

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, July 25, 1980

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT).

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Master, we come into Your presence with the awareness and thankfulness for a new day of life and the opportunity for service. We have not loved You as we ought, yet You continue to love us; we have not been faithful as we ought, yet You are ever faithful to us. We pray for the great needs of our Nation and our world, and also for those people who are near us and who need our love and care. Comfort and encourage those who are anxious about their lives, and give power to those who speak Your truth and testify to Your mighty acts. We pray in Your name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1198. An act to clarify the authority to establish lines of demarcation dividing the high seas and inland waters.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1647. An act to establish a commission to review the facts and circumstances surrounding Executive Order Numbered 9066, issued February 19, 1942, and the impact of such Executive order on American citizens and permanent resident aliens, to review directives of United States military forces requiring internment of Aleut civilians, and to recommend appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-42, appointed Mr. McCLORE to be a member of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

As the Chair announced yesterday, requests to address the House for 1 minute will be entertained at the conclusion of the legislative business today, rather than at the beginning. This should not deprive any Member of the privilege of being heard on any subject of his choice, so long as the Member is willing to await the conclusion of the business of the House.

The Chair believes there is genuine value in the 1-minute rule in the exercise of free expression on subjects, the variety of which is limited only by the individual imaginations of the Members. The Chair would not desire to deny any Member this privilege. For all its value, however, the Chair does not believe that the 1-minute rule must necessarily precede, nor be permitted to postpone, the business of the House. On several occasions this year, the exercise of the 1-minute rule has delayed a beginning on the business of the day by periods extending from 45 minutes to 1 hour.

Only 38 legislative days remain, including Mondays and Fridays, between now and October 4, the date of our recess or adjournment sine die. Nine major appropriations bills remain to be acted upon by the House. No major appropriations bill at this time has completed the legislative process.

In addition to those very basic and indispensable legislative priorities, there are other bills, including the budget reconciliation legislation, the second budget resolution for fiscal year 1981, and a considerable number of important legislative initiatives, which, in the public interest, must be completed before the Congress can adjourn.

Under those circumstances, the Chair requests the understanding and cooperation of all the Members in expediting the necessary legislative business of the House, which is of course our first duty to the American people. The Chair assures all Members, to the extent that any such reassurance may be desired, that their rights under the rules will be fully respected and assiduously protected.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland asks a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Maryland heard the Chair answer a question regarding 1-minute speeches. The gentleman from Maryland asked the Chair whether or not limits on such speeches is to be a policy to be followed for the remainder of the session, and the Chair, as recorded

on page 19386, said that the Chair was not announcing a policy for the remainder of the session, but only for Thursday and Friday.

Do I take the Chair's announcement this morning to mean that this will be the policy for the remainder of this session?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No; as the Chair stated yesterday in response to a question from the gentleman from Maryland, the present occupant of the chair is not in a position to announce a policy for the remainder of the session, and so stated.

The policy for the remainder of the session would be more appropriately determined and stated by Speaker O'NEILL. At this present time, that is all the Chair has to say, or all that he properly should or could say.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his privilege.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the custom of allowing one-minute speeches is a longstanding tradition of the House, begun by Speaker Sam Rayburn in the 1940's;

Whereas the ability of the Minority to be heard rests to a large degree on the one-minute speeches; permitted in a timely fashion; and

Whereas the integrity of the proceedings of the House is impugned where all Members are not accorded a full opportunity to speak; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker exercise his prerogative and reinstitute the custom of allowing one-minute speeches at the beginning of the session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must declare that a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX cannot impinge upon the Speaker's right of recognition. The gentleman's proposal is not, under rule IX, a privileged resolution, and the Chair will so rule. The Chair does not entertain the resolution at this time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of privilege.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly send a second privileged resolution to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the second resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

□ 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.

WRIGHT), the Speaker pro tempore, has, in fact, allowed an arbitrary ground to be used at a time when there is no press of heavy legislative business manifested by the fact that the Speaker and others have announced that we will adjourn today at 3 o'clock when we can easily stay here and deal with any pressing legislative business if that exists.

Further my point of order is that the Speaker has departed from past traditions and, therefore, has exceeded his discretion in regard to 1-minute as supported by the traditions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order, unless other Members insist on being heard. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman's point of order in the first place comes too late. But the Chair is prepared to state that in any event it is not a sustainable point of order.

The gentleman from Maryland is aware, because he is a scholar of the rules of the House, and he is aware of the great thrust of the very section to which he made reference, paragraph 7 of chapter 21 of Deschler's Procedure.

The Chair would simply recite one or two of the precedents therein reported. Recognition for 1-minute speeches is within the discretion of the Speaker, and his evaluation of the time consumed is a matter for the Chair and is not subject to challenge or question by parliamentary inquiry.

Now that was May 9, 1972.

On December 16, 1971, the Speaker pro tempore announced that he would recognize Members to address the House for longer than 1 minute for reasons that he felt desirable. On a number of occasions, July 22, 1968; June 17, 1970; October 19, 1966, the same rule was applied. Recognition for 1-minute speeches is within the discretion of the Speaker, and when the House has a heavy legislative schedule, he sometimes refuses to recognize Members for that purpose.

So the traditions of the House are clear, and the customs have not been broken; and the Chair has tried to state to the gentleman his intention and his firm determination assiduously to protect the rights of all Members, minority as well as majority.

The Chair has had a conversation with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and with the Chairman who will preside in the Committee of the Whole House and has asked that Chairman as a favor to the Chair and as an exercise in abundant fairness to be extremely tolerant of the rules of relevance so as to permit the gentleman from Pennsylvania to speak his mind on an amendment that he will be offering.

Now, the Chair has bent over backward in an effort to be fair with the minority, and the Chair believes the gentleman from Maryland is aware of that fact; and so the point of order is overruled.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland appeals from the ruling of the Chair.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BRADEMAS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

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

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

Mr. BAUMAN. 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 233, nays 139, answered "present" 1, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

YEAS—233

			NAYS—139
Addabbo	Florio	Murtha	Gilman
Akaka	Foley	Musto	Moorehead, Calif.
Albosta	Ford, Mich.	Myers, Ind.	O'Brien
Ae ander	Fountain	Myers, Pa.	Pashayan
Ambro	Frenzel	Natcher	Paul
An terson,	Frost	Neal	Petri
Calif.	Fuqua	Nedzi	Pritchard
Andrews, N.C.	Garcia	Nelson	Purcell
Annunzio	Gaydos	Nolan	Quayle
Anthony	Gephhardt	Nowak	Quijano
Applegate	Gibbons	Oakar	Railsback
Aspin	Glickman	Oberstar	Regula
Atkinson	Gonzalez	Obey	Rinaldo
Bailey	Gore	Oettinger	Ritter
Baldus	Gramm	Panetta	Robinson
Barnard	Gray	Patten	Roth
Barnes	Guider	Patterson	Rousselot
Beard, R.I.	Hall, Ohio	Pease	Royer
Benjamin	Hall, Tex.	Perkins	Rudd
Bennett	Hamilton	Peyser	Sawyer
Bevill	Hance	Pickle	Schulze
Bingham	Hanley	Prever	Sebelius
Blanchard	Harkin	Price	Sensenbrenner
Boggs	Harris	Rahall	Shumway
Boland	Hawkins	Rangel	Shuster
Bolling	Hefner	Ratchford	Smith, Nebr.
Boner	Heftel	Reuss	Snowe
Bonior	Hightower	Roberts	Snyder
Bonker	Howard	Roe	Spence
Bouquard	Huckaby	Rose	Stangeland
Brademas	Hushes	Rosenthal	Stanton
Breaux	Hutchinson	Roybal	Stockman
Brinkley	Hutto	Russo	Tauke
Brodhead	Ichord	Sabo	Taylor
Brooks	Ire' and	Satterfield	Thomas
Brown, Calif.	Jacobs	Scheuer	Trible
Burlison	Jenkins	Schroeder	Van der Jagt
Burton, John	Jenrette	Seiberling	Walker
Burton, Phillip	Johnson, Calif.	Shannon	Wampier
Byron	Jones, N.C.	Sharp	Whitehurst
Carr	Jones, Okla.	Shelby	Whittaker
Cavanaugh	Jones, Tenn.	Simon	Wilson, Bob
Chappell	Kastenmeier	Skelton	Wylie
Chisholm	Kazan	Smith, Iowa	Young, Fla.
Clay	Kildee	Solarz	
Coelho	Kovosek	Spellman	
Collins, Ill.	Kostmayer	Stack	
Conyers	LaFalce	Stenholm	
Corman	Lederer	Stewart	
D'Amours	Lehman	Stokes	
Daniel, Dan	Leland	Stratton	
Danielson	Levitas	Studds	
Daschle	Lloyd	Stump	
de la Garza	Long, La.	Swift	
Dellums	Long, Md.	Synar	
Derrick	Lowry	Thompson	
Dicks	Lukens	Traxler	
Dingell	Lundine	Ul'man	
Dixon	McCormack	Van Deerlin	
Donnelly	McHugh	Vanik	
Downey	Maguire	Ven'o	
Drinan	Markey	Volkmer	
Duncan, Oreg.	Mar'sul	Wa'pren	
Early	Mattox	Watkins	
E'vhardt	Mazzoli	Weaver	
Edgar	Mikulski	Weiss	
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Whitley	
E'vish	M'nta	Whitten	
Ertel	Minish	Wilems, Mont.	
Evans, Ga.	Mitchell, Md.	Wilson, C. H.	
Evans, Ind.	Moffett	Wirth	
Fary	Mo'han	Wolf	
Fascell	Montgomery	Wo'pe	
Fazio	Moorhead, Pa.	Wat	
Ferraro	Mott'	Yates	
Fisher	Murphy, Ill.	Yatron	
Fithian	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, Mo.	
Flippo	Murphy, Pa.	Zablocki	

NAYS—139

Abdnor	Gilman	Moorhead,
Andrews, N.Dak.	Gingrich	Calif.
Archer	Goodling	O'Brien
Ashbrook	Gradison	Pashayan
Bafalis	Grassley	Paul
Bauman	Green	Petri
Beard, Tenn.	Grisham	Porter
Bereuter	Guyer	Pritchard
Bethune	Hagedorn	Purcell
Broomfield	Hammer-	Quayle
Brown, Ohio	schmidt	Quijano
Bryant	Fansen	Railsback
Buchanan	Harsha	Regula
Burgener	Heckler	Rinaldo
Butler	Hillis	Ritter
Carney	Hinson	Robinson
Carter	Hollenbeck	Roth
Cheney	Holt	Rousselot
Claussen	Hopkins	Royer
Clinger	Horton	Rudd
Coleman	Hyde	Sawyer
Collins, Tex.	Jeffords	Schulze
Conable	Jeffries	Sebelius
Conte	Johnson, Colo.	Sensenbrenner
Corcoran	Kemp	Shumway
Coughlin	Kindness	Shuster
Courter	Kramer	Smith, Nebr.
Crane, Daniel	La'omarsino	Snowe
Crane, Philip	Latta	Snyder
Daniel, R. W.	Leach, Iowa	Spence
Dannemeyer	Lent	Stangeland
Davis, Mich.	Lewis	Stanton
Derwinski	Loeffler	Stockman
Devine	Lott	Tauke
Dickinson	Lujan	Taylor
Dornan	Jun'zen	Thomas
Duncan, Tenn.	McClory	Trible
Edwards, Ala.	McKinney	Van der Jagt
Edwards, Okla.	Madigan	Walker
Emery	Marks	Wampier
Erdahl	Mar'enee	Whitehurst
Eriborn	Marriott	Whittaker
Evans, Del.	Martin	Wilson, Bob
Fenwick	Michel	Wylie
Findley	Miller, Ohio	Young, Fla.
Fish	Mitchell, N.Y.	
Forsythe	Moore	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wright

NOT VOTING—60

Anderson, Ill.	Guarini	Richmond
Ashley	Holland	Rodino
AuCoin	Ho'zman	Rostenkowski
Badham	Hubbard	Runnels
Be'ell	Kelly	Santini
Bellenson	Leach, La.	So'omon
Biaggi	Leath, Tex.	St Germain
Bowen	Livingston	Staggers
Campbell	McCloskey	Stark
Cleveland	McDade	Steed
Cotter	McDonald	Symms
Davis, S.C.	McEwen	Tauzin
Deckard	McKay	Udall
Dodd	Mathis	Wa'man
Dougherty	Dougherty	White
Ford, Tenn.	Fowler	Williams, Ohio
Gialmo	Moakley	Wilson, Tex.
Ginn	Nichols	Wydr
Goldwater	Pepper	Young, Alaska
	Rhodes	Zeferrtti

□ 1050

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1981

Mr. TRAXLER. 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. 7631) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The ques-

tion is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TRAXLER).

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. 7631, with Mr. LEVITAS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, July 24, 1980, the Clerk had read through line 3 on page 19. Pending was an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL).

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL) for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee reduced the amount for civil defense from the authorization that the Armed Services Committee provided from \$167 million to \$100 million. We have experienced this same situation for 4 years now, and this has prevented the United States from having any sort of civil defense system to protect its population in the event of a nuclear war.

My amendment merely restores the \$67 million that the Appropriations Committee cut back up to the authorization level of our Armed Services Committee.

Remaining at last year's level will accomplish just what we accomplished last year toward improving civil defense—which was absolutely nothing. We do not have a civil defense program for our Nation today. We continue to go along with a policy of mutual assured destruction, whose acronym is MAD, and it makes an excellent acronym for this particular foolish policy.

The policy is that both the United States and the Soviet Union will keep their populations defenseless or hold them hostage to the strong, mighty nuclear arsenals of the other nation. This might not be too terrible a policy if the Soviet Union went along with it but, unfortunately, they have not, even though the United States has. The Soviet Union has developed an excellent civil defense system.

One might well ask what is magic about \$167 million. It represents the cost of the first year of a comprehensive 7-year civil defense program for our country. We have never had this. This would be the first year of that kind of a comprehensive program.

To me the case is clear for an adequate civil defense system. Everyone in this Chamber, if asked, would readily admit that he desires peace. We are told by our leaders that the best way to assure peace is to maintain the strategic balance, to keep things even, to keep the scales from favoring the Soviet Union.

Our leaders also tell us that we enjoy something called "rough equivalence" in weaponry, that our weaponry is roughly the same as that of the Soviet Union. But if they can protect their population from our weapons and we

cannot protect our population from their weapons, it adds up to them having far more weapons. It makes a mockery of the strategic balance. It gives a great advantage to the Soviet Union in any sort of confrontation.

There is a great debate about just how effective the Soviet civil defense system is.

□ 1100

I guess no one will know the answer to that question until it is too late to find out.

But if they even perceived their system to be far superior to ours—and most experts agree that it is—if they just think their system will protect their people, that creates a very dangerous situation which gives them a great advantage once again.

Mr. Chairman, we can also measure their superiority by how hard they are trying. They are trying approximately 10 times harder than we are to protect their population. When it comes to people, we have 10,000 people employed full time in civil defense. They have 100,000. When it comes to expenditures, we expend roughly \$100 million a year for civil defense and they spend over \$1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to casualties we have the high numbers. Our experts tell us if there were an all-out nuclear war and both sides fired about everything they have, and the Soviets had time to put their civil defense system into effect, they would lose about 10 million people and the United States would lose more than 100 million people. The 10-to-1 ratio still holds when it comes to casualties.

Mr. Chairman, my point is, if we want to maintain peace we have to keep the balance on these strategic scales. We have to keep things even.

We have a couple of choices. One choice is to develop new and more sophisticated weapons, expensive weapons, and target them toward their population so we can kill more of our enemy. Another option is to develop a civil defense system to protect our people from their weapons and probably prevent war in the meantime.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman it is far more humane to save American lives than to destroy the lives of others and for all of those who are interested in the fiscal aspects of this or for balancing the budget, it also happens to be a great deal less expensive.

I would like to demonstrate something on the basis of this chart, something about the options for civil defense.

Mr. Chairman, this chart was the result of a study by an interagency group. It was requested by President Carter to find out just what our options are in civil defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MITCHELL of New York was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. The scale to the left on the map indicates how many people will survive in the

event of a nuclear attack with the various options. At the present time we are at option B. We have almost nothing going for us in civil defense and the Committee on Appropriations, year after year, will give us nothing. If there were all-out nuclear war today with option B, where we are right now, less than 40 percent of our population would survive. If we go to the most expensive alternative, option F where we build shelters for our entire population, 95 percent of our people would survive, but this costs \$100 billion. If this Committee on Appropriations will not come up with \$67 million they certainly will not come up with \$100 billion.

The best compromise as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is that we go to what is called the D prime option where we provide a program of evacuation. We move our people out from where the bombs are going to go off. D prime saves 85 percent of our American population.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point up these two options again. The option that the Committee on Appropriations wants us to maintain would save 40 percent of our population in the event of all-out nuclear war. The one I opt for costs a little bit more and would save 85 percent of our population.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that all day long we talk about cost/benefit ratios in this House. The program I opt for—not the one the Committee on Appropriations would like—will save 100 million American lives and will cost, over a 7-year period, about \$1 billion. If we figure that on a cost/benefit ratio, that amounts to about \$10 for an American life. Even though the Committee on Appropriations does not feel that is an important expenditure, I think \$10 for an American life is about the best cost/benefit ratio any of us will ever see.

We talk about \$67 million as being sort of a big number. It is of course a lot of money, but when we consider it in the context of our overall defense, it is a pittance. We are spending more than \$150 billion on our offensive effort for our troops, our tanks, our planes. This small amount of money, this \$67 million is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our defense effort.

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

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. I yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend the gentleman from New York on his sponsorship of the amendment. I am pleased to have been named a cosponsor of the measure. I think this vote on this amendment could very well be the most important strategic defensive vote of our session. I commend the gentleman. I wish to speak to the amendment further later. I wish the measure well, because it is direly needed.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. I thank the gentleman for his support and for his words of wisdom when it comes to nuclear war and civil defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MITCHELL of New York was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not even know the make-up of the Committee on Appropriations, a committee apparently opposed to civil defense, apparently opposed to a program to protect our population, as far as their hawk-dove orientation is concerned. But this is one defense measure everyone in the Chamber can support. For hawks it can be supported because it is part of a full and well-rounded defense program. All we have now is an offensive capability.

Mr. Chairman, for the doves it is a system which can be supported because it is not destructive at all, it is passive, it is inexpensive, it helps to prevent war because it balances those strategic scales which it is so important to balance. It also protects, in the event of an all-out nuclear war, 100 million American lives.

I think for those who generally vote against defense expenditures can support this in good conscience. If you cannot vote for the weapon systems we need to defend our Nation, at least vote for a program that gives us a place to hide.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MITCHELL OF NEW YORK

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHUSTER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MITCHELL of New York:

None of the funds appropriated for the emergency preparedness and mobilization program may be used to purchase oil that originated in Libya, where evidence has been presented that said oil did in fact originate in Libya.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I also reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I use this as a mechanism to focus on an issue of great importance to the minority and junior Members of both parties. By way of background leading up to the Libyan-HUD relationship, I wish to inform the House that this morning I delivered to the Speaker of the House a letter expressing our shock and disappointment with the sudden reversal of a many year custom in this House where the Chair refused to recognize Members for 1-minute speeches at the beginning of the day's session.

This decision has far-reaching implications for the minority's right to be heard in a timely fashion on public topics of its choice. Whether we are talking about HUD or Carter or the Libyan scandals, I think there are seven points which should be made relevant to this development, this sudden development. The first is the very fact that this custom of 1-minute speeches has been an integral and initial part of everyday's proceedings since Sam Rayburn initiated it many years ago, suggests that it should not be lightly or suddenly discarded.

□ 1110
Such a decision deserves careful, thoughtful consideration.

Second, the argument that 1-minute speeches, whether they deal with Carter or Libyan oil, or anything else, had to be dispensed with yesterday at the beginning of the session hardly fits the facts when only four Members were seeking recognition and the day's legislative business, even though unfinished, was concluded before 6 p.m.

Third, the circumstances surrounding the sudden change in procedure were at least suspicious. Earlier in the week, 1-minute speeches by minority Members about the Democratic administration's Libyan scandal had received widespread national coverage. By moving 1-minute speeches to the end of the day's session, the Democratic leadership was effectively cutting off those speeches for availability as news of the day.

Fourth, by eliminating the 1-minute speeches at the beginning, the majority is effectively stifling one of the few avenues of expression under the control of minority Members. Except for 1-minute speeches, the majority controls what topics will be debated in the House, when they will be debated, and under what rules.

Fifth, 1-minute speeches are especially important for new Members on both sides of the aisle, because they must often wait for hours or days to express themselves in committee or on floor debate, since the seniority system puts them at the bottom of the ladder. Sometimes, they are allocated.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. The gentleman from California rises to inquire of the Chair if the gentleman is speaking on the HUD appropriation bill or has got an amendment to the House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is addressing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. I just—we have an agreement to let him talk out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, with the sufferance of the Committee and at this point in the proceedings, is personally willing to allow the gentleman from Pennsylvania broad leeway—very broad.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the Chair, and will continue.

Mr. BAUMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SHUSTER. If I might conclude, then I would be happy to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SHUSTER. Sometimes, junior Members are allocated no time whatsoever in floor debate due to the rigid time constraints in general debate. Junior Members should not be denied the very limited time to be heard, which they can

only secure on occasion through the 1-minute speeches.

Sixth, if indeed in extraordinary circumstances the press of business requires that substantial time not be consumed in 1-minute speeches, then this matter could quite easily be announced when the week's legislative agenda is released, and at the discretion of the Chair the number of 1-minute speeches permitted at the beginning of the day limited and allocated equitably between the majority and the minority.

Seventh, if the majority leadership believes a longstanding, significant custom of the House should be changed, then it should be done in consultation with the minority and not suddenly and arbitrarily presented to the minority as a fait accompli. While you have the right to govern, we have the right to be consulted. The minority has a limited number of remedies available when it believes that they are not receiving fair consideration, and the minority is properly reluctant to resort to those procedures.

But cooperation, Mr. Chairman, in expediting the day's business is a two-way street. We urge that the majority rethink its position and permit both the majority and minority to be heard in a timely fashion on 1-minute speeches at the beginning of the day. The minority will not be gagged, and we demand that the Sam Rayburn custom of this House be upheld.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The old political saying was, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

Apparently, the Democratic leadership has changed that to say, "If you can't stand the heat, move the kitchen."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, these people are not talking about a relevant, germane amendment to this bill, and I think it is outrageous that these dilatory tactics go on in the people's House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman—

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Makes a point of order it is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California make a point of order?

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Yes. He is out of order. Would you rule on my point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must proceed in order.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Proceed in order. His time is expired?

Mr. SHUSTER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Maryland. I am delighted to yield for 1 minute to anybody who would like to be recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield for a minute, or will you gag me?

Mr. SHUSTER. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Does the gentleman from Michigan insist on his point of order?

Mr. TRAXLER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania insist on his amendment?

Mr. SHUSTER. Considering the discussion I have had with the gentleman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Does the gentleman from Michigan insist on his point of order?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order and I insist on my point of order, most regrettably.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. TRAXLER. The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that the amendment is not germane and imposes new and additional duties upon the administrator which are not contemplated in the enabling legislation. It goes beyond the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard?

Mr. SHUSTER. No, I do not concede the point of order because it indeed is germane, and while I was quite willing to ask to withdraw this amendment, it is a germane amendment. This does not impose any new condition. This simply places a limitation on an appropriation bill, and indeed we are very careful to say that the limitation is imposed only where evidence has been presented. Therefore, this does not impose any additional condition, and my amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

While the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be germane to the subject before the committee at this time, it is the view of the Chair that the amendment does impose additional duties in that it requires the presentation of evidence which must be considered by someone in order to make the determination that the oil in fact did originate in Libya.

As such, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the Mitchell-Skelton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL), which I am pleased to have cosponsored with him and worked with him at length to reach this point today. It is rather unfortunate that this amendment comes up in this mode, under the independent agency appropriation, because under authorization this is authorized under the Armed Services Committee.

The Armed Services Committee authorized for emergency preparedness and civil defense purposes \$167 million. This particular subcommittee and com-

mittee which dealt with it, dealt with it as an independent agency, and I feel did not have the full purview which the topic requires.

Mr. Chairman, we have authorized already a full civil defense program in this body. I think it is now time for us to either fish or cut bait. I think we must decide now about having a strong civil defense for our Nation. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that we look back in history just a few years, to 1939, where in this very Chamber a vote was had on whether to fortify the Island of Guam and increase its naval fortifications. That lost.

□ 1120

In 1941 the draft extension amendment came before this body, and it passed by merely one vote.

History has told us and the warlords and their associates have told us that the Japanese felt a signal from this country that we would not protect and defend our interests in the Pacific as a result of those two actions by this body.

I also wish to point out the importance of this, as has been stated by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. David C. Jones, when he testified and said:

To complement their strategic offensive posture, the Soviets maintain large strategic defense forces and an extensive civil defense program.

Compared to the Soviet counterpart the U.S. civil defense program is funded at a very low level and is relatively ineffective.

Today we make it an effective program. It actually is and should be a part of our strategic defense. The U.S.S.R. expends in excess of \$2 billion a year for civil defense, and we are just trying to get ours at the authorized level of \$167 million.

There has been a clear national policy that is coherent, passed earlier by this body as an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act. The U.S. Senate, in a similar and parallel action, has passed the Eagleton amendment, which is very similar to that which was passed here. Thus we now have a coherent national civil defense policy.

At a later time, Mr. Chairman, when we are in the full House, I will include the amendment that was passed here, as well as the Senate amendment, as extra material so that the Members of this body can see that we now have a civil defense policy. What we have to do now is pay for it.

We have provided in this amendment not just for nuclear civil defense, we have provided for dual defense. We have had tornadoes, floods, and hurricanes, for we know that civil defense is an integral part of protecting the people of our country.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment for all of us. It is much cheaper than the alternative, should we not pass it.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri

(Mr. SKELTON), on his excellent statement and his strong support for civil defense.

The gentleman pointed out that we have no credible civil defense system for our Nation, and our failure in this House to provide a civil defense system borders on a dereliction of our responsibility to provide for the common defense.

I would like to remind my friend of an interview that Mr. Tirana, the former Director of DCPA, engaged in just before he left office as to the status of our civil defense position. He was asked at the end of the interview what he would advise his family to do if there were a nuclear threat.

He said, "I would tell my wife and kids to get in the car and to drive."

The interviewer asked, "Where?"

He said, "I don't know."

That is where we are now. We do not have anything at all to point to in the way of civil defense, and I think it is terrible that the Committee on Appropriations cannot come up with \$167 million in this House bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SKELTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL), let me say that I appreciate his work and his leadership in this area.

We are not asking for that much. Would this amendment or this subject be in the Armed Services appropriations area, I think we would not have this particular dialog that we are having today or the necessity for it.

This is a strategic national defense issue. All of us must recognize that. It is part of our strategic national defense, just as much as the submarines and the MX missiles that we discuss at length in this body.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that the amendment is agreed to.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Yes, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL) for their leadership in this important field.

I would point out that there are two very real reasons why we should adopt this amendment. The first is a practical reason. If we go to dual use, it is cost effective. We get a spillover effect from a wartime need, and we get a practical peacetime benefit from planning for and responding to the natural disasters which always come, the hurricanes, the tornadoes, the wind storms and lightning, whatever they may be, that always come. We have to be prepared for those also. Thus we will know that we have a system that is a functional system and one which could respond to a wartime situation.

The second point is the psychological

thing. The gentleman referred to Guam in World War II and the fact that the Japanese took it as a signal of our unpreparedness. So it was with the Oxford oath, which was also perceived by Hitler to be a sign of the decay and moral decadence of England, and it precipitated perhaps in some degree the oncoming of World War II.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I might interrupt the gentleman at that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SKELTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will recall, history tells us that nearly to a man those who took the Oxford oath ended up doing battle against Nazi Germany.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Yes, that is correct. And that certainly shows that we are well intentioned and we will all serve our country in the finest and fullest manner feasible as we see our right and obligation to do it.

But this is the time and the day for decision. It is time to provide this insurance. It is time to be cost effective in a practical way and also in a psychological manner.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the distinguished gentleman's amendment.

Surely there are no more knowledgeable Members of this body than the two distinguished authors of this amendment. I treasure and value them as good friends and as Members who have a high degree of expertise in this matter, and it is, therefore, with great reluctance that I must oppose the amendment. I say that not only because of my friendship with them and my recognition of the knowledge they bring to this body and their dedication to this area of defense, especially civil defense, but because I am not opposed to civil defense. However, I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that the Soviet Union is often credited with having a viable civil defense program. I am going to relate findings published by the Director of Central Intelligence concerning Soviet civil defense. The report is dated July 1978.

The Soviet program is under military control. It is meant to contribute to the maintenance of a functioning logistic base for continuing military operations, to help limit human and material losses, and to help enable the Soviets to speed recovery from the effects of nuclear war.

Soviet civil defense has three main objectives: To protect the people, to protect the sources of economic productivity, and to sustain the surviving population. The following statements are the CIA assessments of the Soviet's ability to accomplish those objectives:

(1) The Soviets probably have sufficient blast shelter space in hardened command posts for virtually all the leadership elements at all levels (about 110,000 people).

(2) Shelters at key economic installations could accommodate about 12 to 24 percent of the total work force.

(3) A minimum of 10 to 20 percent of the total population in urban areas (including essential workers at economic installations) could be accommodated at present in blast-resistant shelters. By 1985, the percentage of the urban population that could be sheltered would rise to 15 to 30 percent, assuming no change in the present rate of shelter construction.

(4) Soviet measures to protect the economy could not prevent massive industrial damage.

(5) With at least several weeks to build up reserves and distribute supplies of food and fuel, the Soviets could probably provide adequate supplies to sustain the relocated and surviving urban population in the period immediately following a nuclear attack.

The cost of the 1976 Soviet civil defense program was estimated to be 400 million rubles—or less than 1 percent of the estimated Soviet defense budget. According to the CIA, if the three elements of the Soviet program were to be duplicated in the United States, it would cost about \$2 billion in 1976 dollars—with about three-fourths representing manpower costs. That figure is probably closer to \$3 billion today.

Mr. Chairman, my point is that since it would require billions to match the Soviet civil defense program, the gentleman's amendment to add \$67 million is a useless gesture. It will not significantly improve this country's civil defense posture. I urge the Members to agree with the committee's recommendation to maintain civil defense at the 1980 level.

