective, in light of recent oil price increases and other factors, this may indeed be an optimistically high rate of growth. If it is too high our analysis would be skewed and would overestimate the effect of a quota. Lower growth would mean less impact from such a quota.

The conservation factor is based on oil consumption relative to GNP. It is expressed as the billions of dollars of real GNP per million barrels per day of oil input. A higher figure means that oil is being used more efficiently in generating GNP; a lower figure means the converse. In 1968, the conservation factor was \$78.5 billion 1972 dollars per mbd. By 1972 it had declined to 71.4, its recent low, as shown in Table 1.

Oil demand forecasts are obtained by dividing projected conservation factors into GNP projections. The conservation factor has been estimated based on actual GNP and oil

demand. The historical trend during the 1970's has been extrapolated based on the post-embargo experience, and behavior modification accounting for conservation. Business cycle influence has also been included here, to account for increased conservation on the down swing and the opposite on the up swing.

DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

We have adopted the high and low forecasts of domestic oil production from Energy: An Uncertain Future¹ Table 17 (p. 64) contains a range of domestic production estimates. These figures include both crude oil and natural gas liquids (NGL) output. The estimates—9.5 to 10.9 mbd for 1985—seem to fall well within the consensus of current thinking.

The range between high and low shows the uncertainty involved here and the sensitivity of estimated imported requirements to something as unpredictable as estimated oil output just 6 years hence.

IMPORT DEMAND

Based on the estimates of domestic demand, including the effects of conservation and substitution of other fuels, and estimated domestic crude oil and NGL output, plus a 500,000 b/d net processing gain in refining, import demand has been estimated in Table 1. It can be seen that—if our projections are accurate—an 8.5 mbd quota will not begin to impinge upon demand until sometime during 1982. By 1983 the shortfall stemming from the quota will be significant and will likely be over 1 mbd.

KEY YEARS DISCUSSED

Further discussion about some of the key years involved in this analysis seems in order. The time period's early years reflect generally low GNP growth—slightly more than 1 percent for 1979–1981. DRI's projection for 1979, which reflects 3.4 percent growth in 1978, may be too high. When compared to estimated oil demand of 18.2 mbd, unrealistically high conservation may have resulted. The 78.7 conservation factor is the highest in the past decade and represents a big jump over 1978, which Table 1 shows as the best year since the embargo.

Apart from this, 1979 import demand will likely be higher than the 7.8 mbd shown here in order to facilitate inventory rebuilding, assuming more crude becomes available during the remainder of the year.

1980 and 1981 are forecast by DRI to be recession years. Low economic growth—plus conservation and fuel substitution—are projected to keep import demand at or beneath the quota ceiling. Failure of the conservation forecast here to materialize could lead to higher potential demand, as could increased economic activity or an unexpected decline in domestic production. In any event, 1980 and 1981 demand might be very close to the import ceiling examined here.

During 1982, increased economic growth at a 4.9 percent rate is expected to result in higher oil demand as well as a temporary stabilization of conservation. At this point, the quota will likely become an effective constraint on demand.

1985 is forecast to be a recession year under DRI's estimate of cyclic behavior. Here import demand stabilizes because of the decline in GNP and the increase in the conservation factor which could be expected during a recession.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

To a large extent, any economic impacts which might result from an 8.5 mbd quota are a function of how it is administered. We have assumed that import tickets would

be auctioned off by the government. However, they could be allocated to refiners and other traditional importers. In the latter case we further assume that the tickets could be freely traded (on a "white market"), and that under these circumstances the ticket value would be the same as under an auction. But any revenues would accrue to those given the tickets rather than the government.

If the quota creates a supply shortfall relative to what demand would be, then oil prices would rise if they are not controlled. Since controls under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act expire in late 1981, it is probable that oil prices would rise. In order to determine how much, we will have to make some assumptions about demand elasticity and product prices. Since any shortfall which might exist will in reality only be perceived at the point of final sale, it is the initial price of refined oil products and the elasticity of products which will be the ultimate measure of what sort of "shortage premium" price will be commanded. Not only will the shortage premium apply to the imported crude, but it will affect all products sold in the country regardless of whether they are refined from domestically produced or foreign crude or are imported foreign refined products, for that matter.

Estimating the economic effects first involves estimating the average value of a barrel of refined products, under the assumption that any shortfall is distributed equally across all products. Table 2 shows the product prices (paid by final consumers) and weights we used for this. It should be noted that these are very rough estimates based on an average 1982 crude oil price of \$27/bbl (representing 10 percent annual rise in world price as well as complete decontrol of domestic crude).

TABLE 2—Weighted average prices of refined products—1982

Product	Weight (percent)	Per barrel
Gasoline	45	\$55.00
Distillate	20	40.00
Aviation fuels	5	42.00
Residual fuel	20	28.00
Other products	10	47.50
Weighted average		45.20

A commonly made assumption about elasticity is that it is about -1 in the short run and -3 in the long run. A -1 figure means, for example, that every 10 percent price rise will result in a 1 percent decline in demand. But if—in 1979—shortfalls are anticipated for 1982, we believe that this is sufficiently far off to conform to long run behavior. It would give sufficient time to plan for conservation and we believe the -3 figure to be applicable.

Applying these assumptions to the 400,000 b/d to 1.5 mbd shortage which might occur under the quota in 1982, we find that shortfall represents a reduction of between 2 percent and 5 percent of projected total demand (19.8 mbd). This would raise prices by between 7 percent and 17 percent respectively. If this were to happen, oil product prices could rise by \$3.00 to \$8.00/bbl.

In 1985, the estimated shortages under an 8.5 mbd quota are .8 to 1.2 mbd, 4 percent and 6 percent respectively. If this happened in an environment where long run elasticity were operating, prices would rise by 12 percent to 18 percent. If the average price of oil products had risen by 10 percent annually it would then be \$56.50/bbl, and a 12-percent to 18-percent increase would add \$7–\$10/bbl to prices paid for refined products.

¹Senate Energy and Natural Resource Committee Publication No. 95-157, December 1978; prepared by CRS.

Under the approach outlined above, product prices would rise by between \$21.3 and \$52.7 billion annually during 1982. Offsetting this would be import savings of \$3.9 to \$9.9 billion. Similarly in 1985, the quota will cost \$49.2 to \$68.7 billion and result in import savings of between .8 and 2.2 mbd. Since foreign oil will cost an estimated \$36/bbl. in 1985 balance of payments savings of between \$10.5 and 28.9 billion will occur.

Revenues will flow to the Treasury in 1982, at between \$9.3 and \$23.8 billion and oil producers, and to some extent refiners, will receive the remaining scarcity rents of between \$11.9 and \$28.9 billion. In 1985, similarly, the Treasury would collect between \$21.0 and \$31.6 billion and producers and refiners would gain by between \$28.2 billion and \$37.1 billion.

All non-governmental revenue flows estimated here are gross revenues before taxes. Normal corporate income taxes would redistribute some of these monies to the Treasury. Additionally, any windfall profits tax enacted by Congress would place a Treasury claim on some further share. The windfall profits tax and the quota will interact strongly and as a policy proscription, the two should be considered together.

TABLE 1.—OIL IMPORTS, PRODUCTION AND DEMAND, 1972-85

Year	GNP (1972 dollars, billions)	In barrels per day				Estimated import demand			
		Conservation factor	Consumption	Domestic production		High	Low	High	Low
				High	Low				
1972	1171	71.4	16.4	11.2					
1973	1235	71.4	17.3	10.9					
1974	1218	72.9	16.7	10.5					
1975	1202	73.7	16.3	10.0					
1976	1271	72.6	17.5	9.7					
1977	1333	72.4	18.4	9.9					
1978	1386	74.1	18.7	10.3					

Year	GNP (1972 dollars, billions)	In barrels per day				Estimated import demand			
		Conservation factor	Consumption	Domestic production		High	Low	High	Low
				High	Low				
1979	1433	78.7	18.2	9.9	9.9	7.8	7.8		
1980	1439	76.0	18.9	10.2	9.9	8.2	8.5		
1981	1452	77.0	18.9	10.3	9.9	8.1	8.5		
1982	1523	77.0	19.8	10.4	9.8	8.9	9.5		
1983	1600	78.0	20.5	10.6	9.7	9.4	10.3		
1984	1644	78.5	20.9	10.8	9.6	9.6	10.8		
1985	1642	79.5	20.7	10.9	9.5	9.3	10.7		

MONTHLY LIST OF GAO REPORTS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the monthly list of GAO reports includes summaries of reports which were prepared by the staff of the General Accounting Office. The May 1979 list includes:

MONTHLY LIST OF GAO REPORTS
NATIONAL DEFENSE

Improvements Needed in Army's Determination of Manpower Requirements for Support and Administrative Functions. Acc. No. 109425, FPCD-79-32, May 21.

New Alien Identification System—Little Help in Stopping Illegal Aliens. GGD-79-44, May 30.

Problems in Getting People into the Active Force After Mobilization. Acc. No. 109392, FPCD-79-40, May 17.

Opportunities to Improve Decisionmaking and Oversight of Arms Sales. Acc. No. 109422, ID-79-22, May 21.

Centralization: Best Long-range Solution to Financial Management Problems of the Foreign Military Sales Program. Acc. No. 109499, FGMSD-79-33, May 17.

DoD Continues to Subsidize the Foreign Military Sales Program by Not Charging for Normal Inventory Losses. Acc. No. 109357, FGMSD-79-31, May 15.

Should Navstar Be Used for Civil Navigation? FAA Should Improve its Efforts to Decide. Acc. No. 109230, LCD-79-104, April 30.

If Army Helicopter Maintenance is to be Ready for Wartime, It Must be Made Efficient and Effective in Peacetime. Acc. No. 109302, LCD-79-407, May 10.

Congress Should Act to Establish Military Compensation Principles. Acc. No. 109294, FPCD-79-11, May 9.

Defense Use of Military Personnel in Industrial Facilities—Largely Unnecessary and Very Expensive. Acc. No. 109239, FPCD-79-10, May 1.

Letter Reports

Correction of computation errors reduced Air Force aerial port staffing requirements for fiscal year 1979. Acc. No. 109348, LCD-79-216, April 11.

The military services and the Defense Logistics Agency are making sure that prices are reasonable in awarding small purchases. PSAD-79-81, May 7.

The Air Force should increase host nation

weather support in Europe. Acc. No. 109303, LCD-79-413, May 11.

The Defense Department is retaining millions of dollars of excess inventories for possible sales to foreign governments. Acc. No. 109393, LCD-79-211, May 11.

Uncollected debts owed the United States by the Republic of Korea Air Force. Acc. No. 109451, ID-79-32, May 16.

Consolidating the Army and Air Force Exchange Service and the Navy Resale System Office would reduce annual non appropriated fund operating costs. Acc. No. 109444, FPCD-79-60, May 22.

Findings of the Defense Audit Service's reports on the F-15 and F-14 combat aircraft. Acc. No. 109441, LCD-79-420, May 22.

Target cost of the contract for 526 Improved Hawk ground-to-air defense missiles was overstated by about \$710,000. Acc. No. 109477, PSAD-79-82, May 25.

ENERGY

Questions on the Future of Nuclear Power: Implications and Trade-offs. Acc. No. 107423, EMD-79-56, May 21.

The Clinch River Breeder Reactor—Should Congress Continue to Fund it? Acc. No. 109359, EMD-79-62, May 7.

Nuclear Reactor Options to Reduce the Risk of Proliferation and to Succeed Current Light Water Reactor Technology. Acc. No. 109445, EMD-79-15, May 23.

Improvements Needed in Enforcing Crude Oil Reseller Price Controls. EMD-79-57, May 29.

Difficulties in Determining if Nuclear Training of Foreigners Contributes to Weapons Proliferation. Acc. No. 109350, ID-79-2, April 23.

Letter Reports

The operator-licensing program for nuclear powerplants should be completely reevaluated. EMD-79-67, May 15.

DOE has not given adequate emphasis and attention to the timely organization, staffing, and management of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Conservation and Solar Applications. Acc. No. 109399, EMD-79-64, May 18.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

Coal Trespass in the Eastern States—More Federal Oversight Needed. EMD-79-69, May 25.

Enewetak Atoll—Cleaning Up Nuclear Contamination. Acc. No. 109449, PSAD-79-54, May 8.

Ways to Resolve Critical Water Resources Issues Facing the Nation. Acc. No. 109280, CED-79-87, April 27.

Desalting Water Probably Will Not Solve the Nation's Water Problems, But Can Help. Acc. No. 109231, CED-79-60, May 1.

Colorado River Basin Water Problems: How to Reduce Their Impact. Acc. No. 109267, CED-79-11, May 4.

Combined Sewer Flooding Pollution—A National Problem. The Search For Solutions in Chicago: An Executive Summary. Vols. 1-6. Acc. No. 109450, CED-79-77, May 15.

Codisposal of Garbage and Sewage Sludge—A Promising Solution to Two Problems. Acc. No. 109396, CED-79-59, May 16.

EPA Standards of Employee Conduct Need Improvement. Acc. No. 109283, FPCD-79-48, May 8.

Letter reports

Several more years will be needed to eliminate the backlog of lands needing reforestation. Acc. No. 109288, CED-79-88, April 27.

Annual Reports by the Forest Service could be improved. Acc. No. 109442, PAD-79-34, May 22.

The Virgin Islands Comptroller adhered to GAO's standards in auditing the procurement actions for three desalination plants. CED-79-96, May 30.

AGRICULTURE

Colocating Agriculture Field Offices—More Can Be Done. Acc. No. 109264, CED-79-74, April 25.

COMMERCE AND HOUSING

The Maritime Administration and the National Maritime Council—Was their Relationship Appropriate? Acc. No. 109501, CED-79-91, May 18.

Customs' Office of Investigations Needs to Concentrate its Resources on Quality Cases. Acc. No. 109349, GCD-79-33, April 20.

Letter reports

Problems caused by using incorrect Bureau of Census per capita income figures for computing revenue sharing payments to Pitman Township, Ill. GGD-70-34, April 16.

TRANSPORTATION

How Effective is the Coast Guard in Carrying Out Its Commercial Vessel Safety Responsibilities? Acc. No. 109476, CED-79-54, May 25.

Coast Guard Action Needed to Promote Safer Marine Transportation. Acc. No. 109443, CED-79-37, May 21.

"Weight Bumping"—Falsifying Household Moving Weights to Increase Charges—What ICC Needs to Do. Acc. No. 109282, CED-79-75, May 1.

Federal Actions Are Needed to Improve Safety and Security of Nuclear Materials Transportation. Acc. No. 109421, EMD-79-18, May 7.

Replacing Government Sedans Yearly Would Result in Fuel and Cost Savings. Acc. No. 109281, LCD-78-245, May 8.

Information on Questions About Conrail's Track Abandonment Program. Acc. No. 109-278, CED-79-45, April 2.

Information on U.S. Railway Association Contracts With Law Firms. CED-79-78, April 19.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

More Can Be Done to Identify and Help Communities Adjust to Economic Problems Caused By Increased Imports. Acc. No. 109-355, CED-79-42, May 15.