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

Mr. TRAXLER. I am pleased to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks because he just made the case for a strong American civil defense.

Quoting the CIA report of 1978, which I might say is outdated, I suggest, makes the case for the need for American civil defense. If we are to have a strategic defense in this country, not just offensive, we must be able to protect our people, our population, our industry, and our leaders. A strong civil defense has the same effect as a workable antiballistic missile system.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the gentleman has just made the case and made the argument for the Mitchell-Skelton amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's observation. Obviously I do not agree with him.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAXLER. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California.

□ 1130

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. How much money does the committee have in their bill for FEMA?

Mr. TRAXLER. Approximately \$100 million.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. And this amendment would add an additional \$67 million?

Mr. TRAXLER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. In the hearings that the gentleman held, what was the testimony of the Director of FEMA and the Agency that would spend the money? Do they have some plan to spend this money? Can they use the money if the money is given to them?

Mr. TRAXLER. They testified in support of the President's budget, which included \$120 million for civil defense. The committee made a reduction of some \$20 million in that regard. We felt that actually the amount that they could adequately handle was about \$100 million, which is the amount in the bill.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Does the amendment of the gentleman from New York indicate where this money would be spent or is it just added to the \$100 million?

Mr. TRAXLER. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York to respond to that question.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. We have been through this dialog for 4 years now, and I think, if the gentleman from California thinks back a little, he will recall it. There is a comprehensive 7-year program for civil defense. It earmarks every single nickel in this nearly \$2 billion program. Every single category is specified; every single one is described. The program has been in existence and it is the one I pointed to as being D-prime that President Carter requested 4 years ago. So it is there. It is all programmed. It is ready to roll. We just need an appropriation approval.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. I would agree with the chairman of the subcommittee. I think this is completely unnecessary. I do not know if the gentleman has a chance of beating the amendment. It is a motherhood amendment. But the money is not needed. It is a bad amendment, and I would hope that it would be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TRAXLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TRAXLER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, this is similar to the amendment that was offered last year. I want the gentleman from New York to know that each year he grows more eloquent. I want to restate the point I am trying to make in connection with the observations of the CIA in relationship to the Soviet civil defense effort. The \$67 million amendment which I recognize is startup money, and the billion dollars that will be spent over the 7 years under the gentleman's proposal, candidly and honestly would not do the job and is not adequate to match the Soviet effort.

Surely, we are not asking our colleagues for sympathy, but I must tell the Members that our task is not an easy one on this committee. You have suggested limitations through the budget resolution upon us in terms of how much money we can recommend for appropriations. We must exercise some value judgments. I would not tell the Members that in every case we have made the right decision; I would say to the gentleman who has offered the amendment that in this

instance in the opinion of the subcommittee and the full committee we have done the right thing.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman has had a chance to review the chart that I had with me in the Chamber, the gentleman would have noticed that there is a far better program where we can shelter 95 percent of our population if the Appropriations Committee wants to come up with something like \$95 billion. I am sure that if we cannot get a mere \$67 million, we are not going to get a better program.

I am asking for the best one that we can get, one that protects 85 percent of the American people, that improves our survivability by 100 million American lives. It seems a small amount of money to spend to save 100 million American lives.

I would suggest that the committee bill is pennywise and pound foolish. You save a few million dollars by unbalancing the strategic scales to start a war. It seems like it is just a simple thing to spend the money, give us a program that would protect our population, and keep the strategic scale balanced.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to rise in opposition to an amendment that would provide additional funding for civil defense. Certainly none of the members of this subcommittee are opposed to civil defense. Sometimes programs that on their face sound good really do not appear to have a payoff when you examine them very closely. If we had a really coherent civil defense policy, if we had a real solid program, then I think the members of this subcommittee would more willingly appropriate more money for it. We sat and listened to the members of FEMA on what they were preparing for civil defense, and really what is being done is the preparation of a series of evacuation plans.

Some of these plans, as was documented in the Washington Post recently, simply do not make a great deal of sense. In fact, they are nonsense. The Washington Post reported a plan for the evacuation of Washington, D.C., for example, would require, first of all, 3 days' notice of the attack. It would then require dependence upon volunteer bus drivers to evacuate the citizens of Washington, and some of them would be taken to places like the Homestead, a luxurious resort in Hot Springs, Va. When you look at that kind of planning and that kind of expenditure of money, it is really not a payoff for the taxpaying and is not real civil defense. It is nonsense.

It is for this reason that the subcommittee reluctantly opposes this amendment to increase the money for civil defense. If we have a coherent, rational civil defense program, then we will look at it again.

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that we now have a coherent national civil defense policy.

Earlier this year an amendment was passed setting forth a complete civil defense policy through the Armed Services Committee authorization process. The U.S. Senate 3 weeks ago passed a parallel amendment setting forth a coherent national civil defense policy. We have authorized in the armed services authorization bill \$167 million. I think we should stick to that. We have it. It is this year. We can do it. There is no reason to put it off. The policy is here. It has been voted upon here, it has been voted upon in the U.S. Senate. I think this is the year for fruition of a strong national civil defense.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying, and yet it occurs to me as not being a really rational policy. If the evacuation plan for Washington, D.C., requires 3 days' notice, and if we have people sitting around and we are paying them money to draw up that kind of a plan, that is not a rational plan.

Mr. SKELTON. If I may interrupt the gentleman, the gentleman misunderstands the entire thrust of this. The programs set forth are far in excess of what the gentleman is speaking about. They speak about warning systems, communications, learning about shelter systems, research and development, protecting those who live in Three Mile Island situations, and many other areas. There is a comprehensive policy. The program the gentleman speaks of, which was the subject of the Washington Post article, is 2 or 3 years old. It is not the policy that we have adopted here. We are working on something very solid. That is why we should today pass this appropriation amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would just like to point out to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that we apparently have a communications problem. We have had a coherent civil defense program, with every nut and bolt in place, every dollar specified. It is called D-prime. It is the one I pointed to on the chart. It was designed by experts at the request of our President. It is 4 years old. It is the one that we can easily identify with.

Now, the gentleman stated that the plans for evacuation do not make sense, in fact, that they appear to be nonsense. I would point out that simply because it would take us 3 days to evacuate a large city is not a severe deterrent, because it will take the Soviet Union even longer to evacuate their cities.

We have better highways, and we have far more trucks, buses and automobiles. We have a better system of communication. All I am saying is, let us keep the strategic scales balanced. If the Soviet system is poor, give us one that is just

as poor, but give us something. Do not leave us here where even the director of the agency does not know where to tell his family to go in the event there is an all-out nuclear war.

I think if the Members just consider the fact that our experts tell us that we can save 100 million American lives by spending a billion dollars over 7 years, the Appropriations Committee should reverse itself and go along with this amendment.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I first wish to salute the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TRAXLER), for his able handling of this bill, and also the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and I would simply like to make a few remarks for the record with reference to the testimony before the committee chaired by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI), which has taken testimony over the years with reference to civil defense.

First of all, I think that, from the testimony we have received, there is some confusion about the 3 days. It has been said that we require 3 days' notice before we can get a dispersal system in operation.

□ 1140

Well, of course we are going to have notice. We have a pretty fine intelligence system in this country, which is going to provide us with notice. There has been some confusion in suggesting that the missiles will be launched from our adversary and be here within 10 minutes or a half hour or within a half day, but we are going to see movements before that. We are going to know that the danger is imminent. We must recognize the fact, Mr. Chairman, that on bombing day, people are not coming into town; if they are wise and have been educated, and if we have a plan, there is going to be dispersal.

That is precisely what the Soviet Union plans to do. That is precisely the embryo plan which we have to receive as much advance notice and warning as possible and then to save as many American lives as is possible through a dispersal system.

I submit the fact that if it is worth \$100 million, it is worth another \$67 million. If it is not worth it, we should not spend any money at all.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. I want to express my strong feelings for the sincerity of the three gentlemen who are carrying this fight this morning, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

I know the very, very great interest and sincere interest they all have in it,

but the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL) on two occasions—I just could not resist this—on two occasions mentioned Mr. Tirana, the former head of the civil defense system, the fact that he was not able to say where he would send his children in the event of an evacuation. I would say that Mr. Tirana, who headed up the last inauguration that we had here in town, did not know where to send anybody on inauguration night, and he is hardly an expert.

Mr. BRINKLEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. I would like to point out Mr. Tirana did an excellent job under very difficult circumstances without very much support from the administration. As far as his not knowing where to send his wife and children, I do not think anyone in this Chamber knows where to direct their families or loved ones where to go either.

I think that is a crime that we do not know what to do in the event of an all-nuclear war or even an alarm for an all-nuclear war.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Let me just conclude with these words.

I do not think we should delude ourselves. I do not think we should delude the American people about a civil defense system by tokenism. If we are not going to have one, let us not take the \$100 million. If we are going to have a meaningful system, we really ought to spend this \$67 million.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my time.

• Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I believe our country needs a vastly improved civil defense system and I am prepared to support an effort to revitalize civil defense.

However, I will vote against this amendment to add \$67 million to civil defense because I believe that extra money for the present system is likely to be wasted.

I think it will take a good deal more than \$167 million to provide an adequate civil defense. If the system is reorganized, revitalized and given a long-term commitment, I will then be willing to vote the necessary funds. •

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL).

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

Mr. TRAXLER. 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.

□ 1150

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.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TRAXLER) for a recorded vote.

Does the gentleman insist upon his demand?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my demand.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 201, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—175

Abdnor	Gilman	Mitchell, N.Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Gingrich	Moffett
Andrews, N.C.	Glickman	Moore
Andrews, N.D.	Goodling	Motti
Baefalls	Gore	Murphy, N.Y.
Bailey	Gudger	Murphy, Pa.
Baldus	Hall, Tex.	Murtha
Baileys	Hammer	Musto
Bailey	schmidt	Myers, Ind.
Barnard	Hance	Myers, Pa.
Bauman	Hanley	Neal
Bearl, R.I.	Hansen	Nelson
Beard, Tenn.	Hawkins	Oberstar
Bennett	Hefner	Price
Bethune	Hillis	Pritchard
Beverly	Hollenbeck	Quayle
Biggs	Holt	Rahall
Boner	Hopkins	Rinaldo
Bouquard	Horton	Robinson
Breaux	Huckaby	Roe
Brinkley	Hughes	Royer
Buchanan	Hyde	Santini
Burgener	Ireland	Sawyer
Burlison	Jeffords	Scheuer
Butler	Jeffries	Schulze
Byron	Jenkins	Sebelius
Carney	Jenrette	Sensenbrenner
Carter	Jones, N.C.	Shuster
Chappell	Jones, Okla.	Skelton
Cheney	Jones, Tenn.	Snowe
Clausen	Kelly	Snyder
Clinger	Kemp	Spence
Coleman	Kindness	Stack
Conable	Kostmayer	Stanton
Corcoran	Kramer	Stehno'm
Courter	Lagomarsino	Stratton
Crane, Daniel	Lederer	Stump
Crane, Philip	Lee	Synar
D'Amours	Leland	Taylor
Daniel, R. W.	Lent	Thomas
Davis, Mich.	Levitas	Tribble
Davis, S.C.	Lewis	Van Deerlin
Dicks	Loeffer	Vander Jagt
Divon	Long, Md.	Volkmmer
Dornan	Lott	Walker
Dougherty	Lowry	Wamp
Duncan, Tenn.	Lu'ian	Watkins
Edwards, Okla.	Lungren	Whit'ehurst
Emery	McDonald	Whitley
English	Madigan	Whittaker
Ertel	Marks	Williams, Mont.
Evans, Ind.	Marlenee	Winn
Ferraro	Marriott	Wolff
Fish	Martin	Wyatt
Fithian	Mattox	Young, Fla.
Firpo	Mica	Young, Mo.
Fountain	Michel	Zablocki
Frost	Mineta	
Gephhardt	Mitchell, Md.	

NOES—201

Addabbo	Annunzio	Aspin
Akaka	Applegate	Atkinson
Ambro	Archer	Barnes
Albosta	Ashbrook	Bedell
Alexander	Ashley	Beilenson

Benjamin	Gibbons	Pashayan
Bereuter	Gonzalez	Patten
Blaggi	Gradison	Patterson
Bingham	Gramm	Paul
Blanchard	Grassley	Pease
Boland	Gray	Perkins
Boling	Green	Petri
Bonior	Grisham	Peyser
Bonker	Guyer	Pickle
Bra'emas	Hagedorn	Porter
Brodhead	Hall, Ohio	Preyer
Brooks	Hamilton	Pursell
Broomfield	Harkin	Quillen
Brown, Calif.	Harris	Rallsback
Brown, Ohio	Harsha	Rangel
Broyhill	Heckler	Ratchford
Burton, John	Heftel	Regula
Burton, Phillip	Hightower	Reuss
Carr	Hinson	Ritter
Cavanaugh	Howard	Roberts
Chisholm	Hutchinson	Rose
Clay	Jacobs	Rosenthal
Collins, Tex.	Johnson, Calif.	Roth
Conte	Johnson, Colo.	Rousselot
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Royal
Corman	Kazen	Russo
Coughlin	Kildee	Sabo
Daniel, Dan	Kogovsek	Satterfield
Danielson	LaFalce	Schroeder
Dannemeyer	Latta	Seiberling
Daschle	Leach, Iowa	Shannon
de la Garza	Lehman	Sharp
Dellums	Lloyd	Shelby
Derrick	Long, La.	Shumway
Derwinski	Luken	Smith, Iowa
Devine	Lundine	Smith, Nebr.
Dingell	McClory	Solarz
Donnelly	McCormack	Spellman
Downey	McHugh	Stangeland
Drinan	McKinney	Stewart
Duncan, Oreg.	Maguire	Stokes
Early	Markey	Studds
Eckhardt	Matsui	Swift
Edgar	Mazzoli	Tauke
Edwards, Ala.	Mikulski	Thompson
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Traxler
Erdahl	Miller, Ohio	Ulman
Evans, Del.	Minish	Vanik
Evans, Ga.	Mollohan	Vento
Fary	Montgomery	Walgren
Fascell	Moorhead,	Waxman
Fazio	Calif.	Weaver
Fenwick	Moorhead, Pa.	Weiss
Findley	Murphy, Ill.	Whitten
Fisher	Natcher	Wilson, C. H.
Florio	Nolan	Wolpe
Foley	Nowak	Wright
Forsythe	O'Brien	Wyle
Frenzel	Oakar	Yates
Fuqua	Obey	Yatron
Garcia	Ottinger	
Gaydos	Panetta	

NOT VOTING—57

Anderson, Ill.	Holland	Rostenkowski
AuCoin	Holtzman	Runnels
Badham	Hubbard	Simon
Bowen	Ichord	Solomon
Campbell	Leach, La.	St Germain
Cleveland	Leath, Tex.	Staggers
Coelho	Livingston	Stark
Collins, Ill.	McCloskey	Steed
Cotter	McDade	Stockman
Deckard	McDowell	Symmons
Dickinson	McEwen	Tauzin
Dodd	McKay	Udall
Er'eborn	Mavroules	White
Ford, Tenn.	Moakley	Williams, Ohio
Fowler	Nichols	Wilson, Bob
Gialmo	Pepper	Wilson, Tex.
Ginn	Rhodes	Wyder
Goldwater	Richmond	Young, Alaska
Guarini	Rodino	Zefterri

□ 1210

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Guarini for, with Mr. Staggers against.
Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Pepper against.
Mr. Ford of Tennessee for, with Mr. Zefterri against.

Mr. LLOYD changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. DANIEL B. CRANE, HUTTO, and LOTT changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKELTON: Page 18, line 25, strike out "\$136,017,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$159,017,000".

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the last amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL) and by myself providing an additional \$67 million for civil defense, did not pass.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which would increase the civil defense appropriation back to the budget estimate which is only another \$23 million. This puts it back to the figure that the administration had in its budget estimate.

It is not enough, Mr. Chairman, but in the light of the recent vote, I am constrained to offer it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to go into all of the details we discussed at length concerning civil defense and the great need for it. We must move forward in this area. It is part of our strategic defense. I certainly hope that that last vote, which was a close one, we can help make up for it in this area because we do now have, Mr. Chairman, a coherent civil defense policy for our Nation as we pointed out in the last debate on the last amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that this amendment, which is a very, very modest increase for civil defense, is passed.

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

Mr. SKELTON. I will yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and would like to associate myself with the gentleman's amendment. I regret very much I did not know at the time that the previous amendment was going to be offered.

I would simply say, while I vote against budget busting, I am satisfied that this is one of the most important items in the defense of our land. I believe that a strong civil defense program is as important as having the B-1 bomber. I think it is a key part of our strategic defense to let any would-be aggressor know that we are prepared to protect our civilian population in the event of an attack. I believe that in itself is a strong deterrent.

Mr. Chairman, why is Russia using 100,000 military personnel, today, to train the people of Russia—at home, at school, at work—as to how they might best protect themselves. They are continuing to build shelters into which their people can pour. They even conduct civil defense drills on farms.

Mr. Chairman, we are told that in the event of a nuclear attack, which I think that adoption of this amendment would have a tendency to deter, that more than

100 million Americans might not survive but that 90 percent of the people in Russia would survive if we were to carry out a similar attack.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, and I hope this amendment in particular will pass. I think it is just as important to protect our civilian population that we may continue to fight in the event of an attack as it is to have an arsenal of weapons of war to protect our national security.

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

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I supported the previous amendment is not so much because the funds would all be going into preparedness against nuclear attack but because of the other functions of FEMA. For example, protecting people against disasters. I am concerned that the impression not be left that all of this money is going into just civil defense for nuclear attack.

Mr. SKELTON. I would like to point out to the gentleman that during the debate on the last amendment I did stress the fact that this is a dual-purpose cause. We have this also to assist in floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and the like.

During my 4 years in Congress, I have had two killer tornadoes and a killer flood in my district. Civil defense helps in that regard, too.

Mr. GLICKMAN. If I may raise one other point, I am aware after the Three Mile Island accident that FEMA was given the primary responsibility to come up with evacuation plans in the event of accidents around nuclear powerplants. When I questioned the personnel at FEMA they told me that they were going to have to take personnel away from normal civil defense functions in order to accomplish that responsibility.

Would it be the intention of the gentleman that at least part of these funds would go toward the implementation of some of these other tasks that need to be done like evacuation plans around nuclear powerplants, so that the moneys would not be taken away from the normal civil defense positions and not just adding more money into civil defense positions?

Mr. SKELTON. There is no question about it, that is one of the prime areas in which we need civil defense planning and work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SKELTON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of this amendment, Mr. Chairman. It could not be, compared to the previous amendment, classified as even

a half a loaf. It is more like a slice, but it is better than nothing and it is far better than what we are doing now, which is absolutely nothing to protect our population.

This is the administration proposal for the year and at least it will develop a plan to protect those people most likely to be the first targets of a nuclear attack. Those people living in areas of SAC bases and missile sites.

Unfortunately, this constitutes only 5 percent of our population. The amendment we just voted down would have protected 95 percent of our population.

Unfortunately, also, these areas for which we are going to devise a plan of evacuation are only 2 minutes ahead of the rest of the country if it comes to nuclear war.

One other disadvantage is that the program at this rate of development will take until the year 2,000 to develop, the D-prime program. It will take us until the year 2,000 to get a program for the entire country and at that time the demographics will have changed so much that we will have to start all over again.

I would like to say it is better than nothing and I do support it because at least it is a beginning in our D-prime program.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of this amendment, reluctant only because there is not sufficient funds to really do the job right. I also would support the statements made by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN) that this is extremely important, it is vital to our Nation and to just provide this paltry sum for civil defense will send a message to our enemies in Soviet Russia that we are not really paying attention to civil defense that we need to pay.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1220

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of the amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment. The arguments that prevailed with respect to the \$67 million add-on are the same arguments with respect to the \$23 million. I might say for the benefit of those who are concerned with whether or not there are moneys available for planning the evacuation of nuclear powerplants in response to the accident at Three Mile Island, that was taken care of in the supplemental appropriation bill. There was \$1.9 million appropriated for that purpose. We also have provided \$39 million in this bill for financial assistance to the States for civil defense, so that matter has been taken care of.

The problem we have—and this is the disagreement, I guess, between the Armed Services Committee and the Ap-

propriations Committee—the problem we have is that there were no convincing justifications made by FEMA that really presented plans that are going to solve this problem. The gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) will remember, last year when this bill was on the floor we were concerned about whether or not there was going to be a multiyear planning for civil defense. I think all of us recognize the fact that there has to be that kind of operation, but we do not have it here. We are not going to get it with an increase of \$67 million, and certainly not with an increase of \$23 million.

The action of the Committee itself, the Committee of the Whole, in sustaining the position of the Committee on Appropriations is that we should provide the same amount of money that was provided in fiscal year 1980 until the agency comes up with the kinds of plans where we can meet the problem of civil defense. They have not done it yet, and I do not think they have done it with the plans discussed before the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, that \$2.9 million of what is actually in here by the committee was previously funded by the Department of Defense? Is that not correct, sir?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is correct, I believe it was about \$2.4 million.

Mr. SKELTON. So actually that causes it to be less. Also, we can all agree that inflation being what it is, we are left with a civil defense budget of around \$86.5 million if we allow for inflation at a rate of 9 percent. Actually, we are funding, according to the gentleman's figures, less than we have ever historically funded civil defense in the history of this Nation.

Mr. BOLAND. I do not agree with the gentleman. Let me say that when I joined the subcommittee more than 20 years ago, one of the biggest fights was over the matter of civil defense and whether or not we were actually providing the kind of shelters that would protect our population and our leaders during a time of emergency or a time of war.

There were various plans offered at that time. This goes back many years. There were various plans offered for bomb shelters, gas shelters, about every kind of shelter. The other day I looked at appropriation requests that were made over those number of years, in the early years, for civil defense. It amounted to billions, as I remember.

Well, we do not have many bomb shelters, but if we built the bomb shelters 20 years ago they would not have been useful today anyhow. We do not have as many fallout shelters as some like, but if we had built them 20 years ago we would have to change them completely. We looked at the need and decided that was not the direction we wanted to go, and we saved billions.

A lot has been said here with reference to the civil defense activity of the

Soviet Union. I think the gentleman from Michigan, who was managing the bill earlier, clearly indicated that it would require billions—actually billions—to match the Soviet civil defense program. And so, the \$23 million add-on does not come close.

It is, in my judgment, a rather useless gesture. I think that when the FEMA comes up with plans that are really going to do something for the protection of our population, then I would be the first, and I am sure the subcommittee would be first, as would the Committee of the Whole, to vote that kind of program.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, the difference in the conditions in the country and the world now as compared to 27 years ago, or whenever the committee looked at the situation, was that we had massive missile superiority all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(At the request of Mr. MITCHELL of New York and by unanimous consent, Mr. BOLAND was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BOLAND. Let me just say on my own, and without conversing with my distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, would you be satisfied with the \$23 million if I accepted it?

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. We have already lost \$67 million. Yes, I think we would appreciate \$23 million.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the ranking minority Member agree to the \$23 million? This would be an add-on of \$23 million, and we would be providing about \$120 million for this effort in fiscal year 1981. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. SKELTON. That is my amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman will be happy with it.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. I thank the gentleman for his understanding of our problems.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment on this side.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is satisfactory on this side also.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

HAZARD MITIGATION AND DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 400 et seq.), the Urban Property Protection and Reinsurance Act of 1968, as amended, and the National Insurance Development Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 1749bbb et seq.), the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as amended (15 U.S.C. 278f, 278g, and 2201 et seq.), the National Science and Tech-

nology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671) and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, including not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$109,350,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$1,500,000 shall be available for the earthquake hazards reduction program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds shall be available for multihazard research, planning, and mitigation activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brown of California: Page 19, strike out the colon in line 19 and all that follows thereafter through line 23, and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I hope that every Member will look closely at this amendment. There has been some misapprehension that perhaps it added money to the bill or something of that sort. Actually, what it does is merely to strike the last four lines of this section which puts certain limitations on the expenditure of funds for earthquake hazard research and multihazard research, planning, and mitigation activity.

I would like to explain briefly the reasons that I am offering this amendment. Frankly, it has been the position of the Science Committee, which originated the particular programs referred to here—the earthquake hazard reduction program as well as the national fire prevention and control program—that we wanted to have a reasonable voice in the determination of program levels and policy matters with regard to these programs. For that purpose, we wrote into the authorization bill, which passed the House 3 weeks ago, some language which has caused umbrage on the part of the Appropriations Committee.

I want to confess that perhaps we went further than we should have in this connection. What we had in the authorizing bill was language which required, in the event the appropriation was not up to the authorization, a pro rata reduction in the various programs. Now, in effect, what this does is give some additional priority to the earthquake program at the expense of the fire program, and I can understand that this would cause some concern within the administration and within the Appropriations Committee.

But, it was a legitimate reflection of priorities which the Science Committee felt were extremely important. It is the kind of problem which arises quite frequently. We had a similar problem arise with regard to the State, Commerce, Justice bill just last week in connection with the National Bureau of Standards, where the Science Committee wanted to give certain priority to programs aimed at industrial innovation, and in which there was not full understanding of this on the part of the Appropriations Committee.

□1230

I feel that this is legitimate, that these policy differences are legitimate and on matters of great significance they should be settled on the floor.

I do not really think this is a matter

of that great significance, and I have offered to the subcommittee chairman, as I did in connection with the chairman of the other subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), to withdraw that language in the authorization bill in conference so that they will not be offended by it, and the discretion will be left with the administration as to the priorities. I make that offer to the distinguished subcommittee chairman on this particular issue.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can expedite things today. I hope the gentleman's amendment will succeed by voice vote, because it is very simple and obvious and logical, and the discretion should be left up to the people involved here.

It is not just because we are Californians from earthquakes country, but it is only reasonable, given past tragedies, that there be all of the discretionary powers available to the people here concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN) for his comments.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from the earthquake area of San Francisco, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHN L. BURTON).

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the distinguished subcommittee chairman for offering his amendment. This is not costing any more money. It does the job efficiently and economically, and I am in wholehearted support of it.

After we have just accepted an add-on for \$23 million 5 minutes ago, I hope we can accept this one.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHN L. BURTON).

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to my neighbor and colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, would like to associate myself with the gentleman's amendment and with the remarks the gentleman has made.

Clearly, this is very thoughtful and functional legislation. I think, many times, in these troubled times that we are very well served by the presence of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) in the Congress.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind comments.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to my colleague from Orange County, the gentleman from California.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate that some people perhaps may feel that this is an important amendment only for, say, the west coast area, but it is true that 39 States out of the 50 have suffered major earthquakes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. PATTERSON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, as I said, 39 States have had major earthquakes recorded. The two largest earthquakes have been these: One in the State of Missouri and one in the State of South Carolina. And, of course, we in California had the 1906 earthquake in San Francisco.

I think that we should allow FEMA to prioritize how the money is utilized for earthquakes and other kinds of hazards. The limitation that is placed here is really restrictive and unfair. It is a million-and-a-half-dollar cap only in the area of earthquakes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) for offering this very valuable amendment, and I hope all the Members will support it.

Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago, the 95th Congress officially recognized the need to develop a national earthquake hazards reduction program by overwhelmingly approving the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977. That act directed the President to prepare an implementation plan, aimed at reducing human and property losses which will inevitably befall this country when a major quake occurs—and there is little doubt that such a disaster will occur.

FEMA now stands ready to capitalize on recent technological breakthroughs in seismology and earthquake safety by developing such a plan. Yet the Appropriations Committee bill would gamble the lives of thousands of people and billions in property damage. They would allow no more than \$1.5 million to be spent by FEMA in fiscal year 1981 on this program. This amount is less than a fifth of what the science committee found minimally adequate to get this program off the ground.

The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that a repeat of the great San Francisco quake would cause over \$5 billion in losses to dwelling units alone. A major quake in the Los Angeles area could cause up to \$50 billion in property damage. I shudder to think of the toll in human terms.

Last week I had the honor of chairing the Housing Subcommittee field hearings on earthquake insurance availability. Earthquake insurance is an important element of the FEMA hazard reduction program study. Our hearings

have been metered to FEMA's development of an implementation plan so that Congress can be quick to respond with a preventive program before a catastrophe strikes.

The appropriations bill, on the other hand, will tie FEMA's hands and prevent it from establishing priorities, and providing the creative solutions which this problem demands.

The Appropriation Committee bill would sidetrack a disaster prevention plan that could potentially save billions of dollars. Moreover, how can the bill's funding restriction on just two areas—earthquakes and multihazard ever be justified? This would be a classic example of "pennywise, pound-foolish" legislation.

The Brown amendment will cost no more—it does not increase the appropriation—it merely eliminates an arbitrary restriction on earthquake hazard appropriations so that FEMA can set the correct priorities and meet its obligation under Federal law.

I urge the adoption of this amendment so that FEMA may be allowed to develop and put into action the kinds of hazard mitigation programs which are needed to protect our lives and property.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PATTERSON).

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

I would remind my east coast colleagues that our area as well is subject to several major faults and has been the site of several tremors over the past decade. I support the gentleman in his attempt to remove two provisions in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment removes two provisos in the bill which restrict spending for earthquake hazards reduction to \$1.5 million, and which prohibit the use of funds for multihazard research planning and mitigation. As ranking minority member of the Science, Research, and Technology Subcommittee, I can attest to our strong bipartisan support for efforts to reduce earthquake hazards, particularly through policy analysis, planning, and building and safety codes in addition to geophysical research.

The Science Committee also believes that multihazard research and planning are of great importance if we are to make the best use of our resources for meeting emergencies and disasters. Fire departments, civil defense, police departments and other such agencies can and do respond to many different types of natural and man-made emergencies. It is high time that Federal programs reflect these common purposes. Indeed, I always assumed that the purpose of re-

organizing Federal disaster agencies into FEMA was to achieve this very desirable coordination.

I am pleased to note that the House itself has unanimously concurred with the Science Committee's recommendations in these two matters when we passed H.R. 7114 on Monday. Yet today, if this amendment is not accepted, we would repudiate what yesterday we acclaimed. I do not blame taxpayers for being disgusted with the inefficiency of Congress and the Federal Government if we continue this purposeless drift.