Letter reports

Allegations concerning the sewer project in Eastsound, Washington, were substantiated. Acc. No. 107265, CED-79-80, April 30.

Undated information on the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. GGD-79-68, May 11.

Why was construction of the Richard B. Russell Federal Building in Atlanta, Georgia, delayed and what caused a cost overrun? Acc. No. 109500, LCD-79-313, May 16.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Federal Employment Examinations: Do They Achieve Equal Opportunity and Merit Principle Goals? Acc. No. 109356, FPCD-79-46, May 15.

How Can Workplace Injuries Be Prevented? The Answers May Be in OSHA Files. Acc. No. 109243, HRD-79-43, May 3.

Improvements Recommended for Better Oversight of the Capitol Page School. Acc. No. 109351, GGD-79-56, April 26.

Military Child Advocacy Programs—Victims of Neglect. HRD-79-75, May 23.

HEALTH

Home Health Care Services—Tighter Fiscal Controls Needed. Acc. No. 109398, HRD-79-17, May 15.

Health Maintenance Organizations: Federal Financing is Adequate But HEW Must Continue Improving Program Management. Acc. No. 109304, HRD-79-72, May 1.

Evaluation of a proposal to increase Medicare Equity Return Payments to For-Profit Hospitals. Acc. No. 109448, HRD-79-63, April 23.

The Medicare Hospital Certification System Needs Reform. Acc. No. 109358, HRD-79-37, May 14.

Letter reports

HEW adequately audited the swine flu vaccine manufacturing costs of three pharmaceutical firms. Acc. No. 109240, HRD-79-73, May 1.

HEW should give greater consideration to the extent and severity of flu expected in determining the amount of funds the Government should spend. Acc. No. 109352, HRD-79-77, May 14.

INCOME SECURITY

Labor Department is Strengthening Procedures to Recover Costs for Federal Employees' Injuries Caused by Third Parties. Acc. No. 109293, HRD-79-36, May 9.

Letter reports

The office of Personnel and Management should consider providing benefits statements to all Federal employees so that they understand their values. Acc. No. 109353, FPCD-79-53, May 14.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Speedy Trial Act—Its Impact on the Judicial System Still Unknown. Acc. No. 109318, GGD-79-55, May 2.

Management Improvements in the Administrative Law Process: Much Remains to be Done. Acc. No. 109439, FPCD-79-44, May 23.

Impact of the Exclusionary Rule on Federal Criminal Prosecutions. Acc. No. 19279, GGD-79-45, April 19.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Most Federal Employees on the Job 40 Hours or More Weekly: Tighter Controls Among Proposals for Those Who Work Less. Acc. No. 109438, FPCD-79-24, May 21.

Annual Adjustments—The Key to Federal Executive Pay. Acc. No. 109395, FPCD-79-31, May 17.

Federally Assisted Employment and Training: A Myriad of Programs Should Be Simplified. Acc. No. 109284, HRD-79-11, May 8.

Uses of National Economic Models by Federal Agencies. Acc. No. 109394, PSAD-79-24, May 16.

Ineffective Management of GSA's Multiple Award Schedule Program—A Costly, Serious, Longstanding Problem. Acc. No. 109295, PSAD-79-71, May 2.

After Six Years, Legal Obstacles Continue to Restrict Government Use of the Standard Statistical Establishment List. GGD-79-17, May 25.

The Mandatory Small Business Subcontracting Test: Considerations for Public Law 95-507's New Subcontracting Program. Acc. No. 109317, PSAD-79-66, May 11.

Examination of Financial Statements of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 1977. Acc. No. 109242, HRD-79-44, May 3.

Audit of the House Beauty Shop. Calendar Year 1978. Acc. No. 109266, GGD-79-46, May 4.

Examination of Records, House of Representatives Finance Office for Fiscal Year 1978. GGD-79-47, May 30.

Audit of the House Recording Studio revolving Fund for the 9-month Period Ended December 31, 1978. Acc. No. 109401, GGD-79-57, May 18.

Letter reports

GSA and OMB need to improve their management of implementing GAO audit recommendations. LCD-79-311, April 5.

Financial statements of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for fiscal year 1978. Acc. No. 109236, ID-79-19A, April 30.

The Government should have unlimited rights to computer software developed under Government contracts. Acc. No. 109397, PSAD-79-69, May 18.

Internal control weaknesses found in the Environmental Protection Agency accounting system. Acc. No. 109400, FGMSD-79-28, May 18.

Weaknesses noted in survey of accounting controls over revenue and expenditure transactions of accounting stations of the Employment and Training Administration and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor. Acc. No. 109424, FGMSD-79-29, May 21.

Investigation of allegations that the Milwaukee Indian Health Board has mismanaged Federal funds. Acc. No. 109440, HRD-79-83, May 21.

The Monthly List of GAO Reports and/or copies of the full texts are available from the U.S. General Accounting Office, Distribution Section, Room 1518, 441 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20548. Phone (202) 257-6241.●

DRIVING WITHOUT RESTRAINT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues would be interested in this article written by Mr. Will which appeared in the Washington Post.

I think the article is very timely in that in the near future we will vote on the transportation appropriations bill which contains funds for research on automobile safety:

DRIVING WITHOUT RESTRAINT

(By George F. Will)

CHEVY CHASE VILLAGE.—Thinking he heard thunder, my neighbor went to close his car windows. Actually, he had heard a commonplace tragedy, the making of a statistic. A

woman died and a man nearly did in an occurrence shocking but routine: an automobile accident.

The car veered out of control on Connecticut Avenue, hit trees, fragmented, broke in half. Three of us arrived immediately. Emergency equipment arrived quickly. Cleaning up took hours.

In 1900, this "village," six miles from the White House, was where Washingtonians came for country breezes. Today, it is a small incorporated area near the center of a sprawling metropolis. It is divided by Connecticut Avenue, which passes around a traffic circle as it enters Maryland. Trees on the circle are heavily scarred. Crumpling steel and crying sirens are common sounds here as on many urban thoroughfares.

Increasingly, American driving reflects, I think, the sublimated fury of persons heading for infuriating jobs, the animal spirits of persons whose lives allow little scope for such spirits. As Daniel Moynihan wrote years ago, the automobile is "both a symbol of aggression and a vehicle thereof. . . . It is a prime agent of risk-taking in a society that still values risk-taking, but does not provide many outlets."

The endless epidemic of accidents is one of the nation's gravest public health problems. Automobile deaths and injuries have costs beyond counting, and are a special plague to the young. Of every 100,000 males at age 15, about 1,100 will die in accidents, most involving automobiles, before age 25—a death rate 20 times worse than polio inflicted at its worst.

As Moynihan notes, the social life of most Americans "now primarily takes the form of driving to a place where alcohol is consumed." And because traffic laws are widely ignored, almost everyone is a lawbreaker, and the incidence of arrest in America may be the highest of any nation in history. Repairing and replacing wrecked cars may provide 20 per cent of the business for the automobile industry, the nation's most important.

Such statistics are as lifeless as the woman who lay beneath blankets on the Connecticut Avenue median strip. But they describe a river of sorrow flowing from monstrously irrational behavior.

Most drivers frequently exceed speed limits, only 25 per cent use seatbelts, only four per cent use harnesses. Because slaughter behind the wheel is deeply rooted in aggression and other irrationality, it is very difficult to substantially reduce accidents by reforming drivers. So government has tried to reduce the severity of injuries received in accidents.

The public disliked, and the government quickly disconnected, the ignition "interlock" system that prevented cars from starting when safety belts were unfastened. Today, new cars just make a brief buzz of disapproval.

Government may yet require "passive restraints"—air bags that instantly inflate to cushion passengers in collisions. There is evidence that they would save many thousands of lives annually and may be one answer to what Moynihan has called "the seeming incompatibility of safe driving and mass driving." That is a considerable problem in a nation where more people drive than pay taxes or vote.

Air bags require no forethought by drivers, so they are suited to the American driving public. The air bags would probably cost manufacturers less than \$100, a fraction of what car buyers exuberantly spend when loading their cars with snappy wheel covers and other options.

Long before the most recent Connecticut Avenue death, I regretted having once argued that government has no business requiring drivers to buy and use inexpensive devices that might save them from self-destruction. There is a pitiless abstractness, and disrespect for life, in such dogmatic respect for the right of consenting adults to behave in ways disastrous to themselves. Besides, too

many children passengers are sacrificed on that altar. And a large part of the bill for the irrationality of individual drivers is paid by society.

Most important, society desensitizes itself by passively accepting so much carnage.

On Connecticut Avenue that evening, the police operated with the weary patience normal to those who are paid to look unblinkingly at what people do to themselves. "Go home," a policeman finally said, with barely noticeable disgust, to people milling around the debris. "Go home and watch television." After a while, we did. ●

LET US UTILIZE OUR ECONOMIC LEVERAGE UPON THOSE WHO WAGE ECONOMIC ENERGY WARFARE AGAINST US

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to utilize our economic leverage upon those who would wage economic energy warfare against us. Those countries which engage in unfair trade practices with regard to price or supply are actually attacking our economic well-being, our economic way of life. President Carter has called our energy crisis the "moral equivalent of war." This is not the equivalent of war—it is war, an economic one. I am not calling upon this Government to engage in counterproductive retaliatory moves. But we should use the leverage that we have, when it can be effective, in order to fight back, in order to respond to this economic challenge.

I am not ignoring the fact that we must cut back on our energy consumption, that we must conserve. This is our future—it is absolutely essential. In this economic war, that is our offensive. OPEC has made the price of oil so high that alternatives are becoming economically feasible. We can and will develop feasible alternatives to oil, such as solar power, synthetic fuels, wind and water power, et cetera. OPEC pricing contains the seed of its own destruction—if it does not destroy us first.

In the meantime, we must protect ourselves with whatever leverage we can muster against this threat. The legislation that I am introducing today imposes export controls over wheat and wheat flour. All wheat exports will require a validated export license, instead of the present system where such export controls are applied to transactions to Communist countries only. In addition, the bill mandates the Secretary of Commerce impose license fees. This will have the effect of raising the price of our grain on the world market, but not on the domestic market. These fees will be determined by the Secretary of Commerce. Wheat going to needy or developing nations is exempted from the provision requiring a license fee.

The revenues from these export license fees would be shared by the farmers who grow the wheat; applied to reductions on Federal taxes on gasoline and heating oil; and the balance to fund an all-out crash program to develop alternate sources of energy.

The bill also states that export controls should be imposed on nations engaging in inequitable trade practices in price and availability of goods which are vital to the American economy, including petroleum. In this way the bill mandates the Commerce Department to withhold technologies or other commercial goods, if such a denial appears to be an effective way to use our economic leverage.

We are no longer the invulnerable world economic giant that we once were. Clearly, given our dependence on imported oil, we are no longer in a position where we can impose our will on other nations through economic sanctions. But we must try to use our influence to our own advantage when we do in fact have economic power. This Nation is the world's grain reserve, the world's breadbasket. In 1978, U.S. wheat exports were valued at \$4.3 billion and provided 43 percent of the wheat traded internationally. OPEC nations import nearly 15 percent of U.S. wheat exports, and this provides OPEC countries with close to 50 percent of the wheat consumed in those countries. The United States imports 19 percent of OPEC's oil exports and OPEC provides 38 percent of the oil used in this country.

OPEC has the financial ability to import more food, and at a higher price, because of oil revenues. The OPEC nations' desire for wheat has been growing as they have become richer and richer. Industrialized countries, which can afford to pay the ridiculously high price for oil, can certainly afford to pay more for wheat.

In addition, our farmers certainly deserve more profit on their wheat crops. In 1973 the price of a bushel of American wheat was \$3. That, too, was the price of an imported barrel of oil—\$3. Now, six years later, the price of a bushel of wheat is still about \$3. The spot price of a barrel of oil has topped \$30 a barrel. That is 10 times the price of wheat.

In a recent article which appeared in the Washington Post entitled "Using U.S. Wheat Against OPEC: Not as Farfetched as You Think," author Dan Morgan states that the United States does have considerable leverage with regard to OPEC's wheat needs. Mr. Morgan says:

The clear implication is that, with regard to OPEC's wheat needs, the two criteria for U.S. economic leverage exist:

Doing without grain imports, though possible, would be economically disruptive and possibly politically destabilizing.

Only the United States and Canada can guarantee a continuing supply of wheat of that magnitude.

If the economic leverage is there, I say we should and must use it. It is clearly in our national interest to use our own economic power to try and stabilize oil prices. This is a game of economic hardball. Our national economic survival demands that we respond to this challenge.

Last month I introduced complementary legislation which creates a Council of Oil Importing Nations (COIN), so that oil importing nations can stop competing with each other for oil, and get together to negotiate a reasonable base price for oil. Instead of jacking up the price through competitive bidding, this legisla-

tion urges cooperation among importers. With both pieces of legislation, this country can put pressure on OPEC. To get the importing nations together will present a stronger united front to fight destabilizing price rises, and two-tier pricing. This new legislation will allow us more unilateral leverage to secure cooperation from OPEC and our oil importing allies.

Not only will the machinery set up in this bill be useful in pressuring OPEC, but will be in place in the future, should OPEC decide to impose another oil embargo on our Nation. If an embargo is imposed, we can impose one of our own. If no oil, then we can say no to wheat, to technology, to commercial goods. The language to deny these items would be in place in the law, and ready to be implemented. We will have our economic weaponry in place should this economic war escalate to an oil embargo once again.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come for this legislation to be considered by this body. I urge swift action by the Foreign Affairs Committee on this issue. I would like to insert my legislation into the Record at this point:

H.R. 4835

A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 to require the imposition of controls on the exportation of wheat and wheat flour, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 (50 U.S.C. App. 2403) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n) (1) The Secretary of Commerce shall require a validated license for the export of wheat and wheat flour. In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall impose such export license fees as the Secretary shall determine. Such license fees may be waived in the case of exports to developing countries. Such fees shall be imposed in the case of exports to any country which imposes restrictions on access by the United States to goods where such restrictions have or may have a serious domestic inflationary impact, have caused or may cause a serious domestic shortage, or have been imposed for purposes of influencing the foreign policy of the United States.

"(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall not apply to a country if and when the President determines that it is in the national interest to remove the requirement of a validated license set forth in such paragraph with respect to that country."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(o) It is the sense of the Congress that export controls on United States goods and technology should be imposed with respect to any country which engages in inequitable trade practices toward the United States concerning pricing and availability of goods vital to the United States economy, including petroleum." ●

AUTOMOBILE SAFETY

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

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will vote on one of the most pressing issues of our time: Automobile

safety. The debate on passive restraints has been long and somewhat acrimonious; today, however, we can certainly say that it has been bipartisan. In a joint letter to our colleagues, Representative BOB ECKHARDT and Representative JOHN RHODES have urged the House to reject an amendment to the Department of Transportation's appropriation which precludes the implementation of the Department's "passive restraint" order.

I commend this letter to my colleagues' attention, and I would hope that they take note of the broad bipartisan support for the Department's position. I urge support for automobile safety, and the defeat of the Dingell amendment to the Department of Transportation's appropriation.