Let me emphasize that the amendment adds no new money to the appropriations bill in the overall ceiling of FEMA. I concur with the judgment of the Appropriations Committee that spending must be restrained. However, I do not concur with their decision, nor do I assent to their jurisdictional authority, to single out these two small but important programs for special restrictions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from California. Thank you.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYER. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the amendment, and I certainly want to commend my colleague in the well, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), and the ranking minority Member on our side for their efforts on this amendment. I feel it is absolutely imperative to recognize that the multihazard research, planning, and also the mitigation efforts that are necessary in this area, would be restrictive without the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that our colleagues support the amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, want to join in supporting the amendment and encouraging my colleagues to support it.

The flexibility that is built into multihazard studies for FEMA in the amendment, I think, is extremely timely and most appropriate. I think the restrictions in the bill as now established are unfortunate. I think it would be wise for us to provide this flexibility in multihazard research, planning, and mitigation.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for sponsoring his amendment and encourage its support.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK) for his comments.

Unless we put too much stress on the restrictive nature of this language—which I certainly believe to be true, and I would not offer the amendment if I did not—I do want to stress the fact that the authorizing legislation which emerged from the Committee on Science and Technology was an equally stringent

effort to put in restrictive language that would direct the course of research in this area. Perhaps in both cases we have gone too far, and that is why I am offering the amendment.

I hope the gentleman will accept this amendment as a good-faith offer. We have already begun discussions with the Senate staff to accomplish this, and I have no fears whatsoever that we can satisfy them with regard to the language in the authorizing legislation.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to my distinguished committee chairman.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the amendment.

As the gentleman pointed out, it is certainly our intention to try to cooperate with the Committee on Appropriations, with which we have worked in many areas over a number of years and tried to strive to reach the same goals. I think the gentleman's amendment is, as he pointed out, a good-faith effort to try to work out the problem and cooperate with the Committee on Appropriations. That is certainly our intent.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, we just want to get their attention. Would the gentleman not say that is our objective?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has expressed it very clearly.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I would like to first compliment my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), who represents the adjoining district to my home. I recognize his leadership in this field and hope that the House will respond to the work he has done in this area.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the expressions of support by my colleagues. I do not want to belabor this point.

Let me say again that essentially what I am doing here is capitulating to the distinguished gentleman with regard to the language which offended him, and I hope he will be equally generous with regard to the language I am offering.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) and all the other California "bears" are on the march. They have all made their speeches, and that is a tough delegation.

But what the gentleman from California is asking this committee to do is to accept a pig in a poke. He is going to go to conference on the authorization bill, and he is going to suggest particular changes—at least I think he is going to—which are less objectionable to the Committee on Appropriations. We also will have discussion on a similar matter concerning the National Science Foun-

dation. We have some objections to the authorization committee's proportionality language, and it has some to ours. We have some objection to theirs and they have objections to ours, and we will discuss it later.

In any event, what the gentleman's amendment proposes to do is to strike the provision in the committee bill which says:

Provided, That not more than \$1,500,000 shall be available for the earthquake hazards reduction program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds shall be available for multihazard research, planning, and mitigation activities.

We carry \$1,475,000 in this bill for earthquake hazard reduction. The National Science Foundation has about \$20 million for earthquake research.

I can understand the position of all the Members from California, and particularly the distinguished gentleman who chairs the subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology of the Committee on Science and Technology.

The amendment that the gentleman has offered would have had quite an impact upon other activities within FEMA. It certainly would have impacted the U.S. Fire Administration. It would have reduced funds available for fire programs by about \$5,300,000 and increased earthquake hazard reduction funding by \$4,600,000.

□ 1240

It would have also increased multihazard research by \$690,000. The gentleman from California now says he is going to change that when he gets to the conference on the authorization bill. I am not sure it can be changed. I do not know what sort of an agreement he has with the conferees on that side that this would happen.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will yield, obviously, the Senate has no such language. It is merely a matter of accepting the Senate language.

Mr. BOLAND. If the authorization conference agreement is reached, if you reach that agreement in conference, is it not true that the dollar effect of the gentleman's amendment to this appropriation bill is lessened?

Mr. BROWN of California. Will the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. BOLAND. Is it not true that, on reaching an agreement in the authorization conference, the dollar effect of the gentleman's amendment to this appropriation bill will be lessened? Let me continue. It will be lessened, however, the effect is still to take funds appropriated for specific purposes and divert them to items in the authorization bill; that is true, is it not?

Mr. BROWN of California. That is true, yes.

Mr. BOLAND. I do not know why we should agree to that.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will yield, I pointed out that there was a legitimate difference with regard to priorities between the gentleman's subcommittee and the authorizing committee. This is a situation which occurs within many authorizing committees. They develop an interest in those

programs that they originate and they would like to secure the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee in having full funding for them. I am sure the gentleman experiences this in many situations.

Mr. BOLAND. All the time.

Mr. BROWN of California. And this was obviously our effort in regard to the language in our authorization bill. But believe me, I do not think it is worth the time, effort and debate to enter into this kind of an argument about a matter involving only \$2 or \$3 million. If the gentleman will remove his restriction, which is really unnecessary, because any transfer of funds into these programs above \$250,000 the gentleman has to approve anyway if it is a transfer program, what the gentleman has resorted to with this restrictive language is really overkill. We would like to avoid the overkill and let us get back to the status quo.

Mr. BOLAND. Let me try to strike some sort of a balance here. Will the gentleman withdraw his amendment on the National Science Foundation if this amendment is accepted?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOLAND was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BOLAND. I am willing to negotiate with the gentleman on this matter. I am terribly concerned and the Appropriations Committee is terribly concerned about the position of the gentleman's committee on the NSF authorization bill, and we are going to fight that one. I am telling the gentleman I am going to put whatever effort I can into defeating that amendment, and I think we can do it, because I think the gentleman is wrong. I think the Science and Technology Committee is getting in a position where they want not only to authorize, but they want to appropriate, too. So that would be the nub of my argument. I think perhaps we might be able to prevail there. So I am willing now to accept this amendment, provided the gentleman goes along and withdraws his amendment on the NSF.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman asking me about a pig in a poke?

Mr. BOLAND. No, because I am rather direct about it. I have to wait until the gentleman gets to the conference on his authorization bill to find out whether or not there is a pig in a poke or whether or not it is a dove in a poke, and I prefer to have a dove. If the gentleman is telling me now that he will come out with a dove, and also that he is willing to withdraw his amendment that he is about to offer on the NSF, then I think we can come to an agreement.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will yield, I am very deeply anxious to move in a spirit of accommodation with the gentleman. I think he is well aware of that. I expressed in my earlier remarks our fear on the authorizing committee that the Appropriations Committee is seeking to re-

strict the authorization of programs. The gentleman has language in his bill which, if he did not have an exemption from the rules, would be subject to a point of order, because it alters an authorization bill.

Mr. BOLAND. That occurs from time to time.

Mr. BROWN of California. And we object to that very strongly in the authorizing committees.

Now, understanding that we have reasonable differences here, I am still willing to accommodate the gentleman because the language which the gentleman has with regard to the National Science Foundation is not nearly as restrictive and objectionable as the language which we are referring to in this amendment with regard to FEMA.

Mr. BOLAND. And it is not nearly as objectionable as the language in the NSF authorization bill; is that correct?

Mr. BROWN of California. It is closer in line with that; yes.

Mr. BOLAND. Well, not quite; not totally in line. There is one little line there that makes a difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) has again expired.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Do I understand that there is agreement that the gentleman is willing to withdraw the amendment on the NSF, and we will accept this amendment?

Mr. BROWN of California. Under some duress, I am willing to agree with the gentleman. I will not offer my amendment to the National Science Foundation portion of his bill.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the position of the gentleman. He is a very wise and a very able and a very intelligent individual. I know of no man who could have chaired the Committee of the Whole the other day on the State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary appropriations bill better than he.

Mr. Chairman, on this side, I am willing to accept the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, that agreement is acceptable to the minority, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION
CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For construction, repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and for facility planning and design not otherwise provided, for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, \$110,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1983: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation on the availability

of funds appropriated under this head by this appropriation Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations therefor, the amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended, except that this provision shall not apply to the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization for repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and facility planning and design.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations who is handling the bill, I note that there are no funds contained in this bill, and the committee has not acted with regard to research and development funds for NASA.

I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts what the plans are regarding this item that has been omitted from this appropriation bill.

Mr. BOLAND. If the gentleman will yield, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology knows, the conference report on the 1981 NASA authorization bill has been adopted, and it does carry funding for research and development for NASA. The appropriation bill does not carry it. And one of the reasons for it is that the conference agreement includes roughly \$70 million above the President's revised budget request. The add-on is for a number of projects, nearly all of which were reduced from the original budget request. We felt we would like to get a look at what the conference adopted, and that is one of the reasons why I suggested to the subcommittee that we not fund research and development until we get a better look at the bottom line.

Mr. FUQUA. I might point out to the gentleman that it is well within the budget item of the House budget resolution as agreed to by both bodies.

Mr. BOLAND. That is true. We will make an effort to resolve this matter in the conference, and if we cannot do it in conference, of course, we will have to do it in a supplemental bill or the continuing resolution.

Mr. FUQUA. If I might inquire of the gentleman, if the Senate's corresponding subcommittee adds funds for R. & D., would it be the intention of the gentleman to try to negotiate with the Senate on an agreeable figure that could come back to the House in conference?

Mr. BOLAND. If the gentleman will yield, I would respond in this way: There would be that possibility, but there is another little matter with which this subcommittee and I think the Appropriations Committee is concerned. I refer to reprogramming. We need to reach a better agreement with NASA regarding reprogramming procedures, so that when requests for reprogramming come to our committee, we have some say about reprogramming that we do not have now.

□ 1250

We may express a position in a letter to NASA in response to a request for re-

programming, but you send it back often-times NASA pays no attention to it. Well, we have suggested to NASA that that is a matter with which we are vitally concerned. It was one with which we were vitally concerned last year when we were in conference on the bill, and perhaps we can come to some agreement with NASA in this area.

Mr. FUQUA. Of course, some of that is in the basic act that relates to reprogramming, which the authorization committee has the legislative jurisdiction, and of course I share some similar concern that the gentleman from Massachusetts does about reprogramming, and I think it is a proper area that we need to explore and we intend to do that with NASA regarding reprogramming actions; but I hope that that would not hold up the entire R. & D. portion of the bill until that is resolved.

Mr. BOLAND. Well, if that matter is not resolved, then I must say the chances of this being held up might be very good. We have suggested to NASA—and I discussed this with the gentleman the other day—that it agree to an arrangement on reprogramming similar to that which the Department of Defense has had for 20 years with the appropriate congressional committees. I know that NASA does not agree that it can handle reprogramming the same as the Department of Defense. Somehow it feels that there is something very special about NASA and its programs that does not allow them to be reviewed under this type of reprogramming procedure.

Frankly, I cannot accept that. I think that perhaps we can get an agreement with NASA where their reprogramming requests can be handled on the same basis as the agreement between DOD and the committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FUQUA. I agree with the gentleman to a certain extent. NASA is not a line agency in certain respects, as the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense does carry on certain research and development activities. I do not think their reprogramming all necessarily applies in the R. & D. programs as rigidly as it does in their more line day-to-day operational programs. I think as far as NASA is concerned and their day-to-day operations, certainly very stringent reprogramming requests should apply. But certainly in R. & D. programs where certain types of programs have never existed before and estimates at the beginning of programs may change, certain criteria may be modified, it would necessitate certain reprogramming.

So I think, while there should be adequate control very definitely of reprogramming, I am concerned that we do not make it so strict that we hamstring the agency in carrying out the functions that Congress assigns to it.

Mr. BOLAND. If the gentleman will

yield further, I would agree with that. It is not the intention of this subcommittee and certainly has never been the intention of this subcommittee chairman who has sat in that committee for so many years and has given NASA about everything it has desired over that period of time, to hamstring the agency. But I must say that within the last few years we have been having difficulty with NASA on reprogramming. It is perfectly clear to me that the existing reprogramming system simply does not work, and there is a great deal of similarity between the programs in the Defense Department's R. & D. accounts and NASA's R. & D. account.

As a matter of fact, NASA's office of general counsel suggested the possibility of patterning their reprogramming procedure after that of the Department of Defense. I think we can come to an agreement on it. But I must say that, and as the gentleman recognizes, I am concerned, deeply concerned, about this matter, and this matter needs to be settled to the satisfaction of this subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. BOLAND and by unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BOLAND. If the gentleman would continue to yield, we want to be sure that NASA gets the flexibility to run their programs which are so essential to the economic health of the Nation and also to the great advances NASA has made in that area. It is certainly not the intention, may I repeat, of this Member to hamstring that effort, but I must say that in the areas of reprogramming, that which we seek is something that I think the Congress is entitled to.

Mr. FUQUA. I hope that we can resolve that.

In addition, I hope that it will not hold up the R. & D. portion of the bill for this fiscal year. We will continue to work with the gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON AIR QUALITY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Commission on Air Quality as authorized by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7623 and 7626), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$2,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DANNEMEYER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DANNEMEYER: Page 23, line 6, strike "\$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,457,600."

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I will try to be as brief as this amendment is. Very simply, what this amendment would do is reduce the appropriation for the National Commission on Air Quality from \$2 million to \$1,457,600, thereby conforming the bill we have before us to

an action the House took on June 27, 1980.

As Members may recall, the National Commission on Air Quality was authorized by section 323 of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977 for the purpose of producing several reports on various air quality issues. The Commission was given 3 years (and \$10,000,000 was authorized) to complete its task, but because the President was slow in appointing the public members of the Commission, it was delayed almost a year in getting started. Subsequently, rather than accelerating its schedule, the Commission attempted to get its life extended for an additional year without, I might add, going through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

However, there was a strong feeling that the Commission's report should be available when Congress began reexamining the Clean Air Act itself, as it is scheduled to do next spring. So, 8 days after the Appropriations Committee reported H.R. 7631, of which Commission funding is a part, the House passed Senate Joint Resolution 188 which extended the Commission to no later than May 1, 1981, and required that the final report be finished by March 1. Senate Joint Resolution 188 was then signed into law on July 2 (Public Law 96-300), thereby confirming an extension 27 percent shorter than the one that had been requested.

Both the sequence of events and the committee report language indicate that the Appropriations Committee's recommendation \$2,000,000 for the National Commission on Air Quality was based not on Senate Joint Resolution 188, but on the expectation that the Commission's request for a 1-year extension would be granted. True, the committee sliced the Commission's \$2,476,000 fiscal year 1981 funding request by \$476,000 but, the fact of the matter is that the \$476,000 would have caused total appropriations for the Commission to exceed its \$10 million authorization level, which would have violated the Budget Act.

Report language concedes that \$2 million is a sufficient sum for the Commission to complete its work, presumably on August 7, 1981. So what we have here is a \$2 million line item that, in reality, was everything the Commission could have expected—and that budget procedures would allow—for a time frame 99 days longer than the one which will be in effect. Thus, it seems to me that this \$2 million figure should be cut back by a percentage equivalent to the percentage reduction in the duration of the Commission, that is to say 27.12 percent.

Mr. Chairman, in all honesty, even an appropriation level of \$1,457,600—which is what we would have if we effect a 27-percent reduction in the appropriation level for the Commission—may be generous. Since the last 2 months of the Commission's life will be a phase-out period, payroll for those months should be lower. Also, because the final report will be due sooner than previously anticipated, there should be fewer expenses and less need for travel, public hearings, and certain studies. Beyond that, I understand the

Commission has some \$800,000 in contingency funds on hand that can act as a cushion, so I do not think we need fear the Commission having insufficient funds to complete its work. Instead, what we need to worry about and focus on, especially in light of the latest budget estimates for fiscal 1981, is an unnecessary waste of the taxpayers money.

To fund a Commission for 3 months longer than it will be in existence would certainly be a waste of money. Cutting \$542,400 may not make much of a dent in an estimated \$29.8 billion deficit but we have to start making dents somewhere if we ever expect to punch a hole in inflationary deficit spending.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to express opposition to the amendment of my colleague from California, which would reduce the budget of the National Commission on Air Quality.

As you may know, we in California have, to say the least, the country's most severe air quality problems. It is my own personal belief that closing down effectively the work of this Commission is most vital and will be very helpful to us in the Southwest air basin.

I might also mention that the Commission in their last year's budget had a budget of \$5.5 million. This budget reflects a significant cutback in their budget, recognizes that they are closing down their work, but they are asking to be able to close down that work effectively.

Beyond that, I mentioned that last year they had 45 members on their staff. They reflect a staff request of 35 in this budget. I think they are responsibly responding to the reality that their work will be closing down progressively. They will not have to hire people as they leave during the year. Much of their budget is for personnel to complete that work.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand the position of my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANNEMEYER), if he offers this amendment because he reasons that the Commission will not be in existence for the entire fiscal year. That is precisely correct.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is the thrust of it.

Mr. BOLAND. That is correct, and by law, as the gentleman has indicated, the Commission must cease operations not later than May 1, 1981. If the Commission fails to complete its final report by March 1, 1981, it ceases to exist on that day. On a strictly pro rata basis, that would mean the Commission needs less money. But is that really so?

Although the time period has been shortened, the mission really remains the same. Basically, the same effort will have to be condensed into a shorter time period.

In addition, the committee has already

reduced the recommended funding level for the Commission. The request for 1981 is \$2,476,000 and the committee's recommendation, as the gentleman knows, is for \$2 million. That equates to a 20-percent reduction.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Yes, I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, when this Commission started out in 1977, is it not true that it was originally authorized for a 3-year period for \$10 million and up until this year it had consumed by way of appropriations \$8 million; so when the gentleman says there was a reduction of \$476,000 from the appropriation this year, that reduction was nothing more than a reflection of the ceiling established by the original authorization of \$10 million in 1977.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman says is true. In our judgment, any further cuts below the \$2 million would impair the Commission's ability to do its job well.

I agree with the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) that the Commission has, over the time it has been in existence, marshaled its resources effectively. As a matter of fact, one of the most distinguished Members on the gentleman's side, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STOCKMAN) is a member of the National Commission on Air Quality. I am sure that the money we are providing here, the \$2 million, will be used by the Commission as effectively as it has used funds during the past 2 years. I am also sure that, if the Commission does not require some of the money, a few thousand dollars for rent, postage, or other expenses in the last months, that money will all be returned to the Treasury.

As the gentleman knows, \$8 million has already been appropriated to the Commission for some terribly important work, as described by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS). The recommendations for 1981, the \$2 million, will increase that total amount to \$10 million.

I do not think we ought to tie the hands of the Commission at this late date from getting its job done, particularly in the critical months that lie ahead. We have a pretty good investment in this Commission now. I think to reduce it below the amount suggested by the committee would really jeopardize some of the work of the Commission.

On that basis, I oppose the amendment.

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

I would like to pose some questions to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANNEMEYER).

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I would be happy to respond.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Is it correct that the reduction in the life of the Commission was made after the date on which agreement was reached on the appropriation.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. That is correct. To be precise, 7 days after the Ap-

propriations Committee completed its work authorizing the \$2 million, Senate Joint Resolution 188 was adopted by this Congress and signed into law reducing the time within which the commission had to complete its work from August 7, 1981, to May 1, 1981.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Does the gentleman know whether the Commission had to employ any additional people or undertake any additional contracts to complete their work that would necessitate the use of the funds that the Appropriations Committee appropriated?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I am advised that the personnel of the Commission at the present time is adequate to complete the work that it is required to do by the deadline which was set by Senate Joint Resolution 188. The report is due to the Congress by March 1. The committee itself goes out of business on May 1.

Mr. COUGHLIN. The gentleman's advice is that they do have sufficient personnel to complete that report on time?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. That is correct, and I am also advised that this Commission has available to it \$800,000 in contingency funds. In the event that it would run into trouble in completing its work, it could draw on that money in order to complete its responsibilities.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I will certainly be inclined to support the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DANNEMEYER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DANNEMEYER) there were—ayes 9, noes 14.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 184, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—176

Abdnor	Collins, Tex.	Grassley
Akaka	Conable	Grisham
Albosta	Corcoran	Guyer
An'erson,	Coughlin	Hall, Tex.
Calif.	Courter	Hammer-
An'rews,	Crane, Daniel	schmidt
N.Dak.	Crane, Philip	Hance
Anthony	Daniel, Dan	Hansen
Apo estate	Daniel, R. W.	Harsha
Archer	Dannemeyer	Fetzel
Ashbrook	Davis, Mich.	Hightower
Atkinson	Davis, S.C.	Hillis
Bafa's	de la Garza	Hinson
Barnard	Derrick	Hollenbeck
Bauman	Derwinski	Holt
Beard, Tenn.	Devine	Hopkins
Bedell	Dornan	Horton
Benjamin	Duncan, Tenn.	Huckaby
Bennett	Eiwaris, A'a.	Hyde
Bethune	Edwards, Okla.	Ichor
Boner	Emery	Ireland
Bouguard	English	Jacobs
Breaux	Erlenborn	Jeffries
Brinkley	Evans, Del.	Jenkins
Brooks	Evans, Ga.	Jenrette
Broomfield	Evans, Ind.	Johnson, Colo.
Brown, Ohio	Fenwick	Jones, Okla.
Buchanan	Fish	Jones, Tenn.
Burgener	Forsythe	Kazan
Butler	Frenzel	Kindness
Byron	Fuqua	Kogovsek
Carney	G'bbons	Kramer
Carter	Gilman	Laemarsino
Chappell	Ginzrich	Latta
Cheney	Goodling	Lee
Clinger	Gradison	Lent
Coleman	Gramm	

Loeffler	Paul	Smith, Nebr.
Long, La.	Petri	Snowe
Lott	Pickle	Snyder
Lujan	Porter	Spence
Lungren	Quayle	Stangeland
McClory	Quillen	Steele
McDade	Rahall	Stenholm
McDonald	Regula	Stump
Marineen	Rinaldo	Tauke
Marriott	Ritter	Taylor
Martin	Robinson	Thomas
Mica	Roe	Tribble
Michel	Roth	Ulman
Miller, Ohio	Rudd	Vander Jagt
Mollohan	Santini	Walker
Montgomery	Satterfield	Wampler
Moore	Sawyer	Whitehurst
Moorhead,	Schulze	Whittaker
Calif.	Sebelius	Winn
Mottl	Sensenbrenner	Wylie
Myers, Ind.	She. by	Yatron
Nelson	Shumway	Young, Alaska
O'Brien	Shuster	Young, Fla.

NOES—184

Pashayan	St Germain	Williams, Ohio
Rallsback	Staggers	Wilson, Bob
Rhodes	Stanton	Wilson, C. H.
Richmond	Stark	Wilson, Tex.
Rodino	Symms	Wyatt
Rostenkowski	Tauzin	Wydler
Rousselet	Udall	Young, Mo.
Runnels	Vanik	Zeferetti
Simon	Watkins	
Solomon	White	

□ 1320

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Guarini for, with Mr. Cotter against. Mr. Tauzin for, with Mr. Nichols against. Mr. Runnels for, with Mr. Richmond against.

Messrs. BAILEY, FOUNTAIN, and GLICKMAN changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MONTGOMERY and Mr. NELSON changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary administrative expenses and technical assistance of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, including the office of Self-Help Development and Technical Assistance, as authorized by sections 112 and 209 of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 3022 and 3049), \$8,700,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to retire any of the indebtedness of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG
OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida: On page 23, line 16, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof: " *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used directly or indirectly to promote any particular political philosophy or to be used to support any organization or cooperative engaged in political activity and lobbying efforts of any nature."

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering here today is an attempt to prevent the National Consumer Cooperative Bank from pursuing policies based on political motivations. This amendment should not be necessary, that prohibition should be assumed because any agency which receives Federal funding should refrain from political activities. There are some disturbing indicators however, that the NCCB will in fact be politically motivated. That the same Sam Brown who attempted to use ACTION as a political vehicle is a member of the NCCB Board should be of some interest.

Mr. Phillip Kreitner, who is a consultant to the Bank and a Ralph Nader associate, stated the following:

The key to the Bank's influence on the co-op movement will not be to whom it lends business development resources. The key will be what portion of its money, expertise, and ideology it commits to developing the non-commercial half of cooperation: the side of co-ops which makes them education organizations, facilitators of community organizing . . .

Mr. Kreitner also wrote:

Throughout the U.S., co-op professionalization is being given a sharp boost with the advent of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank. Cooperators are captivated by the vision of a new way to capitalize the movement and their careers. The Bank is the first solid indication to the New Wavers that they might be able to make a living doing co-op work.

Just who are the "new wavers" Mr. Kreitner refers to? There has historically been an element within the consumer cooperative movement that perceives cooperatives as an alternative to the capitalists business system, and seeks ultimately to replace the market system with a cooperative economy. Today, cooperatives that share this view are known as "new wave" cooperatives. New wave cooperatives perceive their role not only as economic but also as social and political. New wave co-ops reject the corporate structure as evil, pernicious, and contrary to society's moral values.

The legislation which created the National Consumer Cooperative Bank was actively lobbied by consumer activist Ralph Nader. Mr. Nader advocates that the existing economy of our country, based on private investment, be replaced by a "cooperative economy".

Mr. Nader in an interview in the March/April issue of The Co-op magazine, said that the kind of co-op economy he envisions would have "ramifications towards political and economic change in this country * * *". Mr. Nader apparently perceives the National Consumer Cooperative Bank as that Government entity that can help bring about such a fundamental change. At a recent public interest lawyers conference, Mr. Nader said that in his opinion the cooperatives receiving loans from the National Consumer Cooperative Bank will be politically active in addition to providing goods and services.

One member of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank's board of directors, Derek Shearer, wrote an article in 1976 in which he listed several proposals which a President from the "left" might seek to implement. Such proposals included a corporate democracy act, which was suggested on the so-called big business day, and the establishment of a national bank for consumer cooperatives. Shearer's own views on solutions to our economic problems are in accordance with the views of the new left. He advocates an increase in "public enterprise" and in cooperatives. He has also suggested that to curb corporate abuse the Government establish a holding company in each dominant section of the economy. He writes:

If the American economy is to be transformed that it begins to resemble a democratic economy, public control of the economy must grow substantially . . . Such a pluralist economy must effect a dramatic increase in public enterprise as well as in cooperatives, community development corporations and worker-owned cooperatives.

The implementation of Shearer's economic views would require a fundamental political transformation in the country. Shearer admits that his "comprehensive economic reform program will inevitably be labeled socialistic."

NOT VOTING—73

Anderson, Ill.	Fithian	Livingston
AuCoin	Ford, Tenn.	McCloskey
Badham	Fowler	McEwen
Blaggi	Garcia	McKay
Bowen	Gialmo	McKinney
Broyhill	Ginn	McLellan
Campbell	Goldwater	Mathis
Cleveland	Guarini	Mavroules
Collins, Ill.	Holland	Miller, Calif.
Cotter	Holtzman	Mitchell, N.Y.
Daschle	Hubbard	Moakley
Deckard	Jones, N.C.	Murphy, N.Y.
Dixon	Kelly	Myers, Pa.
Dodd	Leach, La.	Nedzi
Early	Leath, Tex.	Nichols

The rhetoric used by Mr. Shearer, Mr. Nader, and others can be persuasive and they have the right to advocate their views calling for less private enterprise, less individual participation and control of business, more Government and more collectivist activity in the economy. However, they should not be doing so with public funds or through programs created by the Congress. It should therefore be a matter of legitimate concern to taxpayers whether or not their dollars will go to support an organization that might give expression or implementation to such political ideals and goals.

There are other specific examples which increase my concern which I will not go into today in the interest of time. To close my remarks let me relate that in testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee, the chairman of the board of directors of NCCB, Mr. Lawrence Connell, responding to my question in which I asked whether he would have any objection to writing language into this bill stating that there should not be any political use of these funds, Mr. Connell's response was "I would have no objection to that."

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the subcommittee chairman and the ranking minority member. It is my understanding that they have no objection to this amendment.●

□ 1330

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman serves as a member of the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee and performs very valuable service on that subcommittee. I personally am not aware of any particular problem with respect to the National Consumer Cooperative Bank planning politics or using its influence politically, but I see no harm in accepting the gentleman's amendment. We are willing to accept it on this side.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the chairman.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has discussed the amendment with me before. I think it is an acceptable amendment and a good addition to the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment and commend my colleague for his wisdom in offering it.

Lest anyone think that this bank will not engage in political activities without some explicit expression of congressional intent, I suggest a quick review of

some of the statements made by the most active supporters of the Bank and of its employees and directors.

In looking over these statements of individuals and groups interested in the Bank, I have a sense of *deja vu* finding many of the same names and expressions of philosophy which I encountered during the ACTION reauthorization last year.

As Members in this body will recall, most of the problems associated with the ACTION agency last year could be traced back to the philosophy and political activism of the leaders of the agency, who used the agency and Federal funds to translate their particular viewpoints into activism at the community level. Thus, it was little wonder that the Appropriations Committee investigative staff found instances of federally funded volunteers engaging in labor organizing, lobbying, and political activity, and that organizations hurriedly funded by Brown and his cohorts at the agency lacked the ability to effectively manage Federal funds and used totally inappropriate materials to train ACTION volunteers—material which actually encouraged the volunteers to become politically involved and to incite confrontation in their communities.

Refreshing my colleagues' memories on the problems at ACTION under Sam Brown's leadership is not inappropriate at this time, because lo and behold that same Sam Brown is one of the directors of this National Consumer Cooperative Bank. So let us look at what Sam Brown says to get an idea what we might expect of his leadership of the Bank.

We need to build a new coalition of vision . . . for a more equitable distribution of wealth.

This belief was translated into action through two Federal grants to controversial politically oriented organizations which described their objectives in the following way:

ACORN deals with power, not simply with winning issues . . . all these issues are mere manifestations of a much more fundamental issue: The distribution of power in this country;

And

The Midwest Academy teaches how to unite people in step-by-step campaigns where our collective strength wins concrete improvements and begins the job of redistributing wealth and power.

Another Brown quote:

Politics is a struggle to redistribute power and wealth. That's what I'm all about.

Speaking to the National Congress of American Indians, Brown encouraged them to not only become politically active, but to do so on a partisan basis, urging them to bloc vote in local elections and to take an active role in the Democratic Party's national convention and platform process.

In short, Brown is an acknowledged political activist, bent on establishing a new social and political order, and we can expect more of the same from him in his capacity on the NCCB.