JULY 17, 1979.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Our colleague, John Dingell, has asked you to support an amendment to the Department of Transportation appropriations bill (H.R. 4440) that would prohibit the Department from enforcing its 1977 automobile passive restraint standard in the form in which it was promulgated and approved by the Congress.

The standard currently calls for the manufacture of vehicles capable of protecting their front-seat occupants from injury in frontal crashes of 30 miles per hour, beginning with the 1982 model year. The standard permits the manufacturers to use any technology they wish to meet its performance criteria.

Mr. Dingell's amendment would prevent the DOT from enforcing the standard if the manufacturers chose to use any technology other than belt systems. He is asking you to turn the performance standard required under the National Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 into a design standard, and to rule out the use of the other presently available technology, the air cushion restraint system (or airbag).

We are strongly opposed to Mr. Dingell's amendment. Congress requires the agency to set standards based on broad performance criteria, to permit the highest degree possible of competition and innovation in the market. If the agency should be kept out of the business of designing cars, it is even more appropriate that the Congress stay out of a highly technical judgment on the relative merits of competing passive restraint systems.

The Dingell amendment is, we are afraid, but a prelude to attempts to have Congress outlaw airbags, so that none of the manufacturers will have to compete with each other on the basis of superior safety technology. For this reason, too, we urge you to oppose the amendment. Having told the manufacturers that we want them to produce safer cars, we have no business telling them which technology they must or must not use to comply with the law.

BOB ECKHARDT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Oversight and Investigations.
JOHN J. RHODES,
Minority Leader. ●

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. WHITTAKER, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. COLLINS of Texas, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 60 minutes, on July 18.

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

Mr. WEAVER, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. COELHO, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. WYATT, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. BROOKS, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. WOLFF, for 15 minutes today.
Ms. OAKAR, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. WIRTH, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. STRATTON, for 60 minutes on June 18.
Mr. LaFALCE, for 30 minutes on June 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. HOPKINS.
Mr. WYDLER in two instances.
Mr. SYMMS.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. SAWYER.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. COLLINS of Texas in two instances.

Mr. ERDAHL.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. HARSHA.
Mr. DANNEMEYER.
Mr. MCKINNEY.
Mr. DORNAN.

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

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania in 10 instances.

Mr. NOWAK in six instances.
Mr. BARNES in two instances.
Mr. DINGELL in three instances.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California in five instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.
Mr. SIMON.
Mr. McDONALD.
Mr. DIXON in three instances.
Mr. ALBOSTA.
Mr. CONYERS.
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in five instances.
Mr. OTTINGER in five instances.
Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mr. LUNDINE.
Mr. DELLUMS.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. MAGUIRE.
Mr. MINETA.
Mr. WHITE.
Mr. CARR.
Mr. NOLAN.
Mr. WOLFF.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 2154. An act to revise the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, to require that appropriations for acquisition of strategic and critical materials be authorized by law, to establish a National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House, of the following title:

H.J. Res. 353. Congratulating the men and women of the Apollo program upon the tenth anniversary of the first manned landing on the Moon and requesting the President to proclaim the period of July 16 through 24, 1979, as "United States Space Observance".

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 18, 1979, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2021. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the preliminary report of the Rural Transportation Advisory Task Force, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 95-580; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2022. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve the sale of certain excess naval vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2023. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting notice of the Army's intention to omit the clause authorizing the Comptroller General to examine certain records which would otherwise be required to be included in a contract with the Ministry of Defence of the United Kingdom for the Giant Viper Mine Clearance System, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2313(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2024. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a statement describing a proposed transaction with China Airlines, Ltd., exceeding \$60 million, pursuant to section 2(b)(3)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2025. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed plan for the use and distribution of the Goshute Indian judgment funds in dockets

326-B and 326-J before the Indian Claims Commission, pursuant to sections 2(a) and 4 of Public Law 93-134; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2026. A letter from the Executive Director, President's Commission on Coal, transmitting a report on acceptable ways to hasten the substitution of coal for oil; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2027. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a Corps of Engineers report on unauthorized projects in the Grand River Basin, Missouri and Iowa, pursuant to section 204 of Public Law 89-298 and in response to a resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted October 19, 1967; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2028. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a final environmental impact statement and supplemental information on the water supply relocation project for Conway, Ark., pursuant to section 404(r) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2029. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a final supplemental environmental impact statement on the Lewiston, Idaho-Clarkston, Wash., interstate bridge project, pursuant to section 404(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2030. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Management and Budget, transmitting the matching program renewal report for Project Match; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2031. A letter from the Executive Director, Advisory Committee for Trade Negotiations, transmitting the committee's report on the multilateral trade negotiations, pursuant to section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2032. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the extent of excessively heavy trucking and its effects on highways (CED-79-94, July 16, 1979); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARCIA: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 19. Joint resolution providing for the designation of a week as "National Lupus Week" (Rept. No. 96-340). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARCIA: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 209. Joint resolution designating the week of May 14 through May 20, 1979, as "National Diabetes Week"; with amendments (Rept. No. 96-341). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 363. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4007, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the provisions which increase the Federal unemployment tax in States which have outstanding loans will not apply if the State makes certain repayments. (Rept. No. 96-342). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 364. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3398, a bill to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 relating

to increases in the target prices of the 1979 crops of wheat, corn, and other crops under certain circumstances, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 96-343). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 365. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3434, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to make needed improvements in the child welfare and social services programs, to strengthen and improve the program of Federal support for foster care of needy and dependent children, to establish a program of Federal support to encourage adoptions of children with special needs, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 96-344). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 366. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3282, a bill to establish a program for the inspection of schools to detect the presence of hazardous asbestos materials, to provide loans to local educational agencies to contain or remove hazardous asbestos materials from schools and to replace such materials with other suitable building materials, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 96-345). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 367. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2859 a bill to authorize appropriations for programs under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, to amend such act to facilitate the improvement of programs carried out thereunder, to authorize urban volunteer programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 96-346). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 368. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4040, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1980 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and for civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, to authorize the military training student loads, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1980 for civil defense, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 96-347). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 4453. A bill to amend the Saccharin Study and Labeling Act to extend to June 30, 1981, the ban on actions by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare respecting saccharin (Rept. No. 96-348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANLEY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 4732. A bill to fix the annual rates of pay for the Architect of the Capitol and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol (Rept. No. 96-349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. ABDNOR:

H.R. 4815. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to facilitate the production of alcohol fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 4816. A bill to amend section 103(f) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4817. A bill to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 relating to increases in target prices of the 1979 crops of wheat, corn, and other crops under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DANNEMEYER:

H.R. 4818. A bill to provide for the effective demonstration of the safe and permanent disposal of nuclear wastes from civilian powerplants; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 4819. A bill to provide for the use of alcohol produced from renewable resources as a motor vehicle fuel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4820. A bill to provide for an accelerated program to be carried out by the Department of Energy, with the support of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other Federal agencies, of wind energy research, development, and demonstration; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

H.R. 4821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual an income tax deduction for the expenses of traveling to and from work by means of mass transportation facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4822. A bill to provide for incentives for the commercial application of solar energy, energy conservation, and renewable resource equipment and devices in homes, neighborhood and community structures, small businesses, and facilities owned or occupied by nonprofit organizations; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Small Business.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 4823. A bill to amend section 602 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to direct the National Institutes of Health to conduct a study on certain age restrictions on individuals seeking to serve as pilots of aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HANCE:

H.R. 4824. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to limit the eligibility of certain households to participate in the food stamp program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4825. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to impose criminal penalties for the sabotage of a nuclear facility; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. ROYER):

H.R. 4826. A bill to amend section 602 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to certain age restrictions on individuals seeking to serve as pilots, flight engineers, or flight navigators of aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MOORE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. McDONALD):