And I would again refer my colleagues to the statements of other members of

the board of directors and the strongest proponents of this Bank to see that Brown is not alone in influencing the Bank in a politically active direction.

This Congress must expressly direct the Bank to channel its activities in non-political directions. The amendment before us would guarantee that, and it should be adopted unanimously.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK CITY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

For necessary administrative expenses as authorized by the New York City Loan Guarantee Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-415), \$922,000.

Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we go back to page 25. I was called off the floor inadvertently, and I had an amendment at that page.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask unanimous consent that the reading revert to page 25?

Mr. ERTEL. Yes.

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research, employee education and training activities, as authorized by law, and for carrying out the provisions of section 5055, title 38, United States Code, relating to pilot programs and grants for exchange of medical information, \$50,418,000, plus reimbursements.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROBERTS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTS: Page 32, line 4, strike out "\$50,418,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$55,312,000".

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would restore to the appropriation for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses the sum of \$4,894,000 for the development of health care information systems. For the past several years, the Administrator and the Chief Medical Director of the VA have been struggling with the Office of Management and Budget to obtain funds for a Health Care Information System. The requests for funds have been repeatedly denied until the fiscal year 1981 when \$5,399,000 were included in the President's budget request.

The Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies has reduced the amount by \$4,894,000—the amount my amendment would restore.

The Subcommittee on Special Investigations of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has held several hearings on this subject. While we may not entirely agree with the manner in which some funds for

this purpose were obligated at the end of fiscal year 1979, the arguments for getting on with this task are overwhelmingly in favor of it. The Subcommittee on Special Investigations called VA medical center directors and chiefs of staff before it.

These individuals, as well as VA central office officials, repeatedly told us of the tremendous tasks that are being performed manually and those that are not being performed at all due to the lack of these computerized systems.

The private sector has acquired such systems for the delivery of more effective and quality health care. The Veterans' Administration, due to lack of funding, is still operating in the "horse and buggy" days in this regard. It is the commitment of the Congress to provide quality health care to eligible veterans. This cannot be done unless we provide the VA with modern tools and techniques requisite to this day and age.

The systems we are talking about do not happen overnight. The leadtime, from planning and designing the systems to development, installation, and operation, is a 7- to 10-year process. The longer it is delayed, the more expensive it will be. I ask you: Why should a veteran patient have to wait 4 to 8 or more hours to see a doctor when he is sick and goes to a VA medical center? Or even more threatening, it is possible that it could cost the veteran his life.

The computer systems we are talking about are cost effective in terms of personnel and in a medical setting can be lifesaving.

The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, through its oversight functions, has heard an abundance of justification for getting on with this task without any further delay. I think it was best said by the director of one of the largest VA medical centers when he appeared before the Subcommittee on Special Investigations. He said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I wish you could come to my hospital, walk through the halls, and see the problems that are being caused by this situation. Veterans, aged veterans, extremely ill, very disabled, are having to stand 2, 3, 4, 5 hours in long lines just to receive their medications. If they could go somewhere else, I am sure they would, but they cannot. They are very dependent upon us for their care.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. A vote for it could very well mean the difference between life and death in many cases of veterans seeking medical care through VA health care facilities.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, our Subcommittee on Special Investigations held oversight hearings on the VA's plans for computerizing its various systems in order to improve the quality, quantity, and timeliness of the services provided to eligible veterans.

These hearings brought out that the VA, rather than leading the way in developing these systems, lags well behind

the private sector in all areas of ADP (automatic data processing). The gap between the VA hospitals and those in the private sector is graphically illustrated by a recent survey by the American Hospital Association ADP survey of hospital computers. The survey shows that in hospitals with more than 500 beds, 87 percent of private hospitals have ADP capabilities in admitting procedures, while only 4 percent of the VA hospitals are so equipped. In the field of pathology, these percentages are 74 to 4; in outpatient care are 74 to 3; and in pharmacy 74 to 4.

The present largely outdated and manual VA system is not modern and is often frustrating to patients and medical personnel alike. Trained health care professionals could better spend their time if the VA had a good computer system enabling them to better deliver quality medical care.

The VA is currently in the "dark ages" of ADP capabilities and the situation will deteriorate and cause even greater problems with the aging of the World War II veteran population. We should restore the \$4,894,000 to start to modernize VA medical functions to keep veterans from having to wait from 4 to 8 hours to see a physician, to provide prompt pharmacy service on a timely basis, and to avoid duplication of expensive and potentially dangerous drugs, and so forth.

Simply stated, the situation is a life-threatening one; perhaps the difference between the life and death of a veteran.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to support this much-needed amendment.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, may I again, as I have done in the past, pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. As I indicated yesterday, I regret that he is leaving the Congress after this year, because he has done some very excellent work in this area, as he has on the Transportation and Public Works Committee. The committee denied the funds for some very good reasons. But I know how deeply the gentleman feels about this particular amendment, and the committee on this side is willing to accept it.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am deeply indebted to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman also on his long and distinguished career in this area, and we certainly accept this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I cannot recall the last time he has offered an amendment to the VA appro-

priation bill, which means that he feels very strongly that the cut made by the committee in the Department of Medicine and Surgery's health information system must be restored. I share my chairman's concern.

Those of us serving on the authorizing committee have labored for several years to get the Office of Management and Budget to request funding for this project. Finally, the agency was able to convince OMB that a failure to implement a modern-day computer information system would, in the very near future, begin to affect the timely delivery of health services by the Department of Medicine and Surgery. It is not now uncommon for a veteran to have to wait from 2 to 6 hours to be examined at a VA medical center. It is not uncommon to have to wait 2 to 3 hours to get a prescription filled. Drugs are dispensed manually and we know of cases where some veterans are receiving drugs from two or more VA hospitals. That could be dangerous to their health simply because the agency is not equipped to handle the flow with computers.

I regret we do not have the time to quote extensively from our recently completed hearings when several hospital directors, chiefs of staffs and others, testified so eloquently in behalf of this budget request, but I think you will find some of their comments of interest.

In pleading for the funds to implement a health-care information system, the director of one of VA's largest hospitals stated:

As a director of a hospital that has 25,000 inpatient visits, some 200,000 outpatient visits a year, I do not have the tools to control the escalating cost and complexity of a pharmacy operation. It is literally impossible for me to do my job unless somebody gives me the tools to do it with.

The second thing I am very concerned about is patient care. Mr. Chairman, I wish you could come to my hospital, walk through the halls, and see the problems that are being caused by this situation. Veterans, aged veterans, extremely ill, very disabled, are having to stand 2, 3, 4, 5 hours in long lines just to receive their medications. If they could go somewhere else, I am sure they would, but they cannot. They are very dependent upon us for their medical care.

Mr. Chairman, as a director of a hospital, I have said it before and I will say it again, I am ashamed when I go through and I see the job that we are doing. All I can ask is that Congress, OMB, VA try to get together, try to give us the tools so that we can take care of the deplorable situations that are now existing.

We also heard from the chief of staff at one of the VA hospitals in Chicago, who testified to the following dangerous situation:

More importantly, I would submit to you that 20 to 50 percent of patients commit errors in the use of their prescriptions. This misuse of drugs poses a serious threat to the health of the patients. Various drug incompatibilities because of the number of physicians that are seen will vary from minor inconvenience to that patient but may have serious complications, even death.

Permit me to substantiate my request for such an automated system, to take the figures from the Hines Veterans Hospital phar-

macy costs. In 1971, there were over 86,000 prescriptions which cost \$142,000, or an average cost of \$1.66 per prescription.

In 1979, they had over 360,000 prescriptions at a total cost of \$994,000 plus, or \$2.76 per prescription, which is a 60 percent increase.

The total cost of our drugs and pharmaceuticals is another interesting figure. In 1973, our total cost was \$784,000, plus or minus. In 1979, there was a 262 percent increase in the cost of these drugs, for a total of 2,057,000 dollars.

Now if, as our figures show, we can expect a 25 percent saving in duplicate prescription costs, in 1979, we would have realized more than \$514,000, which is 66 percent of the cost of drugs for the entire year of 1973 that I mentioned to you, and which is more than the cost of the entire automated pharmacy system in our medical district.

When properly programmed, these systems of automation will prevent many of the problems that I have indicated. Another hospital director told us the following:

I would like to say that the American Hospital Association made a survey not too long ago, and they found out that 60 percent of their hospitals throughout the nation are automated. Of the balance, 20 percent plan to be automated within the next few years. We presently find ourselves with a Model T Ford going down Route 95, trying to keep pace with the cars of the seventies and coming into the eighties.

We feel very strongly that, as health care professionals, to support the physician in getting the job done, we need automation in our medical centers, and we solicit your support.

I am sure many of my colleagues have heard veteran complaints of long delays in seeing a physician, or lengthy waits to get lab work completed. These complaints are numerous and the VA is anxious to do something about it. This is not the time to cut funds from the small amount requested by the President.

My colleagues should understand that Mr. ROBERTS' amendment does not add to the President's budget request; it would simply restore the cut made by the Appropriations Committee. A vote against the amendment is a vote to continue the practice of veterans having to wait to see a doctor, a nurse or other health-care professional; his having to wait long periods of time to get a prescription filled. Immediate implementation of the plan proposed by the Chief Medical Director and supported by the Committee on veterans' Affairs will eventually eliminate these delays.

I therefore urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by my chairman, Mr. ROBERTS. Veterans throughout the Nation will be grateful that you did.●

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ERTHEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment which relates to page 25, out of order.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this the amendment that would add funds to the National Science Foundation?

Mr. ERTHEL. It is the amendment that

would add funds only to the applied engineering and science function in the NSF.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Veterans Administration, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1004, 1006, 5002, 5003, 5006, 5008, 5009, and 5010 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is \$3,000,000 or more or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, \$376,343,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, except for advance planning of projects funded through the Advance Planning Fund, none of these funds shall be used for any project which has not been considered and approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be available to plan, design or construct a replacement Veterans Administration medical center at Minneapolis, Minnesota, that exceeds six hundred forty-nine hospital and nursing home care beds.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Page 32, beginning on line 25, strike out "\$376,343,000, to remain available until expended" and insert in lieu thereof "\$390,583,000, of which \$376,343,000 shall remain available until expended and \$14,240,000 shall be for construction of replacement facilities at Little Rock, Arkansas, and shall remain available until April 30, 1981".

□ 1340

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would add \$14.24 million for Veterans' Administration construction projects, to account for a reduction of that amount by the Appropriations Committee when it eliminated additional funding for phase 2 of the replacement hospital at Little Rock, Ark. The amendment would also place a contingency on the use of these funds, mandating that they be appropriated pursuant to a contract to be let on the Little Rock facility no later than April 30, 1981.

Mr. Chairman, it would appear that a misunderstanding occurred between the Veterans' Administration and the Appropriations Committee with respect to the Little Rock project, due to the excellent progress the Little Rock hospital construction program has made. It was originally believed that the contract for phase 2 of the project would not be let until September or October 1981. However, the Veterans' Administration is now certain that the contract will be let in April 1981. Failure to provide for the \$14.24 million in our appropriations for this fiscal year will penalize prompt performance, and cost our taxpayers an additional \$3 to \$5 million in inflation adjustments due to the delay that would

accompany such a failure to appropriate. This is a result that no one desires, Mr. Chairman. The Appropriations Committee has been very clear in its report that it does not wish to slow down construction projects, and our taxpayers have been very clear that they do not wish to throw money away when it could be saved. As such, I am offering this amendment to correct a result that apparently was not contemplated at the time the Appropriations Committee put this legislation together.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1980.
Hon. JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: The House of Representatives Appropriations Committee deleted the President's FY 1981 budget request of \$14,240,000 in escalation funds for the Little Rock Medical Center construction project. This request was specifically designed to allow a construction contract award for the final and main phase (Phase II) of the 505-bed acute care facility at the Little Rock Division. Failure to provide these funds in the FY 81 Appropriation will result in a gap in time between the completion of Phase I and the initiation of Phase II.

The Phase I portion of construction awarded last month and currently underway includes excavation, foundations and erection of the structural steel frame plus metal floor decking throughout the building. The Phase II portion consists of enclosing the building, installing the mechanical and electrical items, and completing the interior architectural work. Also, the site landscaping and exterior paving will be completed at that time. To delay the continuity of the overall construction by not proceeding with finishing the building would result in the structural steel frame and metal decking being exposed to deterioration for an extended period of time.

To date, all parties involved in the progressive development of this project have not only maintained momentum in the development of the project, but it has been possible to substantially improve the overall schedule. The current projected Phase II award date of April 1981 illustrates this as compared to an earlier September/October 1981 schedule. At this time, it is estimated that an additional \$4,250,000 would be required due to a delay in the Phase II construction award until October 1981.

Notwithstanding the adverse effect on the exposed structure and the break in the continuity of a large and complex project as this, the increased cost due to future inflation is considered to be of major concern. Also, there will be certain maintenance costs incidental to protecting the property and site during an extended period of delay. Finally the idea of a partially completed government building sitting idle on the landscape is disquieting from a public relations standpoint.

In view of the uncertain future market conditions and in order to avoid jeopardizing this project, it is considered that the requested funds for this project remain intact.

Your interest in assisting us in keeping this project on schedule is appreciated.

Sincerely,

MAX CLELAND,
Administrator.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, when the subcommittee marked up this bill and considered the major construction items of the Veterans' Administration, we were informed that some of the major construction items would not be started until fiscal year 1982. The Veterans' Administration, at the time of the markup, indicated Little Rock was one of them. Since that time, the VA has indicated that it can get started on the second phase of Little Rock in fiscal year 1981.

So, Mr. Chairman, this side accepts the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT).

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

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

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) has spoken to me previously about this. I understand the situation has changed from the time this actually occurred in the Committee on Appropriations, and we accept the amendment.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN).

• Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) and urge my colleagues to support his amendment to add \$14.24 million to the appropriation for the construction, major projects, for the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1981, specifically for completion of the VA medical center in Little Rock, Ark. Any further delay in this construction would add from \$3 to \$5 million to the cost of construction of this replacement medical center.

The House committed itself to appropriate \$144,070,000 in fiscal year 1979 to construct this hospital. Any further delay at this late time, when all of the construction funds for the replacement of this facility except this \$14.24 million has been appropriated, would be penny wise and pound foolish.

This hospital will be near completion in fiscal year 1981. The appropriation of \$14.24 million should complete its construction. There is no reason why these funds should not be appropriated. The Veterans' Administration has advised that all funds are required and will be obligated in fiscal year 1981.

In a recent letter to me, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs stated:

Failure to provide these funds in the fiscal year 1981 appropriation will result in a gap in time between the completion of phase 1 and the initiation of phase 2.

To date, all parties involved in the progressive development of this project have not only maintained momentum in the development of the project, but it has been possible to substantially improve the overall schedule. The current projected phase 2 award date of April 1981 illustrates this as compared to an earlier September-October 1981 schedule. At this time, it is estimated that an additional \$4,250,000 would be required

due to a delay in the phase 2 construction award until October 1981.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we should allow this escalation in cost to occur. The passage of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) will preclude the needless expenditure of these funds.

I strongly support the Hammerschmidt amendment and urge my colleagues to vote for it. •

• Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the ranking minority member of our committee, the very able JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT.

The new hospital at Little Rock has been justified. It has been carefully reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget and most of the funds have already been appropriated. The Administrator has assured the chairman of the committee, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT that the funds are needed in fiscal year 1981 and has planned for some time to award the contract for phase 2 of the construction in April 1981. It makes no sense at all to have the project stand still for 6 months to a year. Should that happen, not only would veterans be adversely affected, but the delay would cost the Government another \$4.5 million. This would be a waste of taxpayers' money.

The Veterans' Administration's construction budget request has been cut more than \$143 million by the Appropriations Committee. These include: Brooklyn, \$2,614,000; Denver, \$42,000,000; Little Rock, \$14,240,000; Miami, \$26,650,000; Seattle, \$15,910,000; and Sepulveda, \$3,686,000. Other projects were cut because they are considered low priority. These include: Atlanta, \$1,540,000; Danville, \$5,600,000; Hines Supply Depot expansion, \$8,800,000; and Long Beach, \$12,171,000. It should be noted that the Long Beach project has been a very high priority project so far as our committee is concerned and it has been pending for more than 12 years.

The Administrator is appealing all of these cuts in the Senate, except for the Seattle project. He informs us that the funds can be used if appropriated and it is my hope the other body will proceed to appropriate all of the funds. Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT's amendment would only restore the \$14,240,000 cut for the Little Rock Medical Center. He does not seek to restore the other cuts made by the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman from Arkansas has worked tirelessly for this project. Through his efforts the Veterans' Administration and the Office of Management and Budget recognized the need to proceed with the project. That accomplishment is no small task and for Congress not to fund the project on time would create a needless and costly delay in the completion of the project. This is not very cost effective.

The Administrator has informed Mr. ROBERTS and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT that to date, "all parties involved in the progressive development of this project have not only maintained momentum in the development of the project, but it has been possible to substantially improve the overall schedule." This being the

case, we should get on with completing the project by supporting the Hammerschmidt amendment. •

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was intending to offer an amendment adding funding to the bill for the construction of a nursing care facility at the Veterans' Administration hospital complex in Wichita. However, I believe that the issue can be clarified by colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND). The project authorization was requested by the Veterans' Administration and has now been approved by the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, both here in the House and in the Senate. By the way, I would mention that this construction project is supported by both the VFW and the Disabled American Veterans.

The amendment would add \$6.8 million to the section of the bill providing funds for major construction projects. It would cover costs associated with design and construction of the nursing care facility for fiscal 1981 including the funds necessary for construction of an underground drain culvert to eliminate flooding conditions at the medical center.

Before I get into a discussion of the need for this project, I think it is most important that my colleagues understand some of the background. When the Appropriations Committee was working on the bill before us today, the project this amendment seeks to fund had not been authorized by our Veterans' Affairs Committee. But, as explained in materials provided me by the VA, this occurred "through an apparent oversight." In fact, the Veterans' Affairs Committee mistakenly included among the construction items authorized as "major construction" a smaller project at the Wichita VA complex which under the governing statute did not require committee approval. That certainly highlights the confusion which necessitates the amendment I am offering today.

Now, however, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and its counterpart in the Senate have approved the necessary authorizing resolutions for this project. And the Veterans' Administration has indicated once again its desire to have this project funded this year. Otherwise, it will throw the VA's priority funding process—which I understand was developed in conjunction with the Congress—out of line. I would also mention that failure to include this project's funding would further hinder the credibility of our Government. In March of this year, notification went out to Kansas from our Veterans' Administration that this project had been approved and that initial construction contracts would be issued in October 1980, the first month of the upcoming fiscal year. Without this amendment, that would not be permitted to occur and the cost of this project would be forced upward with inflation.

In closing, I do want to point out that this project is a needed and necessary one. As the Veterans' Administration advised me, the facility would increase by 60 the number of nursing care beds in VA District 22. These would be the only VA nursing care beds at the Wichita hospital. As a point of reference, I would note that nursing care beds available in other hospitals in region 22 presently meet only 57 percent of estimated need. Among the other nursing care facilities funded in the bill before us is one that would add space in a district where 66 percent of estimated need is currently met.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) if he might comment to me on what he believes the status of the Wichita project to be.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I know of no Member who has followed a project as assiduously as he has. I realize the intense interest that the gentleman's area and the gentleman's State has in this project.

At the time we marked up this bill the Wichita project was not authorized. It is now authorized by the Committees on Veterans' Affairs.

One of the problems we had, as the distinguished gentleman realizes, is that the Veterans' Administration announced this project last spring, and that gave us some concern. That was before the Congress authorized it or acted on the 1981 appropriation bill. We thought perhaps the Congress ought to have some input into it, particularly since the moneys are coming from the Congress.

I can envision a scenario in which postponing the funding for what is in effect two projects will not really cause a delay. The VA indicates that both projects are being designed in-house, so that effort will proceed notwithstanding the final outcome of the 1981 appropriation.

The drainage construction project is scheduled to be funded at the beginning of fiscal year 1981. Because the estimated cost of that project is \$2.1 million, it can be funded from the minor construction account. That is what we will suggest to the VA, and that is what we are telling them to do. So in effect, the drainage construction contract can be let and we can tell them to go ahead and do that.

Because the nursing home care unit construction contract was scheduled to be awarded in September 1981, the project can be funded in 1982, with little if any delay.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's response.

The two parts of this project are important to the veterans of my particular area. Basically, what the gentleman has told me is that the project can really proceed by using the minor construction part of the process w/ respect to the drainage part of the project, and the remaining part of the project can be appropriated next year, with no delay?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAGEDORN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAGEDORN: Page 33, beginning on line 5, strike out "*: Provided, further,*" and all that follows through line 9 and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment deletes the language in this bill which restricts the size of the new Minneapolis VA Hospital to 649 beds. It would not add one dime to the fiscal 1981 appropriations—the \$15 million necessary for design and architectural fees is already in the budget and the bill as reported. What my amendment would do, Mr. Chairman, is assure that the present and future health care needs of the veterans are adequately met.

Joining me today in offering this amendment are the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. ROBERTS, and the ranking minority member of that committee, Mr. HAMERSCHMIDT.

Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that the need for a new VA hospital is uncontested. All parties are firmly committed to replacing the existing facility. The oldest section of the medical center was built in 1927, and while improvements have been made over the years, approximately 40 percent of the operating beds are still located in three of the original six buildings of the 1927 vintage. The need to expand and modernize the facility to meet the medical needs of veterans is clear.

The controversy that we are engaged in today concerns the size of the new hospital. The Veterans' Administration has proposed an 845-bed facility—725 hospital beds and 120 nursing home care beds. It is interesting to note that the total number of hospital beds to be constructed under the VA's plan is less than the present operating level of 738 hospital beds. The Metropolitan Health Board, an unelected body limited to a seven-county region in Minnesota, wants to restrict the size of the medical center to 609 hospital beds and 40 nursing home care beds. It was upon this recommendation that the Appropriations Committee adopted the limiting language.

The Veterans' Administration recommendation was based on a model developed by the General Accounting Office and was made in conjunction with the professional staff and management at the VA facility. While that initial 1978 study was still in progress, the GAO recommended a revised bed-sizing formula, using more current data, and as a result, the initial 1985 bed requirements were changed. It is clear that the VA procedure for determining the size of the hospital was long, involved, and thorough with a full review of all pertinent and relevant facts.

Yet, despite this fact, the health board has been successful in promoting the parochial interest of the seven-county

metropolitan area around the Twin Cities. But the Minneapolis VA Center has responsibilities that extend far beyond the seven-county metropolitan area of Minneapolis. The medical center serves veterans in a service area of five States—Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and North and South Dakota. In all, the VA Medical Center in Minneapolis provides medical care to a total veterans population of approximately 800,000. Currently, the medical center is experiencing in excess of 200,000 outpatient visits annually. It is inconceivable to me that a local health systems agency, whose scope is limited to a seven-county area, could adequately take into account the interests of veterans from a five-State region—even if it wanted to.

Yet this is what the health board claims to have done. Unfortunately, the board's concern regarding the size of the replacement hospital is centered on several misconceptions.

First, the health board maintains that if the VA used more recent community lengths of stay data rather than the 1974 data used, the projections for the number of beds needed would be reduced. In fact, as I mentioned, the VA has made several modifications to improve the bed-size model, including the use of more recent length of stay data and VA discharge rates for the most recent 4-year period. When the VA applied these modifications in May of this year, using 1976 community length of stay data with 4 years of trended discharge rates, the result was a projection for more beds, not fewer. In other words, if the VA based its request for beds on data suggested by the Health Board, more beds would be required.

With respect to the nursing home care bed levels, the Health Board has misinterpreted both the nursing home care feature of the hospital bed-sizing formula as well as the purpose of the nursing care facility itself. The GAO never intended the nursing home care feature of the hospital bed-sizing formula to adequately account for all nursing home care needs. Its only intent was to identify those nursing home care beds which patients hospitalized at the VA Medical Center could use if this alternative were available.

The VA is planning to assure a 20-percent share of the overall veteran need in this area. Under the planning model used by the VA, Medical District No. 18's share of VA nursing home care beds in fiscal 1987 is 328 beds. The programmed beds for the new veterans facility are essential, therefore, to complement the 169 existing beds in the district.

□ 1350

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. HAGEDORN) has expired.

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Chairman, I object. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota

(Mr. HAGEDORN), but first I want to voice my strong support for the amendment before the committee.

I now yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEDORN. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to complete my statement.

Mr. Chairman, contrary to the health board's understanding, the nursing care facility is not intended to be a prehospitalization nursing center but rather is to be used for post-hospitalization services for veterans anticipating relocation to a more permanent home. In my judgment, the 120-bed proposal is more than reasonable. Even with these beds, Medical District No. 18 will still have a nursing care unit bed total substantially below the VA's projected 1987 needs.

Going beyond the central merits of this issue, Mr. Chairman, the action of the Appropriations Committee would establish a dangerous precedent of permitting State and local health planning agencies to interfere with the traditional responsibility of the VA health care delivery system. As mandated by law, the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees are authorized to approve by resolution all major construction of VA medical facilities. And both committees have done just that.

On April 24 the House Committee passed its resolution authorizing the construction of an 845 bed medical center, not a 649-bed facility that the Metropolitan Health Board calls for. Who are we going to listen to as we make decisions about the health care of our Nation's veterans? I suggest we take our advice from the appropriate Congressional committees and those in the executive branch most capable of assessing the needs of veterans, not a local health systems agency consumed by local interests. I am pleased to note that both the chairman and ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee share my concern and I trust they will speak on this issue themselves shortly.

One of the arguments that has been made for letting the committee language stand is that we are dealing with a local issue which should be resolved by the local officials and Congressmen. But this is not merely a local issue. It has national significance because it concerns the health care of our Nation's veterans and the procedures whereby we assure their health care. If we do not adopt this amendment, we will have local health systems agencies all over the country dictating policy on the health care provided to veterans from areas far larger than those within the jurisdiction of the agency.

America's commitment to its veterans should be and is unbending. The action by the Appropriations Committee is the first attack on the integrity of the national commitment that we have to our veterans and their health care system. The need for an 845-bed facility has been shown and documented with the latest available data. The Congress, through its appropriate committees, has spoken, and

the Veterans' Administration, charged with the responsibility of administering and coordinating the health care of our veterans, has thoroughly studied the matter. In my judgment, it would be improper for a local health systems agency to dictate the design of the new hospital, particularly when a careful review of all the facts is unsupportive of its position.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hagedorn amendment to H.R. 7631.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement and contribution to this issue, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no issue here with regard to whether we need a hospital. I think everybody agrees with that. This Minneapolis VA hospital happens to be one of the leading health facilities in the Nation, and we should certainly maintain this quality. But we want to construct at this particular time, after all of this waiting, a model facility. I have long supported this particular objective, and I want to see an adequate facility planned and constructed. We all know the problems of trying to redesign and reconstruct an inadequate health care facility. The real issue here is what the projected needs are in the future. I submit that they are quite substantial, with the era of Vietnam veterans and the unique problems that they have, and an aging veteran population. A model facility should be constructed to replace the hospital as well as a facility that has adequate nursing-care qualities.

We do not have the quantity or quality of veterans' nursing care now in the Midwest area. This would bring it up to the level that the VA has recommended and which I support.

I just want to point out that I generally have been a strong supporter of HSA's. The Metropolitan Health Board in our area fills that role, and they have generally done a good job. In this instance, under an A-95 review, a voluntary process in which the MHB submitted their proposal to the VA, the timeframe provided apparently was not adequate to complete a thorough analysis. In my judgment, they have recommended an inadequate VA facility to address the needs of veterans.

I think the ultimate decision is the Congress and this particular committee of the whole. I think we take the HSA's advice and examine it. Some of the proposals that the MHB have brought forth are good proposals and I agree with them. But others are not appropriate. And obviously the size recommendation is one that they should be faulted for because it will not adequately meet veterans health needs.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by Mr. HAGEDORN of Minnesota. The issue here is far greater than the simple question of whether we will build a hospital with 845 beds versus the Appropriations Commit-

tee recommendation of 649 beds. The issue is much more complex.

The critical question is whether the Congress will continue to fulfill its obligation to our Nation's veterans as we have done for so many years through the current budget process or whether we will change that procedure and now begin to make decisions affecting veterans health care needs based on recommendations of local health planning agencies. In my view, the budget procedure we have operated under for so long, and so effectively, is the better way to proceed. Therefore, we must support the Hagedorn amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand the reasons for the health planning agencies' recommendation to reduce beds in Minneapolis. I gather a number of factors, including mismanagement, have created excess hospital beds in the immediate Minneapolis area, but I can assure my colleagues of one thing. The Veterans' Administration did not contribute to the excess beds.

On the contrary, during the last 12 years the Veterans' Administration has reduced beds throughout the Nation by more than 27,000. If this amendment is defeated, and the Appropriations Committee recommendation is allowed to stand, in 1985 when the proposed new replacement hospital is scheduled to become operational, it will, in my view, be inadequate to take care of the needs of the veterans in this region of the country. My colleagues should understand that veterans throughout the region are admitted to the Minneapolis hospital. It does not care only for veterans in the immediate Minneapolis area, as the gentleman from Minnesota has already pointed out.

We cannot afford to misjudge the demand for health care in VA hospitals within the next few years. Everyone understands that more than 12 million veterans of World War II will be 65 years of age or older by 1985. The demand for care will be overwhelming. It would be a tragic mistake if we decide now to reduce the bed level at this facility and be unable to care for all veterans who need care on the day the hospital is scheduled to open.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hagedorn amendment. In doing so you will assure the veterans of our country of our continuing commitment to care for those who had borne the battle.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support that we have received on this. I will just point out that, on this amendment, the veteran vote is "aye," the planning vote should be "aye," and the cost-saving vote is "aye." I would hope that my colleagues would agree and support an adequate facility in this particular area to one of the leading VA programs in this Nation, one that we can be proud of and one that will meet the projected needs of veterans in this five-State area. The A-95 is a good process. We have their input. That does not mean that we have to let it dictate exactly what we are going to do. I would hope that we could address this and start planning a model facility. The

record is replete with inadequate facilities that have been planned, and the veterans' needs go unmet. I think this is not the place to argue what the policy should be with regard to veterans' health care needs. That policy has been made. It is one that we can follow in terms of developing facilities to meet that need.