H.R. 4827. A bill to prohibit the appropriation or use of funds for the compensation of attorneys, witnesses, or experts for intervening or participating in any rule-making proceeding of any Federal agency unless such appropriation is specifically authorized by law; jointly, to the Committees on Rules and Government Operations.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 4828. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to require EPA automobile fuel economy tests to be based upon actual road conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.R. 4829. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for protection of U.S. probation officers and pretrial service officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 4830. A bill to reimpose controls on home heating oil; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUAYLE:

H.R. 4831. A bill to exempt family farms and nonhazardous small businesses from the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the interest on deposits in certain savings institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAWYER (for himself, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. LEE, Mr. LENT, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 4833. A bill to allow a deduction for dividends paid by domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISS (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. MIKULSKI, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. CHISHOLM, and Mr. MACUIRE):

H.R. 4834. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that the label and advertising for contraceptive drugs and devices state the effectiveness of the drugs and devices in preventing conception in humans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 4835. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 to require the imposition of controls on the exportation of wheat and wheat flour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUDD:

H. Con. Res. 163. Concurrent resolution disapproving the sale of certain defense articles to Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HOLTZMAN (for herself and Mr. FISH):

H. Res. 362. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the President's providing emergency assistance to Indochinese refugees; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., (for himself), Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. GINGRICH, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ROE, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WINN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 371. Resolution concerning mutual defense treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

H. Res. 372. Resolution urging the President to convene a meeting of grain exporting nations to coordinate grain exporting policies and prices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H. Res. 373. Resolution to allow the parties in the case of *New Mexico v. Aamodt* to have access to certain records of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITTAKER:

H. Res. 374. Resolution establishing a Select Committee on Energy; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

255. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the Department of Defense Guam land use plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

256. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to relocation of the ammunition wharf at Apra Harbor, Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

257. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to calling a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding Federal rules and regulations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

258. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to fishery management; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

259. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to proposed regulations to require that steel shot be used in taking waterfowl in Louisiana during the 1979-80 season; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

260. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to establishing "National Hawk Watching Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

261. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to granting a tax deduction for the first \$1,000 of interest on regular passbook savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CLINGER:

H.R. 4836. A bill for the relief of Upper Allegheny Sand & Gravel Co., Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COELHO:

H.R. 4837. A bill for the relief of Dale Z. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 4838. A bill for the relief of Remedios Canillas McClanahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. COURTER, and Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 142: Mr. MOTT, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WINN, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. McHUGH.

H.R. 809: Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 953: Mr. AMBRO.

H.R. 1572: Mr. BRODHEAD.

H.R. 1772: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. EMERY, Mr. BEDELL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. CORCORAN.

H.R. 1775: Mr. ALBOSTA.

H.R. 1918: Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 2247: Mr. EDGAR, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. PATTERSON.

H.R. 2272: Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 3308: Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GINN, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. LUTJAN, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas.

H.R. 3720: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. STANGELAND.

H.R. 3852: Mr. LENT and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.R. 4086: Mr. COELHO, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 4113: Mr. REUSS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE.

H.R. 4158: Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 4345: Mr. CONTE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. GUYER, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WYLLIE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. CORCORAN, and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 4441: Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. CARR, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. BRODHEAD, and Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

H.R. 4549: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 4550: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 4565: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GINN, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MOTT, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STUMP, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HEFFNER, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 4639: Mr. COLLINS of Texas and Mr. McDONALD.

H.R. 4648: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLFE, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.R. 4660: Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURGNER, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GINN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARSHA, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. HEFTL, Mr. HINSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. McDADD, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. McKAY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKLE,

Mr. PRICE, Mr. FRITCHARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLACK, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mrs. SNOWE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SOLOMON, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STEED, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WYATT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. ZEPHERETTI, and Mr. MARKS.

H.R. 4672: Mr. RITTER.

H.J. Res. 3: Mr. GRADISON, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. HANCE, Mr. ROYER, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. GINN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WINN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SABO, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. STRATTON.

H.J. Res. 276: Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FITTHIAN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. STANGELAND, and Mr. JOHNSON of California.

H.J. Res. 321: Mr. COTTER.

H.J. Res. 339: Mr. SIMON.

H.J. Res. 355: Mr. STACK, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mr. ZEPHERETTI.

H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. BRINKLEY and Mrs. BYRON.

H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. WINN, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. BERUTER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. DORNAN.

H. Con. Res. 139: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. McHUGH.

H. Res. 75: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. EMERY, Mr. GUDGER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STOKES, and Mrs. HOLT.

H. Res. 347: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ARCHER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FITTHIAN, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

AMENDMENTS

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

H.R. 3917

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

—Page 16, beginning in line 20, strike out "or the product of \$0.25 and the population of the health service area for which the agency is designated" and insert in lieu thereof "or \$200,000 or the product of \$0.25 and the population of the health service area for which the agency is designated, whichever is greater".

H.R. 3996

By Mr. JENNETTE:

—Page 89, after line 16, insert the following new section:

FIVE-YEAR PLAN TO MAXIMIZE MAIL AND EXPRESS REVENUES

SEC. 128. The Corporation shall, in conjunction with the United States Postal Service, determine those mail transportation requirements which can be met within the route system and frequently which Amtrak is authorized to operate; and shall, through detailed market analysis determine the maximum level of rail express traffic which can be expected to accrue to the Corporation, within such authorized route structure, and shall develop and furnish the Congress, not later than March 31, 1980, with a five-year capital and operating plan to achieve those levels, including modification of existing facilities to handle mail and express more efficiently, the acquisition of modern materials handling equipment and rolling stock, optimum scheduling, and staffing and/or promotional requirements designed to maximize revenues from these two sources.

At the time of presentation of the plan, the President of the Corporation, in conjunction with the Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, United States Senate, and the Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States House of Representatives, will recommend and establish an advisory group of not more than seven members of Congress, or staff alternates, who shall work with the Corporation on the preparation of enabling legislation and the establishment of appropriations levels. This enabling plan shall be completed no later than June 30, 1980.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

—Page 79, line 21, strike out "\$230,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$272,000,000".

Page 79, line 23, strike out "\$253,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$295,000,000".

Page 79, line 24, strike out "\$271,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$313,000,000".

By Mr. PATTERSON:

—Page 68, after line 15, insert the following new paragraph:

"(5) Prior to instituting any fare increase that applies to service provided under this subsection and that represents an increase of more than 5 percent over a 6-month period, the Corporation shall consult with and obtain the views of the appropriate officials of each State to be affected by such fare increase. The Corporation shall provide the officials of each such State with a justification of the proposed fare increase and an explanation of the circumstances warranting such increase (such as the unique costs of or demand for the services involved).

Page 68, line 18, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)".

Page 69, line 15, strike out "(6)" and insert in lieu thereof "(7)".

By Mr. PEPPER:

—Page 56, after line 22, insert the following new section:

REDUCED FARE PROGRAM FOR ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS

SEC. 106. Section 305(c) of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 545(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(c)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) The Corporation may establish, on a standby, space available or other basis, a program of reduced fares for elderly and handicapped individuals. Reduced fares established under such program for rail passenger service provided by the Corporation shall not be in excess of 50 per centum of the regular fare for the same service.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'elderly individual' means a person who has attained the age of sixty-five years; and

"(B) the term 'handicapped individual'

means any person who has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more of such person's major life activities, has record of such an impairment, or is regarded as having such an impairment, but such term does not include any person who is an alcoholic or drug abuser."

Redesignate the following sections accordingly.