As Minnesota's Fourth District Representative which encompasses a large part of the Twin Cities metropolitan area, I have taken a strong interest in this VA hospital project and followed closely the entire planning process. In the past weeks, I have also had an opportunity to review carefully both the Veterans' Administration's bed-sizing estimate and the Metropolitan Health Board's A-95 review of this project. From my review, I am firmly convinced that we must make every effort to construct a model facility in Minneapolis in accordance with the VA's estimated needs. Naturally, I was very disappointed to learn of the Appropriation Committee's decision to adopt the Metropolitan Health Board's recommendation to limit the hospital to 649 beds.

The rider attached to this bill stipulating a 649-bed total is inadequate. A 649-bed hospital is too small to adequately meet Upper Midwest veterans' demands. By comparison, it is almost 200 beds below the VA's bed-sizing estimate of 845 beds that was endorsed by the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees. I might further add that the VA recently completed a revised bed-sizing estimate for the Minneapolis VA project based on 1990 needs that indicates that a more appropriate bed total really might be in the neighborhood of 905 beds. I think these significantly larger bed-sizing estimates done by the VA, certainly the most experienced planner of large VA hospitals, cast severe doubt on the adequacy of the 649-bed proposal as submitted by the Metropolitan Health Board.

I feel strongly that this body should also be made aware of some of the reasoning behind the local review board's proposal. The Metropolitan Health Board made several assumptions that I feel are of questionable validity and allowed them to significantly reduce their bed-sizing proposal. First, the Metropolitan Health Board assumed that younger veterans and veterans in the 46 to 65 age group would continue to use the VA facility at their present rate. The VA on the other hand, using statistics collected over many years of hospital use studies, assumes that veterans will significantly increase their use of the VA hospital facilities as they grow older. I personally feel that the VA's assumption in this case seems more logical.

Another questionable Metropolitan Health Board assumption is one regarding the nursing care facility. The VA designated 120 nursing care beds for the new facility in order to provide a much needed long-term, extended care facility and bring the districtwide number of VA program nursing home beds closer to the figure called for by VA guidelines. The Metropolitan Health Board, however, misinterpreted the purpose of the

nursing care facility to be a short-term intermediate care facility to serve the immediate pre- and post-hospitalization needs of veterans using the Minneapolis hospital facility. The MHB therefore designated only 40 beds for the nursing care facility as called for in the GAO bed-sizing model. I can assure you that if this reduction of 80 nursing care beds takes place, veterans in the Upper Midwest will face a severe setback in the nursing care area. It is ironic to note that in 1977, prior to the hospital replacement project, the VA submitted similar plans to the Metropolitan Health Board for a large extended care nursing facility and received no negative comments during the allotted project review period. The Metropolitan Health Board's only objections to this nursing care facility have come now, as the VA has tried to consolidate the nursing care facility with the hospital project in an effort to reduce construction costs.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that by detailing the shortcomings of these Metropolitan Health Board assumptions you can better understand the flaws in their analysis and the unacceptably low bed total to which this rider will hold the Minneapolis VA hospital. If we allow this rider to stay attached to the HUD-independent agencies appropriation, I think we will end up with a hospital in our area that will not meet veterans' needs. Supporters of this 649-bed proposal have argued that the hospital can always be added to if more beds are found to be needed. I submit that this is a bad way to keep hospital costs down. Any homeowner who has added a room to his house can tell you that the costs of adding the extra room were way out of proportion with the initial per-room cost. I think this extra cost pattern would certainly hold true with hospital construction, only it would probably be much more accentuated.

Certainly we can avoid a major error on this project by rejecting the unrealistic and inappropriate bed-sizing figure. Approving this 649-bed limit would only be a disservice to the veterans of the Upper Midwest and result in us being asked to appropriate more for an addition to the hospital later on. The way to save money on this project is to select the appropriate figure today and in this instance the experience and know-how of the VA should prevail.

On this amendment, the veteran vote is "aye"; the planning vote is "aye"; the cost-saving vote is "aye"; and the good government vote is "aye."

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

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GUYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable Tom HAGEDORN, in his amendment to strike the restricting language of H.R. 7631 as it relates to the replacement of a VA medical center in Minneapolis, Minn. It is my understanding that the entire Minnesota delegation, with the exception of one Member, supports this amendment. While this institution is

physically located in the district of Mr. Sabo, it is an institution that serves veterans from the entire State of Minnesota, western Wisconsin, northern Iowa, the States of North and South Dakota, and even beyond. My concern is not parochial—we have 30,100,000 veterans in the United States—their future needs should have our concern now. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable RAY ROBERTS, that it would be a tragic mistake to permit a local and parochial health systems agency to dictate bed sizing of VA facilities which serve a far greater geographic area than the area with which the local health planners are concerned.

In the past 14 days, I have spoken to American Legion conventions in Ohio and Iowa. Legionnaires of both States emphatically voiced opposition to any reduction to the number of beds in the Minneapolis facility. It would be shortsighted and a disservice to those who served their country.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) has expired.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable Tom HAGEDORN, and the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable RAY ROBERTS, to strike the language from H.R. 7631 which limits the planning, design, and construction of a replacement VA medical center in Minneapolis, Minn., not to exceed 649 hospitals and nursing home care beds.

This large medical center serves a much greater area than the Twin Cities metropolitan area, and it would be a tragic mistake to set in concrete in 1980 a hospital that would be inadequate to care for the eligible veterans who would be served by this outstanding institution in 1985. This is what the Congress would be doing unless we adopt the Hagedorn-Roberts amendment.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Hagedorn-Roberts amendment currently before this body raises several basic issues.

The President of the United States, as well as both legislative bodies, has strongly supported the veterans medical program as a distinct and separate system solely for the benefit of veterans. To permit a local health planning group to

d dictate the bed sizing of new or replacement hospitals would, in effect, place the VA health care program under the Department of Health and Human Services—formerly HEW. This must not and cannot happen.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the Hagedorn-Roberts amendment.

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

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

Mr. KAZEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement. These hospitals and this care are the exclusive property of the veterans of this country, and that is where they ought to remain and everybody else should keep their hands off of them except the Veterans' Administration. I applaud the gentleman for his support of this amendment and I hope that it passes.

□ 1400

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the controversy surrounding the Hagedorn amendment verses the Sabo rider (attached to the HUD-independent agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1981) essentially involve two differing federally mandated health planning systems and winds up asking this body to determine the exact number of beds to be included in the Minneapolis Veterans' Administration replacement hospital.

First, we have the Health Planning and Resources Development Act (Public Law 93-641) which Congress passed in 1974. The act is designed to assist State and local health planners in controlling capital expenditures and to regulate the number of hospital and nursing home beds in the local area by requiring a "certificate of need" for facilities desiring to add more beds. Thus, local health planners have the final authority to approve or disapprove the addition of new non-Federal beds in the local health service area.

Second, Congress had charged the Veterans' Administration and the Veterans' Committee with providing quality medical service to veterans. Federal hospitals, such as veterans hospitals, are exempt from the Health Planning Act, as their mission is special and extends beyond local and State boundaries.

The Minnesota delegation requested that the Minneapolis VA voluntarily participate in the local health planning process during the planning stages of the Minneapolis VA hospital replacement facility. Although VA was not required to participate, it did cooperate with the local review. The local health planning agency set forth seven recommendations in their report and VA accepted many of these recommendations. The controversy then, lies in the number of acute care and nursing home care beds as recommended by either the VA health planners or the local health planners.

While there are many items in dispute over whose statistics are best, the one

item not in dispute is the critical need for a replacement hospital facility in Minneapolis. The Minneapolis VA hospital is one of the three most antiquated VA hospitals in the country and is in desperate need of replacement. Both my colleagues, Mr. SABO and Mr. HAGEDORN agree on the need for a replacement facility.

The items in dispute seem to center around which planning body used the most recent statistics and which planning body was able to most carefully consider future projections, such as age, veterans populations, length of stays and facilities usage—all of which is, at best, a guessing game. We can examine each planning body's use of the varying statistics and would probably come up with an entirely different number of beds. Frankly, I find good arguments on both sides of this statistical guessing game.

In my own examination of the varying data used by both planning bodies, I do take exception to one item that I believe was not thoroughly understood by the local health planners as it related to veterans. The local health planners assumed that aging veterans—over 65—would use community health facilities as they become eligible for medicare benefits. In my judgment, only when medicare begins to pay for 100 percent of all health care benefits, are veterans likely to choose the facility closest to their home. Even then, veterans may still have more confidence in the VA facilities and service. Therefore, I believe the local health planners made an unwise assumption that aging veterans will choose a non-Federal facility over a VA facility because of eligibility of medicare benefits.

The issue can be further boiled down to the nursing home bed controversy, as the current VA hospital has 738 hospital beds and the new VA proposal calls for 725 hospital beds. The nursing home beds would be the addition. In my judgment, the local health planners' lack of consideration for aging veterans use of VA facilities is the same problem behind the discrepancy in the number of nursing home beds—120 versus 40. VA planners want to assume a 20-percent share of the overall veteran need in any one VA medical district. Based on the systemwide VA nursing home care bed projection, the Minneapolis VA district's share of nursing home care beds is 328 beds in fiscal year 1987. The district currently has 169 beds. With the addition of 120 nursing home beds planned for the Minneapolis facility, the district will still fall short.

The Sabo rider language also urges the VA to establish an outpatient clinic at the U.S. Air Base in Duluth. VA's criteria for the establishment of an outpatient clinic is 200,000 veterans. The Duluth area has 60,000 veterans. If Congress chooses to mandate a change in the criteria for an outpatient clinic, the Veterans' Affairs Committees should have an opportunity to review such a change.

Finally, putting all the statistics aside, the overriding issue here, is the precedent this body wishes to establish. It seems to me that unless the local planners have presented incontrovertible fig-

ures, we will be setting a dangerous precedent if we do not accept the Hagedorn amendment. I do not believe the local planners have presented incontrovertible figures.

We have charged the Veterans' Administration and our Veterans' Committee with providing medical service to veterans. Local planners have a different mission. Until they are given authority and resources to plan for VA hospital facilities and services, we ought to support the VA and our authorizing committee. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Hagedorn amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. HAGEDORN).

I would hope other Members who want to speak on this could confine their remarks to a few minutes. We are trying to finish this bill by 3 o'clock. We have a good chance to do it. The opposition to the position of this committee has been well addressed by now. Most Members have spoken. I would hope that others who want to get in would confine their remarks as much as possible.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that this is the first time that I can remember that a Member has taken action to restrict the size of a VA hospital in his hometown. He does not want to abolish VA hospitals at all. He is not making any effort here to change the concept of Veterans' Administration hospitals at all. What he is doing, in my judgment, is trying to put some sense into the establishment of hospitals in areas where there is overbedding. I think that the gentleman from Minnesota has carefully weighed the facts. He has been serving this committee now for a couple of years. I know of no one who is so much in attendance, constantly in attendance, at these committee hearings, works as hard and is as concerned as he is about matters that come before this subcommittee.

As I have indicated, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) has carefully weighed the facts, and his recommendation is, and we put it into the bill, that the replacement VA medical center at Minneapolis not exceed 649 hospital and nursing home care beds. That, Mr. Chairman, is a rather courageous decision. I know it is not a popular thing to do. But in my judgment, the Federal Government and the VA can no longer afford to make decisions regarding health care facilities in a vacuum. That is exactly what we are trying to prevent. That is exactly what the gentleman from Minnesota is trying to do. We cannot talk about balancing budgets while we are building excess hospital beds.

On another point: This particular hospital, the hospital in Minneapolis, I think this is the first hospital that is being built in accordance with the advance planning fund that we established a couple of years ago for the construction of VA hospitals. One of the reasons why the VA got into the advance planning fund was to be assured that the cost estimate on building a hospital is accurate. It has been horrendous. It has been horrendous up until this particular

hospital. I hope that the \$221 million, if the gentleman's amendment is accepted, I hope the \$221 million will build the kind of hospital that they say that they can build.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I have made my point. I admire the position taken by my colleague on this subcommittee, and I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be defeated and that the restriction in this bill will remain.

Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Hagedorn amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to increase the number of hospital and nursing care beds for the proposed new veterans' hospital at Fort Snelling, Minn. We have before us an opportunity to lay the groundwork for an adequate medical facility for thousands of veterans living in the upper Midwest. For years, these men and women have had to endure the dismal conditions of one of the most used hospital structures within the entire VA system. While I am in strong agreement with the Appropriations Committee's decision to provide planning funds in 1981 for the new hospital, I cannot support the restriction on the size of the facility to 609 hospital and 40 nursing care beds.

There is every reason to believe that within a few short years, the veterans again would be underserved by an over-crowded and outdated medical center, much like the present facility. So we must recognize that as we consider this appropriation, we are preparing not only for the present veterans population, but a future one as well. Studies show that by the 1990's the number of veterans will have tripled, indicating the need for a larger facility than the one proposed by the committee. It should be remembered that the Fort Snelling Hospital draws patients from not only the Twin Cities area, but also from Iowa, Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana.

We owe it to these veterans to make a wise decision here today. Minnesota has a nationwide reputation for providing excellent medical care. The Mayo Clinic, for example, is located in my own district and the University of Minnesota is situated in Minneapolis. Patients from around the country also come to the Twin Cities and other Minnesota communities for medical care at many other public and private hospitals and clinics. So I recognize the need to avoid an expensive duplication of services between these fine medical facilities and the veterans' hospital. But the VA hospital offers a unique kind of service for America's veterans. These men and women should not be short-changed by short-sightedness. I urge all Members of this body to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore the 845-bed provision for the Minneapolis VA Medical Center. In doing so, very frankly, I am troubled by what I see as a Hobson's

choice between equally questionable figures, those of the Veterans' Administration and those of the Metropolitan Health Board. Our colleague from Minneapolis (Mr. SABO) has done an outstanding service to the Congress and the Veterans' Administration, by forcing a review and detailed consideration of the number of beds to be dedicated to acute care and nursing home care.

I have the greatest respect for the very thoughtful and considerate manner in which he has approached this matter.

□ 1410

I have here a whole folder of documentation representing both viewpoints, which I have studied thoroughly. Frankly, I question these figures.

The question of the construction of this hospital comes down to four basic issues:

Acute care beds.

Nursing home care beds.

Shared medical resources.

And the cost of providing services.

In an appropriations bill, we are limited in the choices that we can make. There ought to be a wider latitude for resolving this matter than the forum in which we are now confined. We can resolve the question today on the basis of these four issues:

Acute care beds—750,000 veterans in 5-State areas are now served by an inadequate, aging, and grossly inefficient medical center. We cannot expect hospitals in the seven-county area to accommodate needs of that many veterans. The VA is treating a growing number of veterans with service-connected disease or complications. Current 4-year discharge rate data suggest that the 725 beds of acute care proposed by the VA is probably a conservative figure though, still, admittedly speculative.

Nursing home care beds—the formula for providing nursing care is: Forty percent of veterans' needs to be met by community nursing homes on fee basis; 20 percent in State nursing homes; 40 percent in VA nursing homes. The VA now provides 328 nursing care beds in the VA medical district, 18 served by the Minneapolis VA hospital and estimates it needs 120 more.

Again, these numbers are only a projection. Probably the best argument for the 120-bed figure—formulas aside—is the fact that WW II veterans are now nearing average age of 58 to 60 and entering a period in their lives when more and more intensive health care will be needed.

My sense of the issues is that there is no exact science for determining the number of long-term-care beds needed for the Nation's aging veteran population. The best answer probably is, in a word: More. The nagging question is: Who should provide that care, and what percentage by each class of provider?

The VA and Metro Health Board studies do not adequately answer that question. However, if the Congress is to err, it should probably err on the side of the veteran.

Shared medical resources—a criticism of VA by the Metro Health Board that appeared to have merit, at first.

I asked the VA for more detailed information about sharing of resources by the Minneapolis VA hospital and others throughout the United States. The VA report shows cooperative arrangements with seven hospitals and medical research institutions in the Metro area and out of State.

Nationally 99 VA hospitals have sharing agreements with 240 community health care providers at cost to VA of over \$20 million.

One of the most important results of this whole process is the commitment of the Minneapolis VA Medical Center to cooperate with area hospitals in this matter of sharing resources.

Cost of medical care—The most persuasive argument for the proposed VA Medical Center is the VA record in controlling hospital and medical/surgical costs.

The VA, during the period 1977-78, provided medical/surgical care at 7 percent less than the cost of such care in the private sector.

Although the VA patient generally has a longer hospital stay, the VA cost per patient day is substantially less than that of community hospitals.

The alternative to direct VA-provided care for veterans is contracting out. Given the increasing need for veterans' health services, the Federal Government should do all it can to contain costs. It appears to me, on the basis of the facts, that one of the best ways of doing that is to update and expand the current VA Medical Center at Minneapolis.

On balance, with due consideration for the reservations I have already expressed, and absent a proper legislative forum for resolution of these various questions, I believe the House would do well to approve the 845-bed figure and keep a steady hand on the VA to cooperate fully with the rest of the Twin City area medical community on shared services.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the gentleman's statement. I appreciate very much the stand of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

If this were a local hospital, I would certainly say that we ought to restrict it to Minneapolis and St. Paul. There are more veterans in Iowa and Ohio to be covered by this hospital than there are in all of Minnesota. This is a regional hospital. It is something that is not feasible, not a viable operation below 800 beds and the 845 beds was decided by the Veterans' Administration. It has been researched, as the gentleman has said, even the General Accounting Office came up with a recommendation

and I certainly hope we will go along with the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota to strike the language from H.R. 7631 pertaining to the limitation placed on planning, design, or construction of a replacement VA Medical Center in Minneapolis, Minn., not to exceed 649 hospital and nursing home care beds. As the gentleman has indicated, the Veterans' Administration has planned and justified the construction of a total of 845 beds in this replacement medical center. This would include 304 medical-care beds, 54 neurological beds, 277 surgical beds, 90 psychiatric beds, and 120 nursing home care beds.

Members should know that the 120 nursing home-care beds are the only increase proposed by the VA, and this type of bed is urgently needed for aging veterans and should be constructed. If this replacement hospital is constructed with nothing but hospital beds included under the limiting language of H.R. 7631, this will be a reduction of approximately 100 hospital beds below its current hospital bed level. If the 120 nursing home care beds are included within the constraints of 649 beds, this will be a reduction of over 200 hospital beds below its current hospital bed capacity.

Mr. Chairman, this medical center serves a far greater area than the metropolitan twin cities. It is the tertiary health care center for the entire State of Minnesota, as well as parts of North and South Dakota, northern Iowa, and western Wisconsin. Patients are frequently admitted from as far away as Wyoming and eastern Montana. This hospital renders outstanding medical care to veterans in over a 79 county area—not just the 7 counties covered by the health system agency that plans hospital beds for the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area.

Since the development of the estimate by the Veterans' Administration for inclusion in the fiscal year 1981 budget request, several modifications have been made to improve the bed-sizing model agreed upon by the VA and the General Accounting Office. More recent application of these modifications in the current year to the proposed VA medical center in Minneapolis would result in more rather than fewer beds.

Not only has the Minneapolis Metropolitan Health Board misjudged the impact of updated data on VA bed needs, they also misunderstand that the model used to determine the size of this hospital does not just rearrange hospital beds. It has redistributed 201 hospital beds to nonhospital requirements as follows:

Nursing care—the equivalent of 40 beds;

Outpatient care—the equivalent of 130 beds; and

Alternatives to hospital care—the equivalent of 31 beds.

The construction of this new medical center at a total of 845 hospital and nursing home-care beds is fully justified and is the absolute minimum required

to render care to veterans in the area serviced by it.

It would be a sad mistake to legislate veterans health care facilities based on a local health system's or planning agency's decision. The appropriations bill, H.R. 7631, would do this. If there is a surplus of beds in the Twin Cities, or in any other urban area of the country, it is these same health planners who have created the overbedding. They now propose that the VA facilities, which service the veteran population in a far greater geographic area than just the Twin Cities, bail them out for their past blunders.

It will not add anything to the budget. A vote for the Hagedorn amendment will serve notice to the Department of Health and Human Services—formerly HEW—that Congress recognizes the need to make certain that in 1985 and thereafter when our 12 million World War II veterans reach the average age of 65 years or older, we will have adequate beds to take care of them in time of need.

This issue is of primary concern to every national service organization. It is the No. 1 issue today with the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the World War I Veterans of America, and the Paralyzed Veterans of America. My colleagues should be aware that a no vote on the Hagedorn amendment will be viewed by the veterans of this Nation as an antiveteran vote. A vote in support of the Hagedorn amendment will assure the veterans of our Nation that we will not have health planners who are tied directly to the Department of Health and Human Services, or HEW, involved in our business.

We must adopt the Hagedorn amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment that will delete the language relating to the limitation on the number of beds in the proposed replacement Veterans' Administration Medical Center at Minneapolis, Minn.

The Veterans' Administration, in the fiscal year 1981 budget presented in January of this year, requested funds to build an 845-bed replacement hospital in Minneapolis. The decision to construct an 845-bed facility rather than a 500-bed or 1,000-bed facility, Mr. Chairman, resulted from the application of methodology agreed upon by the Veterans' Administration and the General Accounting Office. It is based upon data that has proved to represent an accurate gauge of the needs of the veteran population it is proposed to serve.

On April 24 of this year, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, after considerable deliberation and further presentation by the veteran of the justification for the 845-bed facility by adoption of a formal resolution, authorized the appropriation of \$15 million to begin the construction of the 845-bed hospital.

On June 19, Mr. Chairman, the Com-

mittee on Appropriations reported the measure now before the House (H.R. 7631). The funding level requested and authorized for this facility remains intact, but the bed level was reduced from 845 to 649 beds.

The report that accompanied the bill, Mr. Chairman, indicates that the Appropriations Committee based its action on a local health planning agency's recommendation rather than on the recommendation of the Veterans' Administration.

The Twin Cities Metropolitan Council and its Metropolitan Health Board has concluded that there is a surplus of beds in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area and, therefore, proposes that the surplus be reduced at the expense of the Veterans' Administration hospital.

Unfortunately, the Appropriations Committee has accepted the recommendation of the local council and "believes them to be well-founded." Accordingly, the committee in its report, directs the VA to design a replacement facility "which does not exceed 649 hospital and nursing home care beds."

Mr. Chairman, there is considerable justification for rejecting the Appropriations Committee's limitation upon the size of the Minneapolis hospital. First of all, the appropriation for hospital construction is not reduced by one penny, despite the arbitrary elimination of 196 planned beds. Perhaps the committee's decision would have been easier to understand had it involved a substantial cut in the appropriation.

The Veterans' Administration, in its planning, Mr. Chairman, has exercised considerable restraint. The existing hospital in Minneapolis has 738 acute-care beds. The proposed replacement hospital would have 725 beds for medical care with the additional 120 beds devoted to nursing care.

The committee's recommendation would reduce the current 738 acute care beds to 609 with the planned 120 nursing care beds, so desperately needed, reduced to 40.

Also to be considered, Mr. Chairman, is the parochial nature of the study that appears to have captured the fancy of the Appropriations Committee.

The Twin Cities Metropolitan Health Board, the health system agency that recommended the 649-bed hospital, is responsible for health care planning in the seven county area of Minneapolis-St. Paul.

The Veterans' Administration hospital, although located in Minneapolis, serves the medical needs of all veterans in the State of Minnesota as well as parts of North and South Dakota, northern Iowa and western Wisconsin. While the 845 beds in the new hospital may exceed the needs of citizens in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, they are desperately needed by the sick and disabled veterans of the 72-county area of five States it will serve.

Aside from the justification for the 845 beds in this hospital, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about a far greater danger posed by the precedent which the committee's action appears to establish.

I suppose the Veterans' Administration hospital system could survive the cut proposed for this hospital. It has survived the continuing erosion of beds over the past few years. But it cannot survive, Mr. Chairman, if the alleged surplus of hospital beds in this Nation is reduced by eliminating Veterans' Administration hospital beds.

The VA hospital system was created by our predecessors as an independent health care delivery system created exclusively for the care and treatment of the Nation's veterans. It has always provided so-called second-to-none medical care more economically than community hospitals.

In accepting the views of any local health planning agency, however well meaning, we are setting a dangerous precedent that could well be sounding the death knell of the entire VA medical program. It is inconceivable that any local planning group would have the overview or the insight required to ascertain the number of hospital beds needed in a regional, not a local, medical center serving the needs of Federal beneficiaries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be approved.

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

Mr. Chairman, I first want to say that I appreciate the problems that confront the Appropriations Committee in a circumstance like this.

I rise with some degree of reluctance, because I disagree with respect to the action taken in that committee regarding the Minneapolis replacement hospital. I must confess that I do so with complete confidence in the correctness of my position.

I think we must realize that this replacement hospital came about as a result of a careful review by the VA of the need to replace that facility, the oldest part of which was built in 1927 and the newest part of which is 27 years of age.

A VA-wide assessment of medical facilities based on a scale of 0 to 100 placed this particular facility in the 98 percentile needing replacement. In other words, there were only 2 percent of VA facilities with greater need for replacement.

So the question is not replacement, but the question is the size of the replacement hospital necessary to serve the veterans in that area. This is where I find disagreement.

I refer to page 49 of the report that accompanied this bill to the floor, wherein it is stated that the committee analyzed the recommendation of the Twin Cities Council, which is the HSA in that area under the Health Planning and Resources Development Act, which, incidentally, grew out of the action of another subcommittee on which I serve, in addition to being chairman of the VA Medical Benefits and Facilities Subcommittee.

The amazing thing to me is that this HSA under existing law has absolutely no jurisdiction over VA facilities. The

reason is very simple. The HSA deals with a service population different from that of a veteran facility and it deals with the general population and their needs, whereas the VA deals with a specific constituency with entirely different needs.

The Health Systems Agency under the health planning law makes its decisions upon guidelines issued by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The VA makes its decision on the basis of guidelines issued by the VA relating to VA problems and VA needs.

I think that this situation is clear evidence of the wisdom of this Congress in excluding the VA from the jurisdiction of the Health Planning and Resources Development Act.

There were efforts made every time we considered a health planning bill to bring the VA under the control of the HSA and the entire health planning system, even under the certificate of need requirement, and this Congress has resisted those efforts. I think this is a classic example of why that was a wise decision.

□ 1420

Let me say briefly why that is so. The Minneapolis HSA deals in an area comprising seven counties. The VA service area comprises 72 counties. The area involved in the Minneapolis HSA area is 2,820 square miles. The VA catchment area is 63,707 square miles, 22 times the size of the HSA jurisdiction.

The VA population in the catchment area is 547,117 in 1979, only 310,770 of which reside and repose in the HSA jurisdictional area. That is why 845 beds were determined to be necessary to serve the needs of the larger VA catchment area and not 649 based on a circumscribed consideration of the HSA.

One might say that the objective of the Appropriations Committee to reduce expenditures is commendable and I am one who agrees with that basic approach. But if that basic approach is commendable, I am bound to say that as it is applied here, in this instance, it is being applied for the wrong reason. Therefore, the item of reduction should not be approved and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the unusual position of being here and asking my colleagues to spend less money in my State than most would want.

A few things are clear. A replacement hospital is needed. Good services are provided and will continue to be provided in the VA hospital in Minneapolis.

Why should my colleagues defeat the amendment? Let me just give them a few reasons. Let me respond to what has been said on behalf of the amendment, much of which I think is irrelevant, but a couple of things which I think are very basic.

The basic attack is on what the local health planning agency did. Some people say we should not listen to them, we should not even ask for their advice.

I will tell my colleagues I watch sometimes with irritation and sometimes with amusement as I see some of my conservative friends give the most vehement defense of centralized Washington planning that I have ever heard.

What we simply asked was that we not just listen to the bureaucrats in Washington, in the VA. When I went through my first session on this subcommittee listening to the budget presentations, there were none that ranked lower on my list of competence than the VA construction program, but we should listen to them solely, and we should not even bother hearing what the local people have to say about it. They do not know anything.

I think they do. I think they do. They cover little area, it is said, versus the area of the VA hospital, which is larger. True. True. That is true of every other hospital in our area.

The fact is this local health planning agency provides a certificate of need for every project at the University of Minnesota over \$150,000. The fact is that the patients at the University of Minnesota come from all over the world. Fewer of them come from the immediate metropolitan area than does the VA patient.

We are a health care center. Practically all of our private hospitals pull in patients from all over the country. They clearly have the capacity to look at needs beyond the immediate regional area. They did. They did. That was part of the recommendation.

Then it said the substance of the recommendation is wrong. The VA had really three parts to their original request. They asked for 845 beds. Excuse me, the VA had four parts. They wanted a nursing home of 120, 40 superskilled beds, and 80 general nursing home beds. They wanted 825 hospital beds, 609 acute, 116 nonacute beds, for a total of 825. That is what the health board examined.

They looked at the nursing home. By the admission of the people who testified on behalf of the VA, they really did not have much of a case for the extra 80 nursing home beds.

Our State is on an aggressive building program for veterans' facilities in the State of Minnesota. That had not been coordinated with what the State was doing, with what the private sector was doing.

The health board said: "We will not recommend the 80 beds until you have a well worked out plan on what the real needs of veterans are. We will recommend the 40 beds that you are asking for for superskilled facilities."

The VA asked for 116 nonacute hospital beds. The health board recommended the 416. The crux of the difference was over acute beds where the VA wanted 609 and the health board recommended 493. They looked at more current data than the VA had in their original request.

Then the VA went back with these great models, this great competence, this great study, and said that "We are going to use more current data and develop a

new model." All of a sudden there is a new model. What that new model is, I do not know. Nobody else knows. That is being used as the reason for disregarding the local health board recommendation.

The truth of the matter is their new study, if anything, reinforced what the health board had done. The VA originally had asked for 609 acute beds and the health board recommended 493. The new revised VA model, whatever it is, produced 558 acute beds, which is the heart of the controversy, a reduction of 51 from their original request, still 65 more than the health board recommended.

But lo and behold, they decided they needed a larger hospital because all of a sudden their need for nonacute beds which the health board recommended, what they asked for of 116 had grown to 229 or almost double what they originally asked for. If anything, I have serious question about the models and the data the VA is using.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. SABO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SABO. Let me just suggest we need a VA hospital, we need to do it in the most fiscally prudent manner. We need to do it in a system with local involvement. I think that is appropriate and good and that was done here.

But let me also suggest that I think the VA does a great disservice to health care for veterans in the long term by their little sort of attitude of do not let go, they do not want anyone to look at them. I think that endangers health care for veterans in the long run. I think we make a mistake if we spend unneeded dollars for construction of facilities that are really not needed. That is a wrong priority for spending the limited dollars we have available.

I received a very interesting letter from someone from a veterans' organization writing me on behalf of the Hagedorn amendment. But one of his comments was:

While we address health care in Minnesota, somehow we should be concerned over the serious shortage of nurses.

This has affected the Minneapolis VA Hospital and the soon to be completed nursing care facility at the Minnesota Veterans Home. They will have to limit admissions since they are unable to hire the nurses for staffing.

In my judgment, putting limited VA dollars to needed personnel, paying them decent salaries rather than building unneeded facilities, serves the health care needs of the veterans of this country much better. I ask my colleagues to vote in opposition to the Hagedorn amendment.

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEDORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I was interested in the gentleman's statement, but let me say the last statement about providing the personnel, this Congress has tried on a number of occasions to beef up the personnel at that facility, as well as many

others, and what happens in recent years is that it goes down to the OMB and the White House and the emphasis that we have tried to place on meeting that manpower shortage has really been blocked at those points, not at a point here in Congress.

I join with the gentleman in calling for adequate staffing of all of our medical facilities, and on at least that point we agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. OBERSTAR and by unanimous consent, Mr. SABO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Again I want to compliment the gentleman on the yeoman service he has done on this matter. In all fairness, it must be pointed out that the Veterans' Administration did not fairly and responsibly and adequately begin to look at the adequacy of its figures until the gentleman offered his amendment in subcommittee to affect the number of beds at the hospital. I think it is very, very important for the Appropriations Committee to maintain a strong hand on the Veterans' Administration and keep them in line with their estimates, which still I think are just guesses.

□ 1430

Unfortunately, we have to deal in this restrictive process. There ought to be another way of resolving the matter. The gentleman has done a great service, I think, in the long run for the Veterans' Administration by forcing them to think through their process.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comment. I have to agree with the gentleman. I think it is very unfortunate that the VA feels so threatened by having an outside agency look at their figures. I think that is fundamentally wrong.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have something here we do not see very often. That is someone who opposes the spending of money in his district. I think because it is unusual it sort of stirs in people admiration, and it ought to.

If we were talking about a facility that was going to serve only the district of the gentleman from Minnesota, under no circumstances would I vote for this amendment. However, we are not talking about a facility that is going to serve just the district of the gentleman. We are talking about a facility that is going to serve 79 counties and not just serve the gentleman's State but other States.

Mr. Chairman, what is at issue here is not money in Minnesota; it is not competence of bureaucrats. Bureaucrats are not very competent at any level in government, whether we are talking about HEW or to some extent the Veterans' Administration itself. The question is: Who is going to dictate policy in the Veterans' Administration? This idea that the Veterans' Administration did not look at this very carefully is simply not true. We held hearings in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on this subject. The Veterans' Administration put out a report on it. The OMB studied it and concluded that in fact their decision was a correct decision.

Mr. Chairman, what we are going to decide here in this vote is a very critical issue, and that issue has to do with the independence of the Veterans' Administration and the veterans' hospital system. I serve on the Veterans' Committee and I followed Tiger Teague to Congress (who was for many years here "Mr. Veteran"). If there is one issue that the veterans of this country are deeply concerned about it is the independence of the Veterans' Administration hospital system.

The question is: Are we going to allow a group of local health planners to dictate Federal policy as it relates to the building of a veterans' hospital which is going to serve a several-State area? I think the idea that we should allow local health administrators to dictate Federal policy that involves providing care across State lines is ludicrous and should absolutely be rejected by an overwhelming vote.

I urge my colleagues here today to vote yes on this amendment and in doing so, reassert the independence of the veterans' hospital system. If we are going to talk about competency in planning, it is very interesting that the people who do not want to build this hospital because of excess beds have got more excess beds in the private system under HEW than we do in the Veterans' Administration under our planning program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. GRAMM. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Let me refer to a couple of points which I believe to be grossly inadequate. It is not a question of who decides. Who decides is the Congress. Whether it is a recommendation of the VA central administration, the recommendation of a local health planning agency, the ultimate responsibility for making a decision rests with us, here. The question is do we have confidence enough to listen to more than one source.

Let me respond to a second item. It is said the only reason people are doing this is because there is an excess of health beds. Frankly, the local health planners did not look at that as a factor in making their recommendation.

I have seen all of the letters circulated by the folks who want to defend the original VA recommendation.

They say we have excess hospital beds. That is true. They were created by this health planning agency. The fact is they were created in good part to respond to the fact that historically we had overbuilt and a large part of that responsibility not resting with local planners but being the result of prior existing Federal programs.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. Chairman, let me just respond by saying we held hearings

on this issue. If people want to have the input, they had ample opportunity for that and we are interested in having a broad base input.

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

Mr. GRAMM. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. HAGEDORN. In response to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota, both the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs have already responded to this problem by recommending 845 beds. As my colleague says, it is the Congress that is going to set the policy and I think we are on the right track by accepting this amendment today.

• Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hagedorn-Roberts amendment.

First, I wish to emphasize that this amendment will not add one dime to the fiscal year 1981 appropriations—the \$15 million necessary for design and architectural fees having been included in the administration's original budget request.

Second, this replacement hospital is vital to the present and future health care needs of not only Minnesota's veteran population—but, veterans from northern Iowa, western Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

Third, if the VA Minneapolis Hospital bed level is reduced, the vast majority of veterans who are indigent and have no private insurance coverage, will either receive no care or depend on medicare/medicaid in the private sector at a cost more expensive to the American taxpayer.

The maintenance and integrity of the VA medical system is the No. 1 concern of American veterans. I urge a "yea" vote on the Hagedorn-Roberts amendment. •

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. HAGEDORN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAGEDORN), there were—ayes 33, noes 6.

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

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Veterans Administration, including planning, architectural and engineering services, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1004, 1006, 5002, 5003, 5006, 5008, 5009, and F010 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is less than \$3,000,000, \$126,928,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$26,344,000 shall be available for expenses of the Office of Construction.

Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I have to the NSF authorization on page 25 be considered at the end of all amendments and that we revert to that section for that purpose for that amendment only.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to the end of the amending process?

Mr. ERTEL. The Chairman is correct. The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

For grants to assist the several States to construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify or alter existing hospital, nursing home and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5031-5037), \$15,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1983.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Page 34, after line 3, insert the following: Grants to Affiliated Medical Schools and Other Health Manpower Training Institutions

For grants to established medical schools and other established health manpower institutions as authorized by law (38 U.S.C., subchapters II, III, and IV of chapter 82) \$25,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 1987.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to provide adequate funding for grants to established medical schools and other established health manpower institutions as authorized by Public Law 96-151, the Veterans Health Programs Extension and Improvement Act of 1979.

Public Law 96-151, enacted last December, authorized \$25 million for fiscal year 1981 for medical schools and other health manpower training institutions participating under subchapters II, III, and IV of Public Law 92-541, the Veterans' Administration Medical School Assistance and Health Manpower Training Act of 1972. This sum has not been included in the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration reported to the floor in H.R. 7631. In behalf of Wright State University Medical School in my congressional district and the 192 other health manpower institutions participating under subchapter II, III, and IV, I am respectfully urging my colleagues to give favorable consideration to this amendment.

Under the 1972 pilot program, mentioned above, assistance has been provided by the VA in the establishment of five new State medical schools; grants have been awarded 18 affiliated medical schools in 13 States and Puerto Rico; 135 grants have been made to other health manpower training institutions in 40 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; and 31 VA medical centers have been furnished funds for altering space and providing equipment for education purposes.

TRAINING PERSONNEL—PERSONNEL NEEDS AT VA HOSPITALS

The VA is not seeking extension of authority for appropriations for new grant programs under Public Law 96-151, but would work under the present authority to meet as fully as possible the commitment to the present grantees.

VA officials testifying before the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

stated that based on the level of interest expressed at the time of the passage of Public Law 96-151, "it is apparent that eligible applications representing requests of several times \$25 million would be received."

This program has proven to be extremely beneficial, both to the VA and to the affiliated institutions. In a recent report issued by the National Academy of Sciences on the affiliation of VA hospitals with medical schools, the following statement is made:

The VA can take satisfaction in the NAS findings regarding affiliations. The NAS observes that quality of patient care is enhanced by an educational environment, that the highly affiliated hospitals provide outstanding care, and that the only inadequacy of patient care detected was in non-affiliated hospitals. The NAS further notes that special medical services are possible only where affiliations exist and that other measures of increased efficiency—better staffing and reduced length of patient stay—are a matter of record.

Mr. Chairman, I again urge that my colleagues give favorable consideration to this amendment.

□ 1440

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is probably as good a place to save \$25 million as one would want to look for. The gentleman stated the matter quite precisely. During the hearings with the Veterans' Administration the question was asked whether or not in the past few years the VA has considered terminating this program, or did the VA support its reauthorization. The question was provided to Mr. COUGHLIN by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BROWN.

The Veterans' Administration's answer was:

The reauthorization contained in Public Law 96-151 was congressionally initiated. The VA did not object to its inclusion in Public Law 96-151, but we did not actively support it because of budget priorities and the national health manpower objectives of the Administration.

As the gentleman from Ohio has indicated, this program was started in 1972. The enabling legislation authorized \$25 million per year for 7 years to assist in establishing up to eight medical schools. Five new State medical schools were started, including Wright State in the gentleman's district.

The Veterans' Administration Medical School Assistance and Health Manpower Training Act of 1972 also authorized \$50 million per year for 7 years to provide grants to affiliated medical schools, other health manpower institutions, and expansion of VA hospital education and training capacities. The VA 1981 justification states that the funds previously appropriated allow for full support of all current program commitments.

If this program is opened for new commitments, it will be financed by additional Treasury borrowing. This is not a prudent thing to do at a time when both the legislative and executive branches are trying to keep the Federal budget deficit as low as possible. So, if we open it up now it is not going to be only \$25 million. It might be today, but

the cost is going to increase in this area. I suggest that this is not the time to do it. The assistance for health manpower training institutions program has been adequately provided for, and it would seem to me that this is an area in which the States should help. I would hope that the State of Ohio would pick up its share for this particular hospital.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, the purpose of the program, as the gentleman has well stated, is to provide for training for personnel for Veterans' Administration hospitals and for other purposes. I think the gentleman cannot deny that we do need some additional personnel in those Veterans' Administration hospitals; that the personnel situation is not adequately dealt with, and that one of the means of dealing with it is to enhance training for personnel for those hospitals.

□ 1450

The gentleman cannot deny that it is worth it. The benefits to those Veterans' Administration hospitals are clear, and we know that the inadequate service lies mostly in nonaffiliated hospitals; is that not correct?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, my response to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is that the VA considers this to be a program of lower priority. It does not attach the same priority that the gentleman would attach to it or that I might, under other circumstances, possibly attach to it.

Beyond that, who knows whether or not the medical personnel are going to go into the VA hospitals? They can go anywhere they want. There is no commitment on their part to go to a VA hospital, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, while they are training at least they can be a benefit to those Veterans' Administration hospitals, by the report of the Veterans' Administration itself. The service to the veterans in those hospitals that are affiliated with such institutions is superior to that of the service in nonaffiliated hospitals or hospitals which are not affiliated with those institutions.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose the amendment. This is for \$25 million, and I would hope that the Committee of the Whole would sustain the position of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest reluctance that I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The testimony indicated that this program, simply on a priority basis, on a ZBB basis, or on whatever other kind of basis we want to use in appropriating the available funds, did not come up to the required order of importance or that it was warranted to be funded by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Chairman, we have to make those tough choices. They are tough choices, and I hope the amendment will be opposed by the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that he was in doubt.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BROWN of Ohio) there were—ayes 10, noes 13.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding or improving State veterans' cemeteries as authorized by law (Public Law 95-476, section 202), \$5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1983.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUJAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUJAN: Page 34, after line 9, insert the following:

PURCHASE OF PROPERTY TO EXPAND SANTA FE NATIONAL CEMETERY

For expanding the Santa Fe National Cemetery in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 1006), \$600,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRADEMAS) having assumed the chair, Mr. LEVITAS, 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. 7631) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, and for other purposes, had come to no conclusion thereon.

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M. TODAY TO FILE REPORT ON S. 658, CLARIFYING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO BANKRUPTCY LAW

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until 6 p.m. this evening to file its report on the Senate bill S. 658.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of inquiring of the acting majority leader as to the program for next week.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of July 28, 1980, is as follows:

On Monday, July 28, the House meets at noon. There are no bills scheduled on the District Calendar. Under suspensions, we have nine bills. Votes on suspensions will be postponed until the end of the consideration of all suspensions. The bills under suspension are as follows:

H.R. 7458, refinancing VA guaranteed home loans;

H.R. 7786, Presidential candidates spouses protection bill;

S. 1916, OPIC (Overseas Private Investment Corporation) amendments;

H.R. 5604, Lacey Act amendments;

H.R. 7152, intelligence authorizations;

H.R. 6626, small business loans programs flexibility;

H.R. 5961, Currency and Foreign Transactions Act amendments;

H.R. 7478, increase interest ceiling on U.S. savings bonds; and

S. 658, clarifying and technical amendments to bankruptcy law.

Then, Mr. Speaker, following the suspensions, we will take up H.R. 7631, HUD appropriations, and complete consideration.

On Tuesday, July 29, the House meets at noon. There is only one suspension—House Resolution 748—Relating to the United Nations Conference for Women. Then we will take up H.R. 7591, Agriculture appropriations, fiscal year 1981.

On Wednesday of next week, there will be a ceremony on the West Front of the Capitol to present to the members of the U.S. Olympic team of 1980 medals authorized by Public Law 96-306. It is the intention of the House and Senate to remain in session during these proceedings, but the leadership realizes a great many Members will want to attend these ceremonies. It is hoped the House will have no votes while the ceremonies are in progress, and the leadership will attempt to schedule only general debate during that period.

In the event the House schedule cannot be arranged in such a manner that the ceremonies will not be interrupted, it will be necessary to recess the House for a very brief period. It would be my intention to ask unanimous consent that the Speaker have permission to declare a recess only if it is required at the appropriate time.

On Wednesday, July 30, the House meets at 10 a.m. We will consider H.R. 7765, the Budget Reconciliation Act, subject to a rule being granted. At 11:45 a.m., Members will attend the ceremony on the West Front of the Capitol.

Also we will take up House Joint Resolution 575, disapprove administration's new gas rationing plan, and House Joint Resolution 589, providing additional program authority for the Eximbank.

On Thursday, July 31, the House meets at 10 a.m., and we will consider H.R. 7724, Interior appropriations, fiscal year 1981.

On Friday, August 1, the House meets

at 10 a.m. We will take up H.R. 7831, Transportation appropriations, fiscal year 1981, and then we will consider H.R. 6711, Youth Act of 1980, complete consideration.

The House will adjourn by 3 p.m. on Friday. Adjournment times on all other days will be announced.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

At the close of business on Friday, the House will adjourn until noon on Monday, August 18, 1980, for the Democratic National Convention and the August district work period.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for his exposition of what we will be doing next week.

I would assume, after reading the RECORD of yesterday concerning allowing the 1-minute speeches in the normally prescribed morning hour, that that prohibition of 1-minutes at the beginning of the day was limited to yesterday and today, and that next week we could expect to operate under the normal procedure whereby Members, if they are so moved to say whatever is on their minds during that morning hour, will be given that opportunity.

Does the gentleman have any observation to make on that score?

I am inclined to think that if that practice that has been traditional in the House does not prevail, then we would conceivably have an extraordinary number of rollcalls, and Members should be advised of this possibility.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the acting majority leader.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional information on the 1-minute-speech situation. The only thing I can see is that if we get pressed for time, I suppose there could be a decision on when to recognize Members for 1-minute speeches.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) this question: I notice the Treasury-Postal appropriation bill is not scheduled next week. Is the gentleman aware of when that bill is going to be scheduled?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, that appropriation bill will be scheduled after the recess.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 28, 1980

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

□1500

Mr. BAUMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland has been most pleased with the adjournment hours this week. It has been very convenient for many of us. We are moving along at this leisurely pace, adjourning at 3 o'clock this afternoon, or a little thereafter, having adjourned at 6 o'clock last night. I know that we have been told that we have a very heavy legislative schedule that precludes the permission for Members to exercise their constitutional first amendment rights of free speech at the beginning of the day, the purpose of dispensing with those speeches being to move along with this heavy schedule.

Is the gentleman reflecting the leadership's view that we should not come in, say, at 10 o'clock or 9 o'clock on Monday to carry out the heavy schedule to which the Speaker pro tempore, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), has several times alluded in the last few days? It seems we could get more done on Monday morning, when everyone is fresh from a weekend in their district.

Mr. MURTHA. Of course, many Members have much farther to travel than the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the gentleman from Maryland, as the gentleman knows, and I think it is convenient to meet at noon on Monday.

Mr. BAUMAN. So the legislative schedule is heavy, too heavy for speeches at the beginning of each day, but not heavy enough to come in early on Monday?

Mr. MURTHA. I think in this case it is a matter of convenience to the many Members who travel back to the district during this period.

Mr. BAUMAN. So the leadership view is that we would not want to inconvenience Members' travel, only to inconvenience Members' right to speak their minds freely under the traditions of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO DISPENSE WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST TO AUTHORIZE THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 30, 1980

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday,

July 30, 1980, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to a call of the Chair.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if the press of legislative business is so great that we cannot allow Members to make 1-minute speeches, it hardly seems appropriate that we should recess, even for such a laudable goal as honoring our Olympic athletes.

Of course, if this permission is granted, the Chair in its discretion could recess for any matter.

I just want to protect the leadership's stated goal that we must be here to do heavy legislative work, and so I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL 6 O'CLOCK TONIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 7786

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until 6 p.m. tonight, July 25, 1980, to file a report on H.R. 7786.

The minority has been consulted.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Maryland respond to a bit of a colloquy?

Mr. BAUMAN. Reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed by the Committee on the Judiciary this morning. It is to increase the period during which personal protection is provided to spouses of national Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, and is particularly designed to protect Mrs. Reagan.

Mr. BAUMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. We all want to protect Mrs. Reagan. We all want to protect the right of free speech here in the House. The gentleman from Maryland very carefully refrained today from interfering or using parliamentary procedures in any way that would have lengthened the session except for making the point about the Chair's ruling on 1-minute speeches. But henceforth, until the matter is resolved, very little business is going to take place by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 748, RELATING TO THE UNITED NATIONS MID-DECade CONFERENCE FOR WOMEN

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution

(H. Res. 748) relating to the United Nations Mid-Decade Conference for Women, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

A SALUTE TO DETROIT

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT), I rise for special orders to salute the convention city of Detroit, its citizens and leaders who, as a result of hosting the Republican National Convention last week, rediscovered the magnificence of their city and the civic spirit. The idea of having special orders to salute Detroit occurred to us after having received so many superlative and laudatory comments from colleagues about the warm reception they received and memorable experience they had in the city of Detroit during their convention.

The more than 20,000 delegates and alternates, and journalists from all over the country and, indeed, the world, and guests who, according to every report that I have seen, were unanimous in the view that their Detroit visit was both memorable and remarkable. Part of this feeling, no doubt, resulted from the fact that the delegates regarded their convention as a major success. But, it seems, an even bigger factor was the tremendous hospitality and good feeling that was generated on the part of the citizens and the leaders during that extraordinarily busy week in Detroit.

The convention week in Detroit created something truly remarkable for the city. It created a renewed sense and perception of the city's strength, of its remarkable character and of the wonderful and varied experiences that it offers visitors to the city. There were a number of comments about this that illustrate how Detroit so captured the imagination of those visitors.

A Minnesota Delegate, Vern Neppi, told Dick Ryan of the Detroit News:

The people here have been tremendous. They are caring, solicitous and hospitable.

Eighteen months ago, when Detroit was selected for the convention, he was one of the severest critics of that decision, and last week he apologized for his earlier view.

Another delegate was quoted as saying:

I've never seen anyone try so hard to make it nice for us.

A Houston delegate was quoted in the New York Times as saying:

We expected a dirty, ugly, awful city.

Instead we found a beautiful town, just beautiful.

Nebraska's Gov. Charles Thone said:

Detroit has been the victim in the past of some bad press.

I suppose this is an important reconsideration of cities like Detroit, which have been criticized in the past—until people get there in person and examine it for themselves, and then they find that the reports and stereotypes were not accurate.

□ 1510

A delegate from Portland, Oreg., summed up the sentiments of his colleagues when he told Mike Dupont of the Detroit News:

Detroit is like any other American big city, except people are trying harder, there is a real can-do, helpful orientation about Detroit.

Bill Brock, the Republican National Chairman, told the Detroit Free Press:

There has not been a single day that a dozen or more people have not come up to me and said, "Detroit is a helluva town. It is a nice place. We like it." I think Detroit with this convention will break its stereotype when people find out it really is a very fine place.

The new sense of the city perhaps was best captured by the Detroit News columnist Pete Waldmeir:

I have never been so proud of this town and the way it conducted itself as I was during the GOP convention. It was a sight to behold and something that those who experienced it will not soon forget. . . . Go ahead and congratulate yourselves, Detroiters, for once you went into the revolving door behind adversity and came out in front of it.

The special significance of the past week in Detroit cannot be lost. The tremendous redevelopment of the city, including the redevelopment of its waterfront, the creation of Renaissance Center, the Joe Louis Sports Arena, and the other fine facilities, is a major factor behind the city's renewal. But even with this new development, Detroit never would have earned the title, "The Renaissance City," were it not for the incredible spirit and character of its people.

The event of the Republican Convention last week served to confirm for all time the fact of Detroit's renaissance and its rebirth as a city.

This salute to the city of Detroit honors its citizens and leaders. A special word has to be said for the mayor of the city, Coleman Young, without whose foresight, boldness, and leadership, much of what has taken place in the city might not have occurred. Two years ago when the mayor launched the effort to host a national political convention, some doubted or misunderstood the wisdom of this course of action. There can be no doubters today. Mayor Young understood then that Detroit had a great deal to offer visitors as a convention and vacation city. He recognized the need to diversify the city's economic base so that it did not have to depend exclusively on its industrial economy and only one source of income. His efforts more than

paid off. Also deserving of note is the fine effort undertaken by the Detroit Host Convention Committee headed by Thomas Murphy, chairman of General Motors.

Detroit has a new sense of itself today. The Nation has a new awareness of the attractiveness of the city. This will have major significance for the city—and the State—in the coming years.

But having said this, please be assured I am not wearing rose-colored glasses. No one can overlook the adverse economic circumstances the city and citizens find themselves in today as a result of larger forces operating in the Nation, and indeed, the world, that clearly are beyond its control.

The energy crisis led, over the past decade, to a crisis in the auto industry, Detroit's economic mainstay. Two national recessions—in the mid-1970's and in 1980—have left the city with unprecedented problems. Among them an 18.5 percent overall unemployment rate, which includes an unemployment rate among black citizens of 30 percent and a jobless rate among black teenagers in excess of 56 percent.

One out of every four Detroiters now receives some form of public assistance. The city now labors under a \$70 million budget deficit, which is projected to grow to over \$100 million next year unless a dramatic national economic turnaround takes place.

The events in Detroit last week showed the remarkable resilience of the citizens in the face of these enormous economic and social problems. They shined despite their difficulties. However, we cannot allow ourselves to be carried away by the extraordinary spirit of Detroit that was experienced by the conventioners last week, without pledging ourselves to do something about the economic problems that confront Detroit as well as other cities. I am hoping that my Republican colleagues in Congress, many who approached me to tell me how they were warmly welcomed not just by the city leadership, but by ordinary citizens—I hope we can join together and redouble our efforts in the Congress to resolve the economic problems that face Detroit, the big cities and the Nation, which are after all national in scope and must be solvable here, if they are to be solved anywhere.

I thank my colleagues for joining in this special order and salute to Detroit.

I have a number of news articles which I wish to insert in the RECORD.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Michigan, who enthusiastically cosponsored the "Dear Colleague" letter calling for this special order.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my friend and distinguished colleague from Michigan for giving Members an opportunity to pay this well-deserved tribute to the city of Detroit.

A week ago, we were just concluding

the Republican National Convention in the Motor City, and the comments, the bouquets, the expressions of appreciation were unanimous, as the gentleman has said, not only from delegates of the United States, but from commentators and observers from all over the world.

Detroit stood tall in the eyes of the world because of the great job that they did of hosting this convention.

As the gentleman has pointed out so well, a lot of things went into it, from Mayor Coleman Young on down, but I think the factors that stood out most of all were the people of the city of Detroit, their caring, their concern, their courtesy, their extending themselves to make sure that everyone felt at home in Detroit. I think that everyone did.

I would also like to commend my friend for giving all of us this opportunity to express, I think, a very well-deserved tribute to a great city.

The Grand Old Party had a great party in Detroit, a new city, a city of renaissance, and we found that the Grand Old Party felt very new again as we left the city of Detroit and felt like a party that itself was filled and on the brink of renaissance.

It has been 1 week since the Republican National Convention adjourned, and delegates from across the Nation packed their bags to return home. And I think that I can safely speak for each and every delegate when I tip my hat to the great city of Detroit and say "thank you" for a job well done in hosting our national convention.

Probably to the pleasant surprise of many convention delegates, Detroit was really the perfect host. The facilities were just super. The friendliness of the people of Detroit was overwhelming and contagious. The cooperation and planning on the part of officials were obviously effective. In the final analysis, Detroit was the right place for Republicans to be in 1980, the best location from which Republicans could send our message to the American people.

The Cobo Hall-Joe Louis Arena complex was tailor made for a national convention. Delegates, guests, and the media had plenty of room inside Joe Louis Arena for comfortable and orderly sessions. The large area in Cobo Hall partitioned into a working area for the media was a very convenient arrangement according to all the comments I heard from press people. The sparkling renaissance center, combined with other waterfront attractions, made the downtown convention area just a great place for conventioneers to use—day and night.

And any concerns that convention goers may have had about safety in downtown Detroit were dashed by the very thorough effort of the Detroit Police Department, working in close cooperation with police from other local jurisdictions. Police officers were literally everywhere at every hour of the day providing a friendly atmosphere of safety without making it seem like security at the Moscow Olympics.

In Detroit last week, the cop on the street corner was not the only person

with a smile and a greeting. Warm hospitality was the order of the week, from harried hotel and airline clerks to convention "hosts" to taxi drivers and just about everyone else we ran into. "Detroit Loves a Good Party" was the slogan adopted by the city and it soon became evident that Detroit really did enjoy hosting the convention.

As a native Michigander coming back to my home State, I was genuinely proud of the host city's performance. Undoubtedly, the bipartisan team of Governor William Milliken and Mayor Coleman Young was instrumental in overcoming the many problems of putting a national convention together. But there are obviously many, many people who deserve hearty congratulations for organizing this 1980 Republican Convention.

Mr. Speaker, last year when Detroit was selected to host the Republican Convention, many people were puzzled and asked "Why Detroit?", particularly for a Republican convention. Now that the hoopla is over and the dust has settled, it is rather obvious that Detroit was right not only for us conventioneers, but as a very real symbol of the message the Republican Party has for America in 1980.

Despite its glorious performance last week, Detroit is not a city without problems. It has a very high unemployment rate as a result of our misguided economic policies. It has a large, decaying inner city area with over 40 percent of the households receiving welfare benefits. To a great extent, Detroit carries the burdens of a nation with no effective policy for relieving the very real problems of unemployment, inflation, economic opportunities for minorities, and revitalization of urban areas.

Detroit is a working man's town, but is now a town in which over 20 percent of the working men and women have no job because of the administration's dismal economic programs. It was the appropriate place for the Republican Party to demonstrate our desire to put the workers of Detroit—and the workers of America—back to work through policies that emphasize progress, productivity, and most of all jobs.

But Detroit is in the process of a renaissance, rebuilding itself slowly and deliberately. The new downtown waterfront area is a remarkable tribute to the people who refused to give up on Detroit, people whose vision and work made that area what it is today, and what it promises for the city tomorrow.

Republicans believe that the Nation needs just such a renaissance, a reawakening of our spirit of what America can do. Republicans will be carrying the message from Detroit that with the right policies, the right leadership, progress can be made. Yes, much has been done, but there is still much to do. But Republicans have not given up on the spirit of America, on what the people of the United States can do for ourselves just as we did not give up on Detroit.

The 1980 convention was great for Republicans, and I think that it was great for Detroit. It was the perfect

occasion for the city to launch a new era with a new image, and it was the perfect place for the Republicans to launch our campaign with a new message for America.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of the special order being taken by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) today.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1520

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I know his keynote speech at the convention was listened to, not only in Detroit, but across the country with great interest and his leadership contributed to bringing together the kind of participation that made the convention a success. All of us will feel free, hopefully, to come back to Detroit many more times. Perhaps even a Democratic convention will be some day held in the great city of Detroit, who knows.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

As a Wisconsin delegate to the Republican National Convention, I must confess that I was initially somewhat disappointed when the Republican National Committee selected Detroit as the site for the 1980 convention. Detroit's reputation, as the gentleman from Michigan knows, was not the most positive; but after spending a week in Detroit my impressions were completely turned around. I have nothing but good to say to all the citizens of Detroit, the police officers, the service personnel, the bus drivers, the taxi drivers; they all went out of their way to make the delegates to the Republican convention, the news media, all the guests of the Republican convention, really feel at home in Detroit.

Detroit is certainly a city that is on the rebound. I am glad that my political party was able to focus the attention of the Nation on the fact that Detroit is experiencing a renaissance.

I certainly wish to take my hat off to all the people in Detroit, particularly Mayor Young, as well as the civic host committee that did such a great job in helping to solve the problems of all the various delegations.

I hope that the Republicans come back to Detroit, particularly after our candidate carries Michigan this fall.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I must say that after working with the gentleman for almost 2 years on the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, I

am most happy that we have found something upon which we can totally agree.

As you know, I took a 1-minute speech when we were allowed to have 1-minute speeches earlier this week, to give a salute to Detroit, because I thought it was appropriate. As a matter of fact, I was kind of surprised when I got there, because I was one of the last ones in line, that it had not already been done, but evidently a number of people were waiting for this special order.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin said, I think a number of us were initially dismayed at the selection of Detroit for our convention, because of perhaps the erroneous reputation that it had achieved in the past. I must say that you certainly converted a great number of us. I know everyone in the California delegation that I spoke with had nothing but praise for the city of Detroit. A number of us talked about how we would consider Detroit and that area for periods of vacation in the future.