H.R. 4034

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

—Page 29, strike out line 23 and all that follows through line 8 on page 35 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—(1) It is the intent of Congress that any export license application required under this Act shall be approved or disapproved within ninety days after its receipt. Upon the expiration of the ninety-day period beginning on the date of its receipt, any export license application required under this Act which has not been approved or disapproved shall be deemed to be approved and the license shall be issued unless the Secretary finds that additional time is required and notifies the applicant in writing of the specific circumstances requiring such additional time and the estimated date when the decision will be made.

"(2) (A) With respect to any export license application not finally approved or disapproved within ninety days after its receipt as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the applicant shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the national security and foreign policy of the United States, be specifically informed in writing of questions raised and negative considerations or recommendations made by any agency or department of the Government with respect to the license application, and shall be accorded an opportunity to respond to such questions, considerations, or recommendations in writing prior to final approval or disapproval of the application by the Secretary. In making such final approval or disapproval, the Secretary shall take fully into account the applicant's response.

"(B) Whenever the Secretary determines that it is necessary to refer an export license application to an interagency review process for approval, the Secretary shall first, if the applicant so requests, provide the applicant with an opportunity to review any documentation to be submitted to such process for the purpose of describing the export in question, in order to determine whether such documentation accurately describes the proposed export.

"(3) In any denial of an export license application, the applicant shall be informed in writing of the specific statutory basis for the denial.

"(d) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall, not later than ninety days after the date of enactment of the Export Administration Act Amendments of 1979, institute administrative deadlines designed to carry out the intent of Congress set forth in subsection (c) of this section. Such administrative deadlines shall provide that notification shall be given to the Secretary when a deadline is not met. Not later than fifteen months after such deadlines are instituted, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on the implementation of these deadlines.

Page 35, line 9, strike out "i" and insert in lieu thereof "e".

Page 37, line 8, insert "and with the administrative deadlines instituted pursuant to subsection (d) of this section" after "this section".

Page 37, line 9, strike out "j" and insert in lieu thereof "f".

Page 37, lines 10 and 11, strike out "finally approved under subsection (d), (f), (g),

(h), or (i) of" and insert in lieu thereof "otherwise approved under".

Page 37, lines 14 and 15, strike out "as prescribed in such subsections".

Page 38, line 24, strike out "time period prescribed in" and insert in lieu thereof "administrative deadline instituted pursuant to subsection (d) of".

Page 39, strike out line 3 and all that follows through line 2 on page 40.

Page 40, line 3, strike out "m" and insert in lieu thereof "g".

—Page 37, line 9, insert "(A)" after "(1)".

Page 37, line 23, insert after "issued" the following: "unless the Secretary extends the sixty-day period under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph".

Page 38, insert the following after line 2:

"(B) Upon the request of a country or countries participating in the multilateral review, referred to in subparagraph (A), of an application, the Secretary may extend the sixty-day period prescribed in that subparagraph if the Secretary determines that the application is of exceptional importance and complexity that require the extension. The Secretary shall notify the Congress and the applicant of any such extension and the reasons therefor.

By Mr. SHANNON:

—Page 45, insert the following section after line 21 and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly:

EXPORTS OF HIDES AND SKINS

Sec. 110. Subsection (f) (1) of section 7 of the Export Administration Act of 1969, as such section is redesignated by section 104 (a) of this Act, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" after "(f) (1)"; and
(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), in order to carry out the policy set forth in section 3(7) of this Act with respect to animal hides and skins, animals hides and skins may not be exported in any year in an amount which is a greater percentage of the total supply of animal hides and skins produced in the United States than the percentage of the total supply of animal hides and skins produced in the United States which were exported during the years 1973 through 1977. The limitation set forth in the preceding sentence shall not apply if the President, after receiving the recommendations of the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, determines that—

"(i) countries which are major producers of animal hides and skins and which, on the effective date of this subparagraph, have in effect restrictions on the export from those countries of animal hides and skins resume reasonable levels of exports of animal hides and skins; or

"(ii) during the last calendar year ending before such determination is made, the supply of animal hides and skins produced in the United States, after deducting the amount of such hides and skins exported during that calendar year, was sufficient to meet the demands of the domestic economy. The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the President recommendations so that the President has sufficient information to make the determination described in this subparagraph. Before making such recommendations, the two Secretaries shall hold public hearings, after providing reasonable notice thereof, and shall afford interested parties an opportunity to submit written comments, with or without oral presentation, at such hearings. Any determination of the President made under this subparagraph shall be valid for a period of one year."

H.R. 4040

By Mr. DELLUMS:

—Page 8, line 5, strike out "\$4,940,265,000" and all that follows through "and (2)" on line 10 and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,270,265,000 of which".

Page 8, strike line 20 and all that follows down through line 24 on page 9.

—Page 33, after line 8, add the following new section:

RESTRICTION ON TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR OBLIGATION

Sec. 818. Of the total amount appropriated pursuant to the authorizations of appropriations contained in this Act, the total amount that may be obligated or expended is the amount equal to the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act less \$15,000,000,000.

By Mr. HUGHES:

—Page 33, after line 8, add the following new section:

PURCHASES OF GASOLINE AS FUEL FOR MOTOR VEHICLES

Sec. 818. (a) Gasoline may not be purchased by the Department of Defense from gasoline wholesalers for use as fuel for motor vehicles owned or operated by the Department of Defense unless the Secretary of Defense determines, with respect to a purchase of fuel for motor vehicles, that—

(1) gasoline is not available in sufficient quantities to meet the requirements of such purchase;

(2) the use of gasoline is not compatible with the design or operating conditions of the motor vehicles for which the fuel is being purchased; or

(3) the cost of purchasing gasoline would exceed 115 percent of the cost of purchasing gasoline.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "gasoline" means a fuel which is suitable, alone or in combination with other fuels, for motor vehicles and which consists of 10 percent methanol or ethanol, manufactured using no petroleum, and 90 percent gasoline.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

—Page 29, beginning on line 1, strike out "school records and other existing records" and insert in lieu thereof "existing records other than school records, together with a discussion of the impact of alternative methods of establishing such a registration system on privacy rights under the Constitution and under statutes protecting such rights (including section 552a of title 5, United States Code), and the impact of such alternative methods on other constitutional issues".

By Mr. SKELTON:

—On page 16, strike all of lines 5 through 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 701. The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 through 2297), is amended—

(1) by adding after title IV the following new title:

"TITLE V—ENHANCED PROGRAM FOR THE 1980's

"FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS

"Sec. 501. (a) The Congress finds that—

"(1) a program providing for relocating the population of the larger United States cities, and other risk areas, during a period of strategic warning resulting from an international crisis can be effective and cost less than alternative programs;

"(2) the present civil defense program is inadequate;

"(3) a new civil defense program can be developed immediately which, with only a modest increase in resource allocation, can enhance the civil defense capability of the United States.

"(b) The Congress determines that a new

civil defense program should be implemented—

"(1) to enhance the survivability of the American people and its leadership in the event of nuclear war and thereby to improve the basis for eventual recovery and to reduce the vulnerability to a major attack;

"(2) to enhance deterrence and stability, to contribute to perceptions of the overall strategic balance and crisis stability, and to reduce the possibility that the United States could be coerced by an enemy in times of increased tension;

"(3) to not suggest any change in the United States policy of relying on strategic nuclear forces as the preponderant factor in maintaining deterrence; and

"(4) to include planning for population relocation during times of international crisis which are adaptable to deal with natural disasters and other peacetime emergencies.

"PROGRAM ELEMENTS

"Sec. 502. To carry out section 501, the President shall develop and implement a civil defense program which includes—

"(1) a survey of the shelter inherent in existing facilities;

"(2) nuclear civil protection planning for both in-place protection and population relocation, during times of international crises;

"(3) planning for the development of additional crisis shelter, of capabilities for shelter management, of the marking and stocking of shelters, and of ventilation kits for shelters;

"(4) the development of emergency evacuation plans in areas where nuclear powerplants are located;

"(5) the improvement of warning systems;

"(6) the improvement of systems and capabilities for the direction and control of emergency operations by civil governments at all levels, including development of a distributed survivable network of emergency operating centers;

"(7) the improvement of radiological defense capabilities;

"(8) the improvement of emergency public information and training programs and capabilities;

"(9) research and development; and

"(10) the development of such other systems and capabilities as are necessary to realize the maximum lifesaving potential of the civil defense program.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Sec. 503. The powers contained in titles II and IV of this Act shall be used in developing and implementing section 502"; and

(2) by adding at the end of the table of contents the following:

"TITLE V—ENHANCED PROGRAM FOR THE 1980's

"Sec. 501. Findings and determinations.

"Sec. 502. Program elements.

"Sec. 503. Administrative provisions."

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 702. There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, in 1979 dollars, the sums of \$138,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, \$145,900,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, \$243,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983, and \$283,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The sums specified in this section shall be adjusted by the inflation factor used by the Office of Management and Budget in preparing budget estimates submitted to the Congress, so that the actual sum authorized for each fiscal year shall reflect then current dollars."

And, on page 16, line 12, strike "Sec. 702." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 703."

—On page 17, immediately after Line 2 insert the following new section:

Sec. 703. The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 through 2297), is amended—

(1) by adding after title IV the following new title:

"TITLE V—ENHANCED PROGRAM FOR THE 1980'S"

"FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS"

"Sec. 501. (a) The Congress finds that—
 "(1) a program providing for relocating the population of the larger United States cities, and other risk areas, during a period of strategic warning resulting from an international crisis can be effective and cost less than alternative programs;

"(2) the present civil defense program is inadequate;

"(3) a new civil defense program can be developed immediately which, with only a modest increase in resource allocation, can enhance the civil defense capability of the United States.

"(b) The Congress determines that a new civil defense program should be implemented—

"(1) to enhance the survivability of the American people and its leadership in the event of nuclear war and thereby to improve the basis for eventual recovery and to reduce the vulnerability to a major attack;

"(2) to enhance deterrence and stability, to contribute to perceptions of the overall strategic balance and crisis stability, and to reduce the possibility that the United States could be coerced by an enemy in times of increased tension;

"(3) to not suggest any change in the United States policy of relying on strategic nuclear forces as the preponderant factor in maintaining deterrence; and

"(4) to include planning for population relocation during times of international crisis

which are adaptable to deal with natural disasters and other peacetime emergencies.

"PROGRAM ELEMENTS"

"Sec. 502. To carry out section 501, the President shall develop and implement a civil defense program which includes—

"(1) a survey of the shelter inherent in existing facilities;

"(2) nuclear civil protection planning for both in-place protection and population relocation, during times of international crises;

"(3) planning for the development of additional crisis shelter, of capabilities for shelter management, of the marking and stocking of shelters, and of ventilation kits for shelters;

"(4) the development of emergency evacuation plans in areas where nuclear powerplants are located;

"(5) the improvement of warning systems;

"(6) the improvement of systems and capabilities for the direction and control of emergency operations by civil governments at all levels, including development of a distributed survivable network of emergency operating centers;

"(7) the improvement of radiological defense capabilities;

"(8) the improvement of emergency public information and training programs and capabilities;

"(9) research and development; and

"(10) the development of such other systems and capabilities as are necessary to realize the maximum lifesaving potential of the civil defense program.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS"

"Sec. 503. The powers contained in titles II and IV of this Act shall be used in developing and implementing section 502.; and

(2) by adding at the end of the table of contents the following:

"TITLE V—ENHANCED PROGRAM FOR THE 1980'S"

"Sec. 501. Findings and determinations.

"Sec. 502. Program elements.

"Sec. 503. Administrative provisions."

—On page 16, strike all of lines 6 through 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 701. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, in 1979 dollars, the sums of \$138,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, \$145,900,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, \$243,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983, \$283,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The sums specified in this section shall be adjusted by the inflation factor used by the Office of Management and Budget in preparing budget estimates submitted to the Congress, so that the actual sum authorized for each fiscal year shall reflect then current dollars."

H.R. 4473

By Ms. HOLTZMAN:

—Page 12, line 13, strike "\$248,951,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$346,295,000".

By Mr. PAUL:

—On page 19, line 16, after the word Cuba, strike the period and insert a comma and add the following: ", the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the People's Republic of China."

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

—Page 23, insert the following after line 12:
 Sec. 527. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act may be used to furnish assistance to any country that is a member of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, except that this section shall not be construed to prohibit disaster assistance to any such country.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESTRICTIVE AMENDMENTS TASK FORCE ISSUES REPORT

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1979

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the House will begin debate on the foreign assistance appropriations bill for fiscal year 1980. In recent years, this bill has become a target for a series of amendments which would restrict the ability of the United States in the multilateral financial institutions. My colleague MATT McHUGH has been chairing an MCPL (Members of Congress for Peace Through Law) Task Force on Restrictive Riders. Under his fine leadership, that task force has recently issued an excellent paper on how these riders affect our participation in multilateral financial institutions. I hope all my colleagues will have a chance to review this paper before debate begins tomorrow.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS
 FOR PEACE THROUGH LAW,
 Washington, D.C., July 2, 1979.

RESTRICTIVE AMENDMENTS: CONSTRUCTIVE
 OR DESTRUCTIVE?

Amendments which seek to earmark or restrict authorizations or appropriations to

multilateral development banks (MDBs) and to the United Nations or its specialized agencies actually impair U.S. ability to participate in these programs in any capacity, and often put the United States into a position of violating our obligations under international law. This fact sheet will explain the dangers of such amendments.

I. BACKGROUND

Attacks on U.S. participation in the United Nations or in other international organizations, which used to take the form of campaigns to "Get the U.S. Out of the U.N." have now taken the form of annual campaigns to "restrict" our voluntary contributions to these institutions. These amendments, which are offered by conservative members in both the House and the Senate, have impeded to a degree U.S. ability to participate in international organizations and programs of the U.N. family and the development banks.

Generally speaking, these amendments have taken two forms: one deals with our "assessed" contributions to the U.N. and its agencies; the other deals with our voluntary contributions to the U.N., the World Bank, and the regional development banks (the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the African Development Fund.)

II. ATTACKS ON THE UNITED NATIONS

The most recent instance affecting the United Nations has been the Helms Amendment, added last year by the Senate to the State Department Appropriations bill, and accepted by the House. It provided that, of

our annual contributions to international organizations, "no part may be made available for the furnishing of technical assistance by the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies."

Since enactment of the Helms language precluded acceptance by the United Nations of any U.S. contributions, the House this year repealed it through passage of an amendment to the International Development Assistance Act. The Senate, following suit, inserted repeal language in the State Department Authorization Act. The Senate also sustained action by the Foreign Relations Committee which had rejected a "Modified Helms Amendment" which purported "merely" to delete that portion of our regular payment to the U.N. (\$41.2 million) which would have been used for technical assistance programs.

Reasons for repeal of the Helms Amendment and rejection of the "Modified Helms Amendment."

(1) Under the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, and under Article 17 of the United Nations Charter, contributions by member countries may not be accepted by the United Nations if any restrictions are attached to them. The U.S. has voted to abide by these documents; any departure from them would violate our international legal obligations.

(2) The practical effect of the Helms Amendment was to make it impossible for the U.S. to pay any of the \$500 million it owed the U.N. in mandatory payments, since the fall of 1978. The U.S. is now legally in arrears on its payments.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.