I thought it was interesting that our convention had sort of an international aspect to it, when you had the delegation from Arkansas staying in Canada and some other delegations staying across the river.

I just think that those of us who were somewhat concerned about it knew that there had been a renaissance in terms of buildings downtown, but we had to be there to see the renaissance of spirit that truly existed with the people from all walks of life; police officers stopping you on the street, asking you whether you were enjoying your stay; waiters stopping you in the middle of your meal and asking whether you were enjoying Detroit and welcoming you there; people of all sorts doing that.

It is very obvious that unless you have that sort of will, unless you have that sort of spirit, you cannot succeed as the city of Detroit did. As far as I am concerned, the city of Detroit did just tremendously well. It was extremely successful. Speaking as one California delegate pledged to the next President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, I can say we were most happy to be there.

I think, truthfully, that most of the delegates share the concern the gentleman from Michigan has expressed about the economic situation that presently exists around this country, but particularly in some of our major industrial cities and States. Although we may disagree with respect to the exact means that we seek to achieve the same goals, we are very hopeful that we do truly have an opportunity to implement some of the programs that we spoke about during our convention, that they will help provide the economy of Michigan and other cities and States around the country.

I thank the gentleman for having this special order.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I know they are sincere. I look forward to saying to him and to others, that I have been trying to tell you this for so long that Detroit is a great city with a great people and only until we were able to bring the convention there and do what I suppose in human experience is necessary, to see

for yourself, to understand firsthand the motivation that has led me to argue that even in adversity, Detroit and its citizens were able to excel, only then did it become clear how fine a city it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BETHUNE).

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

I would like to lend support to all that has been said about the hospitality of the city of Detroit. As a southerner, I would like to say that we pride ourselves on being able to recognize hospitality when it is extended. It certainly was extended in your city. I would second everything that has been said about that.

A number of myths about Detroit were dispelled, not just in my mind, but I hope all across the country. One thing that was said repeatedly before we got there was that, "It's going to be hot and you are going to swelter there in the city of Detroit while you are in convention."

That has been completely laid to rest, because the weather was superb, on most days ranging anywhere from 70 to 75 degrees, particularly when you measure it against the city that was almost selected and lost out by one vote for the Republican National Convention. I am glad we settled on Detroit.

As was mentioned by the gentleman from California, I stayed in Windsor, Canada, your sister city. I found the people there to be just as hospitable as the people in Detroit. It surprised me that they were so interested in an American political convention. I guess it is because there is so much interaction between those two cities and the fact that they watch Detroit television that they have developed an interest in American politics.

In any case, we had many conversations with people there on that side of the river and they were just beautiful, too.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his observations of his experiences.

We in Detroit modestly do not claim to have any control over the weather itself, but I suppose all of these factors worked together to produce the actual results.

Many of the concerns of the citizens in Windsor stem from the fact that many of them work in the city of Detroit. They have frequently felt this dual connection to not only the cities, but the two countries.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

Mr. BAUMAN. I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Speaker, that it was a great pleasure for me as the cochairman of the Maryland delegation, along with my senior colleague from Maryland, Senator MATHIAS, to attend this convention in Detroit.

This is my seventh National Republican Convention, and serving as I did as a delegate, along with my wife who was also a delegate from my congressional district, we found the hospitality there unequalled in my experience in any of the seven conventions. It may well be

that the conventions I have attended in Miami were graced by more tropical weather and vegetation. It is very hard to equal the conventions we have had in San Francisco with the views that the bay permits; but nowhere did I find more friendly people more genuinely interested in assisting the delegates. I say that as one who shared the initial skepticism about the location of the city of Detroit for our convention. We arrived there on Sunday afternoon before the convention and immediately attended a dinner that evening in the Renaissance Center and had a very difficult time finding a parking place because of the crush of many people trying to reach the area. We were assisted by a member of Detroit's finest, a policeman who let us park perilously close to a fireplug and assured us that he would be on duty until well after midnight and would keep an eye on our car so nothing would happen. Apparently they did not keep as close an eye on the Governor's car, because that was stolen, the Governor of Michigan, but that was in Romulus, not in the city of Detroit, as I understand.

So I would have to say after a week there, a genuine effort was made by everyone we met, every service personnel, all those who work for the city, and the average citizens who would welcome you on the street to make our stay a real pleasure, and that it was.

□ 1530

Without committing myself to casting any votes on future legislation that may bear on the gentleman's interests in Detroit, I can certainly say I am in a far better disposition to listen to his arguments in the future, which are always persuasive.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank my colleague for those excellent remarks. Even to know that his concern for my interests may grow as a result of his Detroit experience really warms my heart, to think of the possibilities of new cooperation that may even yet emerge from this particular Congress. I am very sincerely appreciative of his remarks.

• Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to rise and offer a few remarks pursuant to the special order of the gentleman from Michigan because I can speak with firsthand knowledge of the splendid hospitality and great courtesy of the people of the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan.

The banners said, "Detroit Loves a Good Party," and certainly I, together with my fellow delegates from South Carolina and across the country, can attest to the royal welcome rolled out by the people of Michigan for the Republican National Convention.

The convention facilities were splendid, Renaissance Center is a marvel and the hotel accommodations superb. But as always, it is people who make a city great. And Detroit is blessed with people who were especially gracious to all of us. My special thanks go to the friends at the Holiday Inn in Troy, who put grits on the menu to bring a touch of home to our South Carolina delegation; and to the guides and cabdrivers, local officials, and people on the street who went out of their way to welcome and assist us.

I know I speak for every South Carolinian and every delegate who was there when I say, "Hats Off to Detroit and Michigan." •

• Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to salute the people and the city of Detroit for the very fine job they did in hosting the Republican National Convention. Additionally, I would like to thank my colleagues, Representative JOHN CONYERS and Representative GUY VANDER JAGT of Michigan, for requesting this time for a special order to thank the people of Detroit for the outstanding job they did in welcoming the GOP.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, as well as that of many of the California delegates, that the hospitality of the citizens of Detroit added substantially to the tremendous success of our convention. We emerged from the Joe Louis Arena a unified party—a party which stands for fiscal integrity, strong national defense, and jobs for the unemployed, and a party which believes in the family, the neighborhood, work, peace, and freedom. The "Good Party" had a "good time" in Detroit. We are ready to fight for the No. 1 position and to handle our Nation's problems—certainly the record shows that the GOP has fought better and harder at finding solutions than the other party.

The good spirit of Motor City, both in and out of the convention hall, the courteous manner, the welcoming attitudes of all the residents and service people warmed the hearts of the convention delegates and guests. Detroit is an outstanding example of the renaissance of an inner city of America; it clearly demonstrates the achievements that can be had when both the business community and the city work together with that special "can do" spirit. The people of Detroit have worked long and hard to revitalize their city, and the evidence of its rebirth is impressive. Republicans have endorsed the Urban Jobs and Enterprise Zone Act of 1980 and are committed to nurturing the spirit of self-help and cooperation throughout America in order that all American cities might experience this same renaissance.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party had a great reception, and a positive convention nominating the next President of the United States, Ronald Reagan. We owe our success not only to the people that make up the Republican Party, the fine leadership of Ronald Reagan, but also the many service people who made it all possible—the hotel clerks, elevator operators, waiters and waitresses, cab drivers, and all those who worked at the Joe Louis Arena and Cobo Hall. Thank you, Detroit, for hosting the Republican National Convention in 1980. The city's slogan is "Detroit Loves a Good Party." And, indeed, the GOP loves Detroit. •

• Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my Michigan colleagues in paying tribute to the city of Detroit and its leadership for their outstanding job in hosting the recent Republican National Convention.

Renaissance City proved worthy of its nickname by demonstrating a genuine

spirit of good will, hospitality and friendship to the more than 10,000 visitors from throughout the country.

Mayor Coleman Young and General Motors Chairman Thomas Murphy, who headed the host committee, are to be commended for hard work and dedication which they and their committee brought to the convention planning.

I was born in Detroit, and lived there as a small boy before my family moved to Taylor. For this reason, I feel a special pride in Detroit in its successful efforts to create a new sense of greatness and purpose.

The delegates and journalists who attended the Convention have returned to their home towns with a different viewpoint on the city of Detroit, which has suffered in recent years from unwarranted criticism.

As we move into the final decades of the century, Detroit is again taking its rightful place as one of the finest cities in America.

To Mayor Young, Chairman Murphy, and to every citizen of Detroit, I express my congratulations on a job well done. •

• Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the city of Detroit exceeded the highest expectations of visitors and its own citizens by being an outstanding host to the Republican National Convention.

The Detroit metropolitan area is being subjected to tremendous downward pressure these days because of the very serious problems of the automotive industry. The gravity of these problems is unfortunately not well enough understood by the leadership of both political parties, America's opinion makers and by the general public. Indeed, there seems to be a considerable body of opinion that says, "let Detroit stew in its own juice." But the automotive industry is not located exclusively in Detroit by any means. It is decentralized over 20 States. And if Detroit stews in its own juice, then soon thereafter the steel, glass, rubber, textile, and petrochemical industries will also stew in their own juices.

At the same time, we are witnessing a dramatic change in attitude in Michigan, a change which has brought together industry, union, and Government officials and rank and file in a spirit of cooperation. We have realized that working together is our best hope for survival and eventual triumph.

This new cooperative spirit helps explain the warm reception and united effort which greeted the Republican National Convention.

Accordingly, I am pleased to join in this bipartisan acknowledgment of this Detroit experience.

Under leave to extend my remarks, a Detroit Free Press editorial of July 17 is set forth below:

CENTER: THE GOP CONVENTION SHOWS WHAT A JEWEL THE CITY HAS BUILT

If Detroiters have seemed as interested in being seen by, as opposing to seeing, the visitors to town this week, the visitors will have to make allowances.

Detroit has been through rough waters. The riot of 1967, the physical and social decay of the late '60s and early '70s and the violence of the early post-riot years left our collective psyche badly scarred. And the

energy shocks of '73-74 and '79-80 meant special difficulty here.

It was important for us to show ourselves, and the world, that this city could be a successful host for something as massive as the Republican convention. Those who minimize it in the light of the trouble in our industrial economy miss a fairly basic point.

For a city that has depended so heavily on an industrial economy, the creation of the civic center area and the emergence of Detroit as a newly aggressive contender for convention business is far more than symbolic. For us, this is vital diversification.

If anyone failed before the convention to understand what Mayor Young and the civic leadership have been trying to do, surely there is no basis for misunderstanding now. The civic center—the Plaza Hotel and the Renaissance Center, Hart Plaza, Ford Auditorium, the Veterans Memorial Building, Cobo Hall and the Joe Louis Arena—is one of the more coherent and impressive such complexes anywhere in the country.

For our part, we have emerged from this week more convinced than ever that the gutsy gamble the mayor took in getting the Joe Louis Arena built is going to pay off for Detroit. The much-maligned arena has its defects, and the mayor financed it on a wing and a prayer, but it is there, and it works.

The old argument about whether the mayor was concentrating on the downtown area at the expense of the neighborhoods never seemed all that persuasive to us. The renewal of the city had to start somewhere, and the place to start was on the riverfront.

Some mistakes have been made, for sure, but the renewal has taken hold in a persuasive, indisputable way. And the psychology of the metropolitan area has changed; the old defeatism is not banished, but it is no longer the dominant theme.

Detroit will continue to face some difficult days, as the auto industry struggles to adjust to the energy realities that the country tried so long to deny. A revolution is in process, and the fact that it is occurring in the middle of a recession makes it doubly painful for multitudes of Detroiters. And the hardest adjustments may lie ahead.

This week, though, and the events leading up to it, ought to tell us that Detroit is a survivor—that it is changing, that it is creating new possibilities and a new spirit. For an industrial town that has struggled so long with harsh realities, these new possibilities and this new spirit are important and uplifting. •

• Mr. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Michigan for taking this time this afternoon to discuss the city of Detroit and the recent Republican National Convention which was held in that city. I was privileged, Mr. Speaker, to be one of the Mississippi delegates to the convention and was further honored with the responsibility of casting all of Mississippi's 22 votes for Governor Reagan.

I will admit that I went to Detroit with misgivings. As one from a State that has also suffered its share of bad press, I can sympathize with the concerns of the gentleman from Michigan and can say that I received an absolutely delightful surprise in Detroit. The people and the city officials of Detroit could not have been more courteous and hospitable. Mr. Speaker, I know a good deal about Southern hospitality but I had never had such a lengthy exposure to Northern hospitality. I can state absolutely that it is every bit as noteworthy as that to be found in Mississippi.

Detroit as a city did itself proud

during the Republican National Convention. This is due in part to its enlightened city administration under the direction of Mayor Coleman Young. It is also due to a committed business community which has come together to turn Detroit around and return it to its rightful rank as one of America's major industrial cities.

I thoroughly enjoyed my visit to Detroit and hope to be able to return again. One of our delegates prepared a sign which she carried throughout the convention hall on the night that Governor Reagan made his acceptance speech. It said simply, "Mississippi says, 'Thank you, Detroit.'"

• Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this special order with my colleagues and other Members who represent the Detroit area in the House in expressing our appreciation for the wonderful efforts of the city of Detroit to make our national convention a pleasant success.

The facilities were excellent, the convention site was convenient, and we were made welcome by the friendly community spirit that is rejuvenating Detroit.

Despite a dash of uncooperative weather, we found Detroit a most hospitable and attractive place to gather. I am certain that as our delegates, and those of us in Congress who took part, returned to their homes and jobs, we all carried back an impression of Detroit as an up and coming convention city.

I want to join my colleagues in expressing my appreciation for all the dedicated efforts made by city officials, the friendly reception by the people of the city, the Michigan Republicans who were our hosts, and the Republican National Committee, which exerted great effort to make the convention flow smoothly.

It was a good convention, held in a great city, and Detroit can be proud of its proven ability to accommodate a major function with grace and efficiency.

• Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, while we were in Detroit, I just had to marvel at the Renaissance Center and the tremendous renovation of the downtown area along the river. I think the center is one of the greatest tributes to community spirit and civic pride we have in this country. Not a dime of Government money was spent on it.

I also spent one morning at the Navy and Marine armory where disadvantaged children are learning to read by way of a new and innovative method of instruction. In just a few short years this project has attracted countless volunteers and is now in operation at sites all over the city. Not a dime of Government money went into it.

When I arrived in Detroit, I was driven downtown by a young man named Jay Kennelly, a college student and part-time worker who volunteered his services for the convention. When he dropped us off, he said if we needed a ride anywhere day or night, just give his family a call. Thousands of other volunteers with the civic host committee greeted thousands of other convention-goers in the same manner. Not a dime of Government

money was involved in the service. A billion in Government funds could not have generated the energy, the enthusiasm, the service, and the generosity of those volunteers.

That was and is the spirit of Detroit. It is the spirit of people who believe in their town and believe in themselves. And this comes at a time when many of those same people fear for their jobs and fear for the future.

They had a point to make and they made it. They had an impression they wanted to leave and they left it. They showed us what determined people who care about their home, their community and their neighbor can do in the face of adversity. Detroit stands as a symbol of self-reliance and will.

Detroit was not transformed into a bastion of Republicanism overnight. I doubt that we will sweep the city in the fall. But I hope we left as favorable an impression on Detroiters as they left on us.

Apart from all of the extravagance, flamboyance, and circus atmosphere of a convention, I hope the people of Detroit and other great cities alive with civic pride and determination understand that we are behind them 100 percent. We have more of a stake in them than they do in us and we must show them as they showed us, that we are willing and able to work as hard as we can to make their life better.

• Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, as a delegate-at-large attending the Republican National Convention from the State of New Jersey, I want to express my appreciation to the city of Detroit for its gracious hospitality, and to commend the city for its outstanding civic spirit.

Detroit has demonstrated to other cities in the United States that urban centers can rise above the problems and setbacks of the sixties and take their place among the most vibrant and progressive in the Nation.

Detroit has not only recovered from what at one time threatened to be crippling racial disorders, but has emerged as a civic, cultural, and convention center well worth visiting and enjoying.

The convention provided a challenge to Detroit and the city met that challenge in every respect.

• Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in a salute to the city and citizens of Detroit. I have attended many conventions over the years. Detroit as host city was truly the best. Starting with Mayor Coleman Young, General Motors Chairman Thomas Murphy, Gov. William Milliken and his wife Helen, just everyone was courteous, friendly, and warm.

The spirit of a city is very much reflected in its citizens. There is no question that Detroit's spirit is enthusiastic, boundless, and dynamic. I did not expect such an overwhelmingly pleasant experience. I know that Detroit, along with many other great cities, has its share of difficulties. But you could not tell from the reception the city gave its guests. I would like to make a special point of applauding the citizens of Plymouth, Mich. They went out of their way, as well, to help host convention delegates.

Michigan is a State I plan to revisit, and Detroit can take the credit for making my visit a truly memorable experience.

• Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleagues Mr. VANDER JAGT and Mr. CONYERS in providing the leadership in suggesting a special salute to the city and citizens of Detroit for the wonderful spirit shown last week as hosts of the Republican National Convention. My own personal experience was one of enjoyment and relaxation, a result of the pleasant reception received from city officials, in particular Mayor Coleman Young, Host Committee Chairman Thomas Murphy, and the gracious citizens of Detroit.

I especially remember how the citizens from every walk of life went out of their way to extend a warm, cordial, and enthusiastic welcome and to provide for our needs no matter how inconvenient the time or circumstance.

I take this opportunity to applaud the civic spirit demonstrated by the citizens of Detroit which made the convention memorable for all in attendance.

• Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my fellow Republican colleagues in expressing a genuine thank you to Mayor Coleman Young; the chairman of the host committee, General Motors Chairman Thomas Murphy; and the citizens of the city of Detroit for making all of us who attended our national convention feel at home. "Detroit Loves a Good Party," and that was certainly reflected in the mood of the city during the week of the convention.

The vitality and friendliness of the city of Detroit was shown not only in the welcoming signs that were on billboards on the interstates entering the city and throughout the convention area, but also by the citizens who were willing to lend a helping hand in providing information when asked. The diversity and excitement of the city were highlighted by the entertainment and activities planned by the civic host committee during the week of the convention.

The key location of the Joe Louis Arena and the Cobo Hall and other meeting facilities were added extras to making the convention area convenient for the conventioners. The Detroit Police Department did an excellent job in insuring the security and safety of all those attending the convention, and in directing the traffic around the area. In addition, the transportation provided to the delegates and alternates to and from the downtown convention centers was excellent, with no major tieup in getting to the meeting halls on time.

The hotel accommodations and preparations for those attending the convention were ideal. The staffs of the various hotels, in view of the enormous crowds, were pleasant and willing to be of assistance. The remarkable civic spirit was captured in the outstanding facilities made available to the delegates and alternates.

The city of Detroit demonstrated a truly remarkable atmosphere of friendliness in hosting the Republican National Convention, and I am pleased to join in saluting the wonderful spirit expressed

during the week of July 13. I look forward to future conventions being held in this memorable city.●

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all of us who attended the Republican convention in Detroit were most appreciative of the warm hospitality of these fine citizens. I arrived in Detroit with deep apprehensions. Dallas had bid strongly for the Republican convention and we had come very close to getting it. But I was overcome by the warmth and friendly spirit of all of the people in Detroit.

The taxi drivers impressed me the most. I took many, many trips that were only six to eight blocks long, as I was trying to get across town in a hurry. Usually taxi drivers complain and grumble when you take a short trip. But every one of these drivers were friendly, nice, and courteous.

Thomas A. Murphy and Bill Agee had such dynamic personalities, one would have thought they were Texans.

When I went to the airport to leave, my plane was late. But the American Airlines desk attendant said she would try to get me on an earlier flight if they could retrieve my luggage. I went and got the man who originally checked in my bags. He took my ticket stubs and walked all the way to the plane to get my bags cleared. I offered him a tip, but he said he was glad to do it, as he had already checked my bags in once. I still tipped him, but I was surprised to see a person who was so cheerful to be of service.

Detroit was a clean city. The policemen were always ready to be of assistance.

Everyone was so sincerely motivated to make the convention a success that we had a tremendous convention.●

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of my distinguished colleagues from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS and Mr. VANDER JAGT) in obtaining this special order on behalf of those of us who wish to properly commend the great city of Detroit.

As one of those who originally objected to the selection of Detroit as the site for the Republican National Convention, and as one who even chided our national party chairman, Bill Brock, I can only say, "I was wrong."

The city of Detroit has every reason to be proud of its performance, individually and collectively, during the Republican convention.

Mayor Coleman Young and General Motors Chairman Thomas Murphy, along with Detroit's businesses and citizens, went to great effort to prepare and promote their city for us. Everyone I met while there was helpful, pleasant, and concerned that we would enjoy our stay in their city. With such an outpouring of helpfulness and concern, it would have been impossible not to be impressed.

Therefore, for the record, I join my colleagues in saying, "Thanks, Detroit. Thanks, Mayor Young and Chairman Murphy, for making us so welcome and treating us with such warmth and hospitality."

And to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I say, "It's too bad you didn't have the foresight to schedule your

convention for Detroit, a city that once was counted down, but definitely is not counted out by we Republicans."●

● Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this special order today commanding the citizens of Detroit, the mayor, his administration, the police department, and others, on the occasion of the Republican convention during the 2 weeks following Independence Day. Everything I have heard has been favorable, and my own personal impression during my time in the area was a definite plus.

An indication of my feelings on this matter was contained in a letter to the Honorable Coleman A. Young, mayor of the city of Detroit. My letter dated July 18 follows:

JULY 18, 1980.

HON. COLEMAN A. YOUNG,
Mayor of the City of Detroit, City-County
Building, Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MAYOR YOUNG: Not only as Chairman of the Republican Conference, but also as a visitor to your city on the occasion of the Republican National Convention, I wish to compliment you, your police department, and the citizens generally for a warm and cordial welcome.

Frankly, many people were apprehensive about visiting Detroit because of the publicized problems of the past. You, your administration, and your residents have acquitted themselves well and you are to be commended.

Thank you for a very pleasant week.

Sincerely,

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

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Republicans who visited Detroit for the Presidential nominating convention last week were surprised and impressed by the city and the reception provided for them. Detroit—as everyone who has spent any time there recently knows—is a city on the move, a city whose vitality and hospitality are evident to all. Our good friends in the Republican Party are given to laboring under false impressions, and I am pleased that their visit to Detroit has led to their realization of what a fine city it is.●

● Mr. BROADHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified by the great number of our Republican colleagues who have been kind enough to seek me out to compliment the city of Detroit upon its handling of the recent convention.

They have learned what we Detroiters have always known—that our city is a great one. They have seen at firsthand that Detroiters are warm and friendly, that our convention facilities are second to none and that we are in the midst of a renaissance that is truly exciting.

I am very proud of my city, especially in view of the fact that it managed to host a fine convention while experiencing record unemployment and economic woes. I am delighted that our Republican friends chose to meet in Detroit and pleased that they enjoyed themselves.●

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, those of us who call the Detroit area home were especially proud of the hospitality and the bright new image our city displayed to the Nation during the Republican National Convention last week.

On returning to Washington, I imme-

dately wrote the following letter of congratulations to Detroit Mayor Coleman Young and General Motors Chairman Thomas Murphy, who chaired the convention host committee.

Yesterday, as Congress reconvened, I was happy to hear so much praise lavished on the City of Detroit for its outstanding job as host to the Republican National Convention.

Both in the Republican Cloakroom and on the floor of the House of Representatives, Member after Member told me that while they had some apprehensions about going to Detroit, they now were anxious to return for another event.

Everyone was impressed with the beauty of the new Detroit waterfront and pleasantly surprised at the excellence of the accommodations and the friendliness of the people. Joe Louis Arena, Renaissance Center, and the supporting facilities were tremendous. Everyone from taxi drivers to waiters seemed genuinely interested in making the visit as pleasant as possible.

It was a week that helped shape a new national image for the City of Detroit and one that will make it one of our country's great convention centers.

Everyone who worked so long and hard to make the Convention a success deserves our thanks. You, especially, deserve special praise for the leadership you provided in bringing the Convention to Detroit, for getting the new facilities built and for instilling the spirit that guaranteed everything would go smoothly.

As one who has called the Detroit area home all of my life, I was extremely proud of my City.

Best regards.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of the Republican convention spilled across the city limits of Detroit and filled the entire metropolitan area with enthusiasm and community pride. In my district just north of Detroit, merchants decorated their store windows with signs welcoming the Convention delegates, and every evening was filled with parties and special events.

The Republican National Convention is one of many important national events that will be held in Detroit. People from all over America have come to know it as an interesting, pleasant, and friendly place to visit and vacation.

Bill Brock, chairman of the Republican National Committee, summed up everyone's feelings on leaving Detroit when he said he'd like to come back for the Republican Convention in 1984.●

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to take the opportunity to commend the city of Detroit for its role as host of the 1980 Republican National Convention. Special thanks go to Mayor Coleman Young, Mr. Thomas Murphy, chairman of the board of General Motors Corp., who served as chairman of the civic host committee, and most of all many, many thanks to the citizens of Detroit who gave so much of themselves to make our guests feel at home.

Detroit, the Renaissance City, stands before America as a symbol of a new life, a new spirit, and a new opportunity for growth in this decade.

Community leaders and government officials are rebuilding a great city, and their efforts were demonstrated during our convention. The beautiful waterfront, highlighted by the Renaissance

Center, the new Joe Louis Arena, Cobo Hall, and other fine facilities were showcases of what a great city can do.

The efforts by Detroit that went into making our convention a success show that the city has a new spirit, a spirit that it can accomplish and succeed, a can-do spirit that I call the spirit of Detroit.●

• Mr. F'ISH. Mr. Speaker, last week the Republican national convention was held in Detroit, Mich. I would like at this time to share with my distinguished colleagues some of my experiences and impressions during the convention.

During my brief stay I heard repeated over and over again my view how friendly and warm the people of Detroit were as hosts for this convention. It was my pleasure to see this first hand. The city was extremely gracious in extending the use of its facilities to the convention's representatives and guests.

I would like to congratulate Detroit for its fine work. It was most gratifying to see the strong civic spirit, and the sincere efforts to make the convention a success. The dedicated city officials, public servants, fire and rescue teams, and many others put in long hours to make our stay as enjoyable and safe as possible. Hosting a convention of this size is certainly a noteworthy task, and to do it as successfully as was done last week is most commendable. The Hyatt-Regency in Dearborn which housed the New York delegation was a model for pleasant, accommodating service.

The remarkable civic spirit shown in Detroit was reflected in the most generous hospitality that we received. On our first evening I had the most fortunate opportunity to be entertained by Mr. and Mrs. Marvin L. Howard, of Birmingham, Mich. Their hospitality and delicious dinner were outstanding examples of the genuine friendliness evident in Detroit. There is certainly no doubt that Mrs. Howard's desserts could hold their own against the finest cuisine in the country.

The reception sponsored by civic representatives for the State of New York was also an outstanding success. These representatives went out of their way to make sure that we had an enjoyable afternoon. I do not think that anyone could argue with their claim that Detroit does indeed "love a good party." The Norths of Grosse Ile were especially gracious and are a fine example of the outstanding citizens of Detroit.

My own view of Detroit has been influenced by last week's events. On one walk from Cobo Hall to the Renaissance Center, one Detroit citizen stopped me and shook hands saying "welcome to Detroit." To many the Renaissance Center now symbolizes the rebirth of Detroit, and a new sense of the city's greatness. Clearly Detroit is alive and exciting. Whereas many people may have been afraid to visit downtown Detroit just a few years ago.

Last week we saw crowds listening to music in Hart Plaza, riding the trolley cars near Cobo Hall and taking advantage of the many other activities which the downtown area has to offer. I for one look forward to my next visit to the Renaissance City and its fine citizens.●

• Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, as a delegate to the Republican national convention held last week in Detroit, I would like to express my appreciation to the citizens of "the renaissance city" who proved to be such pleasant, friendly, and cooperative hosts.

The term "renaissance" means rebirth, and that is a most fitting theme for the city of Detroit which has emerged from the riot-torn period of the sixties with a new sense of civic pride. Detroit is dealing successfully with the difficult urban problems of crime, pollution, and inner city decay; the city is moving forward with a brighter future ahead of it.

The optimism of the people of Detroit is readily apparent, even to those of us who visited the city for just 1 week. Recently reported opinion surveys of my fellow delegates indicate that my positive impression of the city of Detroit was not an isolated reaction. The great majority of delegates were a little leery of holding the convention in Detroit but virtually all came away favorably impressed.

The facilities located in the heart of the renaissance center were ideal; the Joe Louis Arena, the nearby hotels, and restaurants efficiently accommodated well over 10,000 conventioners, journalists, and guests, and offered every conceivable service that such a large gathering could demand.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend Coleman Young, the mayor of Detroit, as well as General Motors Chairman Thomas Murphy, the chairman of the host committee, but most of all I wish to thank the people of Detroit who went out of their way to help make the Republican convention the success that it truly was.●

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include in the RECORD the following material:

[From the Detroit News, July 20, 1980]

THANK YOU NOTE TO OUR TOWN

(By Pete Waldmeir)

A clean-cut young man approached me one evening last week on the sidewalk between the RenCen and Hart Plaza. He was smiling pleasantly and I figured he was going to ask for directions.

"Sir," he began, looking me square in the eye, "you're proud and you're stupid."

Wrong again, I thought. He's one of my readers.

"I'm not proud at all," I answered defensively, hoping he might not press me on the second point. "They call me Old Humble Pete. I'm a very self-deprecating person."

"You, sir," he said, with finality, "are proud and stupid and you are going to hell."

"No," I corrected. I'm going to work. But yours is an honest mistake." As I departed, he was heading for another lost soul.

A girl on roller skates, dressed in a bikini, whizzed past selling bumper stickers that said obscene things about Jimmy Carter. A young man stood defiantly under the statue of George Washington which graces the lawn of Mariner's Church, holding a sign which proclaimed, "The permit I have to stand here is the First Amendment to the Constitution..."

An artist sat cross-legged on the lawn, sketching the head of a giant wolfhound in pastels while a pregnant girl played a guitar. A turbaned Sikh handed out religious pamphlets in front of the Plaza Hotel. Two overweight but frolicksome businessmen dressed

in bedsheet burnooses paraded up and down Jefferson carrying a sign with read, "220,000 Libyans for Carter."

It was fun, the last two weeks. A big city showing off. New York without the pimps and hustlers and wall-to-wall crazies.

I've never been so proud of this town and the way it conducted itself as I was during the GOP convention. It was a sight to behold and something that those who experienced will not soon forget.

Conventions, political and otherwise, come and go. They're all pretty much the same. But the way Detroit's people reacted to this one, the way the town preened and strutted its stuff for the thousands of visitors, was absolutely amazing.

Go ahead and congratulate yourselves, Detroiters. For once you went into the revolving door behind adversity and came out in front of it.

We had a bus strike, a garbage strike, a newspaper strike and a storm that knocked out power to several sections of the city. Downtown restaurants put on extra help and lengthened their hours and took a bath the first few days because there were too many free parties where visitors could O.D. on booze and food.

A 70-pound ice sculpture melted, broke and went sailing out a window at the 73-story Plaza, crashing on a skylight below. Mayor Coleman Young put 2,100 of his 5,000 coppers on 12-hour shifts in the downtown area to make certain nothing messed up his party and it worked.

The bad guys not only were forced to hit Eight Mile Road, one went to Romulus and stole Gov. Milliken's limousine.

Miraculously, there was not one major incident. The protest marches were peaceful. Some kids got rowdy at a rock concert. But it was a minor punchup.

Glen Campbell and Tanya Tucker even remembered the words to the national anthem.

The only guy I know who wound up in the hospital was London Chop House entrepreneur Les Gruber, who keeled over from exhaustion. It's hard work writing all those big numbers on dinner tabs.

Sore-footed and bone-tired, Howard Lashbrook sat in McDonald's last Thursday night nursing a coffee. He's a Detroit traffic cop and he'd worked all week in front of Cobo Hall, where the crowds were heaviest.

"Do me a favor," he said. "When it's all over, thank the people for us. I never heard one cross word from anybody. They were all super, just super. I never would have believed we could do it."

"What a high-class town."

You heard the man. Thank you.

[From the Detroit Free Press, July 17, 1980]

CENTER: THE GOP CONVENTION SHOWS WHAT A JEWEL THE CITY HAS BUILT

If Detroiters have seemed as interested in being seen by, as opposing to seeing, the visitors to town this week, the visitors will have to make allowances.

Detroit has been through rough waters. The riot of 1967, the physical and social decay of the late '60s and early '70s and the violence of the early post-riot years left our collective psyche badly scarred. And the energy shocks of '73-74 and '79-80 meant special difficulty here.

It was important for us to show ourselves, and the world, that this city could be a successful host for something as massive as the Republican convention. Those who minimize it in the light of the trouble in our industrial economy miss a fairly basic point.

For a city that has depended so heavily on an industrial economy, the creation of the civic center area and the emergence of Detroit as a newly aggressive contender for convention business is far more than symbolic. For us, this is vital diversification.

If anyone failed before the convention to understand what Mayor Young and the civic leadership have been trying to do, surely there is no basis for misunderstanding now. The civic center—the Plaza Hotel and the Renaissance Center, Hart Plaza, Ford Auditorium, the Veterans Memorial Building, Cobo Hall and the Joe Louis Arena—is one of the more coherent and impressive such complexes anywhere in the country.

For our part, we have emerged from this week more convinced than ever that the gutsy gamble the mayor took in getting the Joe Louis Arena built is going to pay off for Detroit. The much-maligned area has its defects, and the mayor financed it on a wing and a prayer, but it is there, and it works.

The old argument about whether the mayor was concentrating on the downtown area at the expense of the neighborhoods never seemed all that persuasive to us. The renewal of the city had to start somewhere, and the place to start was on the riverfront.

Some mistakes have been made, for sure, but the renewal has taken hold in a persuasive, indisputable way. And the psychology of the metropolitan area has changed; the old defeatism is not banished, but it is no longer the dominant theme.

Detroit will continue to face some difficult days, as the auto industry struggles to adjust to the energy realities that the country tried so long to deny. A revolution is in process and the fact that it is occurring in the middle of a recession makes it doubly painful for multitudes of Detroiters. And the hardest adjustments may lie ahead.

This week, though, and the events leading up to it, ought to tell us that Detroit is a survivor—that it is changing, that it is creating new possibilities and a new spirit. For an industrial town that has struggled so long with harsh realities, these new possibilities and this new spirit are important and uplifting.

[From the Detroit News, July 16, 1980]

Critics Join Ranks of Detroit Boosters

(By Richard Ryan)

Eighteen months ago, Vern Neppl, chairman of the Minnesota Independent Republicans, was incensed when Detroit was selected as the site for the 1980 Republican National Convention.

"Detroit is a very depressing city," Neppl said at the time, explaining that his state colleagues preferred to go "anywhere but Detroit because they don't feel safe there."

Last night, Neppl stood on the convention floor in Joe Louis Arena, and apologized for his earlier remarks.

"The people here have been tremendous," Neppl said in completely unsolicited comments. "They are caring, solicitous and hospitable."

"The convention facilities are great. The kind of job you people have done here will make it a very tough act to follow."

Similar unsolicited praise came from Nebraska Gov. Charles Thone.

He conceded he was frankly apprehensive about attending the convention. "Detroit," he said, "doesn't come to mind as a favorite vacation city."

But now, the third day of the convention, Thone has changed his mind.

"Detroit," he said, "has been the victim of some bad press."

California Sen. S. I. Hayakawa isn't hard to pick out of the crowd.

While the rest of his fellow California delegates are wearing white cowboy hats, Hayakawa insists upon wearing the tam-o'-shanter that has become his trade mark.

Hayakawa, a 73-year-old freshman senator, is attending his first convention. But he's not enjoying it very much.

"All you reporters go up and down the aisle talking to us and diverting our attention from the speakers," Hayakawa told a reporter.

Illinois Rep. Robert H. Michel is like the man who got all dressed up and had no place to go.

Michel is Reagan's floor manager. He's the guy with the red baseball cap with his name on top. The other fellow with red, yellow and white baseball hats work for him.

Their mission is to quell any rebellion on the convention floor. But there hasn't been any.

Reagan and his forces are in total control.

"It's not so much that we've stacked the convention," explained Rick Shelby, an Oklahoma delegate and one of Michel's floor leaders who helped stack the delegate deck for Ronald Reagan in Arkansas' GOP caucuses earlier this year.

"It's just that we were very successful in selecting our delegates."

[From the New York Times, July 16, 1980]
DETROIT AND HOUSTON REFLECT SHIFTING FORTUNES OF THE MIDWEST AND THE SUN BELT

(By William K. Stevens)

DETROIT—It's 8 A.M., downtown Detroit early July. The temperature is a glorious 65, on the way to 83. The sun sparkles on the river and glints off the quintuple cylinders of the Renaissance Center, glossy for the Republican National Convention this week. There is extra spring in the step of white-collar workers coming in from the green leafiness of the suburbs. It is the best of seasons here.

Eleven hundred air miles, one time zone and a full turn of the wheel of economic history to the south-southwest, it is the worst of seasons. The morning temperature in downtown Houston is 84 degrees, on the way to 104. The city is oppressive. Everyone who can has fled inside to the air-conditioned comfort of office buildings or the underground tunnels that connect them.

In both cases, mood masks reality.

Even in the sauna that Houston has become, the new skyscrapers rise one after another, accompanied by clank and clatter and sweat. Beige and ebony, rose and emerald, they crown the explosively growing capital of the Oil Patch and proclaim the coming-of-age of the Sun Belt.

CLOSED BAR SYMBOLIZES DECLINE

Here in Detroit, the capital of the Middle Western industrial crescent, there is fundamental decline, symbolized by the plywood nailed up where the windows of Mickey's Dodge Bar used to be.

A short time ago one could go to the bar to take the economic and psychological pulse of the auto workers who flocked in from Dodge Main, the hulking factory across the street. Now Dodge Main is closed. The workers' profane laughter lives only in the imagination. There is no pulse to take at Mickey's anymore.

No two major cities today are more extreme examples of, or illustrate more dramatically, the great shift of power and people from the North to the South and from the East to the West.

It has been going on for some time, of course. So dominant has the North been, however, and so wide is the historical gap between it and the Sun Belt, that the day when the two regions might become equal seemed far off.

DAY OF PARITY NEARS

Now, as the Republicans meet in the depressed hub of the industrial crescent to nominate their candidate from the Sun Belt, a number of indicators suggest that the day of parity is much closer than had been expected. In fact, it may be reached before the 1980's are over.

Detroit, the nation's automobile capital, and Houston, the oil capital, opposite sides of the economic coin, illustrate what is happening. In 1970 less than half as many people lived in the Houston metropolitan area as in metropolitan Detroit. But De-

troit's fortunes depend on a stagnating industry whose long-term troubles have been made worse by the nation's energy problems. Houston is built on a healthy, surging industry whose very strength comes from efforts to deal with those energy problems.

Detroit is not about to fold up. Nor is Houston a paradise. The difference is that Detroit has had its first great era, as symbolized by the drab, gray office buildings, straight out of the 1920's, that still set the dominant tone of downtown despite the glitter of Renaissance Center.

Houston's era is just beginning. The newspapers are always announcing new skyscrapers, and construction of one of the biggest, a 71-story, emerald-green tower, is proceeding in the very teeth of the national recession.

CLOSING THE POPULATION GAP

Today metropolitan Houston is about 60 percent as populous as metropolitan Detroit with an estimated 2.7 million people to greater Detroit's 4.4 million. Demographers expect the gap to close rapidly, some predict by 1990.

Houston's rapid gain on Detroit is part of a much broader movement of people between the regions. In the 1970's, according to Census Bureau estimates, the South and West combined became more populous than the North and East for the first time in the nation's history.

Moreover, in the last decade the South, including Texas, replaced Michigan, as the region and state making the heaviest new capital investment in manufacturing. And although the Crescent is expected to remain the principal seat of heavy manufacturing for some time, the South is expected to overtake the Middle West in overall manufacturing employment by the middle of this decade.

At the same time, economists in the North fear the results of the new billions in taxes to be reaped by the governments of oil-producing states as oil and gas prices are decontrolled.

"The dynamics created by the shift of wealth to the oil-producing states would create forces that would inevitably draw more industry and more taxpayers to those parts of the country," said Felix Rohatyn, the New York investment banker.

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES COMPARED

In the cases of Houston and Detroit, the change in regional fortunes is highlighted by the recession. Greater Detroit, hit by what is being called a depression here, had an unemployment rate of 14.7 percent in May, the latest month for which comparative figures are available. In Houston, the rate was 4 percent, against a national figure of 7.8 percent.

In hard times, automobiles are one of the first things people stop buying. Even before that, the scarcity of fuel meant disaster for an auto industry unable to meet the new demand for fuel-efficient cars.

But the search for energy, that economic touchstone of the age, goes on, regardless. And in Houston, the economy for the most part is purring. As prices rise to reflect the scarcity, Houston becomes even more affluent. Moreover, it is the center of an industry that produces most of the world's oilfield equipment at a time when the search for oil and natural gas is at its most intense.

On a more fundamental level, manufacturing has gradually shrunk as a proportion of the nation's total economy. The industrial crescent, built on manufacturing, has accordingly suffered.

PLANTS ARE LESS COMPETITIVE

In addition, economists say, obsolete plants in both the steel and auto industries have made them less competitive with foreign producers. Here the Crescent is caught in yet another bind: The more its industries modernize and automate, the fewer jobs they provide. The result is further retrenchment

and further migration of people to the Sunbelt.

Other factors are at play, too. When highways, air and modern communications superseded rail transportation, it became possible for factories and businesses to cut the ties that bound them to the older cities. Industry became footloose, and entrepreneurs tended to move where they perceived the business climate to be better. That meant south.

With all this, it would be a mistake to overstate Houston's run at parity with Detroit. Houston, like the rest of the South, started from a long way back.

Metropolitan Detroit is not only considerably larger than metropolitan Houston, it is also somewhat more affluent. Once a year, Sales and Marketing Management Magazine publishes a survey of buying power. Using an index of real, spendable wealth that it calls "effective buying income," the latest such survey determined that in 1978, the average Detroit family had \$23,623 at its disposal, while the average Houston family had \$22,437. The magazine projected that Detroit would maintain its lead at least until 1983.

INNER CITIES ARE SIMILAR

Detroit's restaurants and nightclubs are every bit as lively as Houston's, its cultural institutions at least as well-regarded. At the same time, stretches of the inner cities of Houston and Detroit look alike, their dilapidated buildings and mean streets virtually interchangeable.

But Houston is creating itself, right now, for the future, much as Detroit did decades ago. Things are so much in flux that Houston's character is not yet fully formed, although some of the elements are there: Southern and Western openness, boom-town optimism and verve, an ethnic mix led by traditional Texans but well leavened by Hispanic-Americans and Asians. Nor has Houston yet been tested in adversity as Detroit has.

Detroit's character is long established: tough, resilient, forged by decades of struggle by varieties of ethnic groups.

These days, Detroiters seem almost defiantly anxious to talk about their heralded renaissance. They flock to the riverfront on special festivals, filing downtown with a life unknown to downtown Houston after dark. As one Detroiter said, "This city is cooking."

RETRENCHING AND READJUSTING

But it is readjusting, too. The Renaissance Center, an impressive catalyst for downtown rebirth, was in a sense the creature of a special effort by a persistent Henry Ford 2d. In Houston, buildings just seem to grow naturally. It is a difference in stage of life.

Not long ago, according to Ralph Widner, president of the Academy of Contemporary Problems, a meeting of Middle Western developers and public officials took a straw vote, and all said they thought the industrial crescent would decline in population and employment in the 1980's or remain stagnant. "If you'd taken it three years earlier," Mr. Widner said, referring to the straw vote, "the worst case would have been stagnant and the best would be modest growth."

How will it end? Most analysis say the realities of the marketplace and the imperatives of automation will result not only in a smaller automobile industry, but also in a smaller Detroit that must learn to cope with no growth.

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1980]

DETROIT: ALL REALLY LOVE NICE PARTIES

(By Iver Peterson)

DETROIT, July 18.—Party politics came to Detroit with the Republican National Con-

vention this week: parties in museums, parties on houseboats, parties at \$1,000 a plate and parties that went barefoot in Belle Isle Park.

The city seemed to enjoy the parties, and the delegates gave the city rave reviews.

"There's all this free time, so we might as well use it," Ferdinand Taylor, an alternate delegate from Oregon, said between bites of a canape at a Republican Women's Club gathering.

It would be hard for any of the 10,000 delegates, alternates, news organizations' workers and other assorted conventioneers to miss the cue. The city fought hard to overcome its image as a dull factory town and decked out everyone from busboys to Mayor Coleman A. Young with buttons declaring "Detroit Loves a Good Party," the city's official theme for the four-day convention.

A "BEAUTIFUL TOWN"

"I don't know what else they could have done for us," said Virginia Thomas, whose husband was a delegate from Florida.

Many out-of-towners said they had been afraid the city strike that hit Detroit two weeks before convention time would produce piles of garbage on the city's streets. The strike was settled two days before the convention opened.

"We expected a dirty, ugly, awful city," said Julie Gianellone of Houston. Instead, she said, she found a "beautiful town, just beautiful."

The Republicans held more than 60 official parties. The National Committee was the host at six, including "The World's Largest Detroit Loves a Good Party Party," which was open to anyone with \$1.75 and a thirst for Stroh's beer. Each of the 50 state delegations, and the delegations from Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia, held one. There were only eight delegates and alternates from Guam, but 200 people showed up for their party.

There were even signs that parties may be replacing the news release among special interest groups that have discerned which way the wine is flowing. The city of Pontiac, 30 miles north of Detroit, announced that it had "an unemployment rate of 26.4 percent, a staggering inflation rate, urban renewal problems and a volatile racial mix" and threw a "kegger" beer party, with a headline to show that being down does not mean that the city is out of the social and political whirl.

DIFFERENT STYLE IN DETROIT

Mayor Young's official reception on an excursion boat in the Detroit River the day before the convention opened was akin to Pontiac's effort, though the style in Detroit is not to call attention to the problems it shares with the other manufacturing centers in the state.

But the city and its people were aware that Detroit had hardly been the first choice of the delegates. Its reputation as "Murder City," long outdated by a falling crime rate, stayed in the minds of the people who came to the convention, and the memory of the devastating race riot of 1967 outlasted more recent cheerful news.

Clarke Reed, a National Committee member from Mississippi, became a celebrity by saying, months before the convention: "They say that the convention center is only five minutes away from all the hotels. The trouble is that nobody has ever made it."

THE CITY TRIES HARD

Yet the main complaint about Detroit as a convention city was that the delegates were scattered in hotels as far as 25 miles away from the Joe Louis Arena, where they met this week.

"I've never seen anyone try so hard to make it nice for us," said Eileen Baker, who came from Missouri with her husband, a delegate.

Pat Cosgrove of Washington said: "The

hospitality reminded me of a Southern city, not a Northern city."

The Cosgroves were among many visitors who praised the work of the Detroit police. Mrs. Gianellone said, "You had to feel safe here; there was a policeman every five feet."

The delegates managed to have their fun without many problems. The only incident requiring the police was an anti-Republican demonstration by a band of self-described Yippies near the convention center.

The Detroit Bar Association had planned for the worst by opening a 24-hour legal referral hot line for anyone in sudden need of a lawyer, but not one call for help came through.

There were cries of disappointment from restaurateurs over a lack of business. According to the press agents hired by downtown establishments to promote some of the millions of dollars in business that the convention was expected to produce, the visitors stayed close to their hotels early in the week, while regular patrons avoided downtown in the belief that there was no room for them.

SUBURBANITES COME BACK

Later, however, when the disappointment of the restaurateurs became known through newspaper articles and radio and television reports, suburbanites began filtering back downtown.

The Detroit Institute of Arts mounted special exhibits for the delegates and pushed the closing time back to 10 P.M. in hopes of a rush of culture seekers. There was no rush.

One special display included a painting by Thomas Couture called "The Enrollment of the Volunteers," which was commissioned by the French Government in the mid-19th century to inspire a volunteer army for France.

"We thought it would tie in with the debate about the draft," Bob Rogers of the institute said, "but the Republicans came out against it in their platform. It looks like we were a little out of step."

[From Time Magazine, July 21, 1980]

DOWN BUT FAR FROM OUT: HURT BY THE RECESSION, THE G.O.P.'S HOST IS FIGHTING BACK

It's a lunch-bucket town with a world-class symphony. A heavily black city with a black-run government, but an economy dependent on white business leaders. A community that prides itself on its race relations, yet a town where the underlying tensions could still cause another riot. And it's a Democratic town holding the Republican National Convention.

With its many contradictions, Detroit defies labeling and upsets preconceptions. Self-styled sophisticates from elsewhere have long scoffed at the industrial city. Just last week a researcher from one of the television networks had the gall to ask a Detroit spokesman to help put together a list of a dozen "top mugging spots" for convention delegates to avoid. Actually, crime in the city has dropped dramatically in the past few years. And a European reporter who assumed the Detroit River was hopelessly polluted by the city's heavy industry looked out over the waterfront in astonishment at fishermen angling for coho salmon.

More than 20,000 visitors will form their own conclusions about Detroit this week during the four-day Republican Convention. Some 15,000 journalists will jostle with 4,000 delegates and alternates in and around the just finished \$27 million Joe Louis Arena, where Ronald Reagan will become the Republicans' presidential candidate. The crowds are overwhelming Detroit's limited hotel and eating facilities; some conventioneers are staying across the border in Canada, or up to 40 miles away in small towns of Michigan.

Both Detroit and the G.O.P. are out to exploit each other, and make no bones about it. Coleman A. Young, Detroit's shrew and

aggressive mayor, hopes to use the convention to prove to the nation that his town is, as its boosters have been boasting, a city in the midst of a revival. He is well aware of the risk in seizing the national spotlight, if only for a week. "We have our warts," Young says with typical candor, "and we see them too." Republican Party leaders, in turn, hope to use Detroit as a theatrical backdrop in their bid to lure blue-collar workers and blacks away from the Democratic Party.

Some of Detroit's warts were highly visible last week. Even as parking-lot operators were putting out potted geraniums to brighten the city's face for visitors, some 425 striking sanitation workers let garbage pile up along the streets. Bus mechanics, too, were on strike, forcing the collapse of local service that carries 200,000 people daily—although some residents claim the system has long been so poor that no one can tell the difference. In all, about 8,400 striking municipal workers (out of 21,700) tried to use the convention as a club to beat the city into granting hefty wage hikes. Young, who came out of the same tough "Black Bottom" ghetto that produced Joe Louis and was once an organizer for the United Auto Workers, bargained hard but at week's end settled for a draw. A new pact gave the workers less than they had asked but more than the mayor had offered—despite Young's repeated plea that "I ain't got no more goddam money."

The mayor had a point. Detroit's economy has long depended on the auto industry, which has been slowed to a sputter by the recession and foreign imports. Rising losses by the carmakers and spreading layoffs (the city's unemployment has reached 18 percent) have caused city tax revenues to fall and contributed to a financial deficit for the fiscal year of \$70 million.

The symbiosis between city and cars is, of course, what makes the Motor City unique. "It is both a great blessing and a great problem," says Edward Cushman, a political science professor at Detroit's Wayne State University. In normal times more than one-third of the city's 1.8 million wage earners hold jobs directly related to the auto industry. When the assembly lines are rolling, the area's autoworkers, many of whom are black, can take home as much as \$30,000 a year. When layoffs are temporary, the combination of company, union, state and federal benefits give workers up to 95 percent of normal pay. But Detroit is fearful now that the unemployment will linger on and on.

Still, in this city of contrasts, the good years of the auto industry helped power the undeniable revival of Detroit's downtown. So, too, has the unusual rapport between black city officials and the community's white business executives, who rarely live within the city limits. The outspoken Young, for example, does not hesitate in public to rib his good friend Henry Ford II. When the former Ford Motor Co. boss complained in a speech that the 73-story Detroit Plaza Hotel, the showpiece of the city's celebrated Renaissance Center complex along the waterfront, might be doing nicely in attracting conventions but was not producing enough "transient business," Young took a microphone to declare: "Hank the Deuce just told us we gotta start hot-sheets it at the hotel."

This close relationship between white and black leaders began as a community-wide reaction to the race riot of 1967, one of the worst in the Nation. A total of 33 blacks and ten whites died in the chaos, and the damage to property amounted to \$80 million. Civic leaders formed an interracial group called New Detroit and worked hard to improve race relations, especially between black residents and a white-dominated police force. Three years later, Henry Ford led the formation of Detroit Renaissance, a group made up of chief executives of the major corporations in the city. This power elite had the financial

clout to rebuild the downtown, which was so deserted after the riots that Young says: "You could have shot a cannon down any of the major thoroughfares at night and not hit anyone."

The redevelopment of the waterfront area has been economically successful, although critics differ over its aesthetic appeal. The main cluster of new buildings is the \$350 million Renaissance Center, consisting of five glass towers containing office space and topped by the spectacular Detroit Plaza Hotel. The center has helped the city raise its conventional revenues from \$56 million in 1970 to a projected \$115 million this year. More than 90 percent of the center's office space is rented. Although the complex looks a bit like a mother ship from *Star Wars*—or perhaps because of the fact—visitors flock to its more than 20 restaurants and stylish boutiques.

While the grandest and gaudiest redevelopment has occurred downtown, Detroit has also built a number of privately owned housing projects around the city, including the remodeling of 125 houses and 175 apartments by General Motors Corp. near its headquarters three miles north of the downtown area. Obviously well intended by GM, the project is resented by many blacks, who fear that it will raise real estate values in the area until only affluent whites from the suburbs can afford to buy houses there. GM is planning to provide some subsidized housing.

General Motors Chairman Thomas Murphy discovered how quickly Detroit could respond when an auto company needs a lift. He told Young in June that GM's Cadillac division and the Fisher body plant that supplies it might have to leave Detroit in a search for more space. Within a week, the city assembled a land package of more than 500 acres in a deal with Hamtramck, a municipal enclave surrounded by Detroit. The plan will involve the razing of 1,500 homes and the relocation of churches, businesses—and even a cemetery.

Not all Detroiters, however, cheer all of the reconstruction that is going on in the city. To check decay, Young and other city officials have granted tax concessions to developers willing to build in the area, but they are criticized for doing so as city deficits grow. So far, however, most residents seem to agree with Bob McCabe, president of Detroit Renaissance, who defends Young: "This city is in a fight for its life. It needs to be competitive. You need tax abatements not to make developers rich but to make the developments possible."

A tougher challenge that constantly confronts Detroit's government is trying to improve the lives of the city's poor. About 60 per cent of Detroit's 1.2 million people are black, and about 80,000 have incomes below the poverty line. Some 300,000 are eligible for food stamps. Large sections of the city are 90 percent black; the public school system is 85 percent black; the students are up to two years below national standards. As in most major cities, unemployment figures for young blacks are astronomical: estimates range as high as 60 percent. Sources of racial resentment remain. Walter Douglas, the black who heads an organization that expedites new construction, points out that the privately operated Detroit Golf Club is in the middle of a predominantly black area, but has no black members. Says Douglas: "It's a damn shame."

Young has served his constituents well by leading a drive to expand black influence in the city. First elected in 1973 by a mere 12,000 votes (out of 250,000), he has helped blacks win six of the nine city council seats, including its presidency; a majority on the Wayne County board of supervisors, which sits in Detroit; and 16 of the 23 judgeships in the city's criminal courts. In addition, the

deputy mayor, superintendent of schools and chief of police are black.

Young's pressure on the police department has been effective in two ways. By sharply increasing the percentage of black police officers (from 15 percent in 1974 to more than 40 percent), he has defused some of the emotional conflict between police and the black community. At the same time, the force has become more effective. In Young's first year in office, Detroit was known to headline writers as *Murder City*. Its 714 homicides constituted the highest per capita rate of any major U.S. city. Last year the murder toll was down to 451. Lesser crimes decreased too—so much so that other police departments have sent representatives to see what Detroit was doing right.

There are still muggings, of course, but downtown streets that were once an eerie no man's land after dark now come alive with normal night life, as the Republican delegates undoubtedly will discover. Detroiters tend to live it up to the lyric of an old Motown song: "By day we make the cars, by night we make the bars."

After years of decline, the city that produced such jazz greats as Kenney Burrell, Yusef Lateef and Joe Henderson is enjoying a resurgence in the music style. Unfortunately, rock and to a lesser extent soul have faded since the Detroit days in the '60s and '70s of Diana Ross, Stevie Wonder, Aretha Franklin, Gladys Knight and Alice Cooper. Detroit's main musical pride today is its highly respected symphony directed by Antal Dorati, 74, who has done for Detroit what he had achieved earlier for Dallas, Minneapolis and Washington.

Yet the beat to which Detroit moves remains, for better or worse, the rhythm of the assembly lines. The \$45 million that Detroit merchants expect to ring up at the convention may inspire a few more "hallelujahs" in celebration of the city's revival, but it cannot affect the auto industry's deep-seated problems. Mayor Young remains optimistic—and defiant. "Detroit has always been a feisty city," he says. "We've known trouble, but we're not afraid to take it on."—By Ed Magnuson. Reported by Barrett Seaman/Detroit

[From the Detroit News, July 15, 1980]

IT'S THE RIGHT TIME FOR THE SPOTLIGHT

(By Joe Falls)

BOSTON.—What a curious feeling.

You turn on the TV set and there is the Detroit skyline on the screen:

You look a little closer and there is Hart Plaza and Jefferson Avenue and the rising towers of the Ren-Cen.

Your first reaction is: "What are we doing on television?"

Then you find yourself smiling, feeling a strange sense of pride. Somebody is finally noticing us.

Detroit, Mich.

We really are the news capital of the world this week.

Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's a nice feeling to be 700-miles from home and see our city in living color.

Sure, the streets may be dirty out near Jos. Campau, and maybe there's still some trash laying around on Brush and Beaubien.

But they've stopped showing these things. We are now seeing Detroit at its best—its vibrant, colorful, exciting best.

It's a fine feeling, sir. You ought to come here and see it for yourself.

It is also fair . . . because everybody has seen the other side of our city.

The fire and the smoke and those hard hats in the streets.

We've lived with that image for a long time.

It was 13 years ago, on that fateful Sunday afternoon in 1967, when the first telltale wisps of smoke appeared from out beyond the left field roof in Tiger Stadium.

One of the Yankee writers said, "Your city's on fire."

Somebody else laughed.

Naw. A city doesn't burn. What'd Horton do on the last pitch?

But the smoke billowed higher, until they were peering out back windows of the press box. Our city was burning and burning badly.

Now it is our time to show everybody there is more to Detroit than fire and smoke and helmets.

It is our turn to show them that there can be some glitter to Detroit.

Glitter . . . and hope and promise and, yes, even some prayers.

A lot of people still laugh at Detroit. A Boston sports writer named Steve Marantz took a shot at us in his Sunday paper. He was doing a piece on Richie Hebner, and he said the poor guy is trying to make his living in Detroit.

He said Detroit is a place where either people are dead or are waiting to be dead.

I don't know Steve Marantz. I've never bumped into him at a sports event. I just wonder if he realized what he was writing.

We've got a long way to go, but don't you have to start somewhere?

Detroit is trying to get started. We can only hope our comeback continues, until all the people in town this week come back to see us again, maybe in another 10 years, when there could be a sweep of civilization along the riverfront unlike anything this side of Chicago.

In the meantime, it is a kick to turn on your TV set and see John Chancellor talking to you from his NBC booth high atop Joe Louis Arena.

The arena is new to us, and it is far from perfect, but it is ours. It is fun to sit in your hotel room before going out to Fenway Park and watch the big TV stars do their stuff in Detroit.

You just hope they stop by Lafayette for a Coney Island light on the mustard, heavy on the onions. Or stop for a flaming cheese in Greektown.

If they want to show the trash piles, they can. If they want to show the empty auto plants, they can.

These things are real, and they are very hurtful. Nobody is proud of them.

The point is that these people visiting our town should have been around 10 years ago. There would have been nothing for them in the streets, not even safety.

Now there are a few things to do. A band to listen to, a pigeon to feed, an ice cream cone to lick.

Not much, maybe—not much at all when compared to a place like Boston, which is a great walking-around city.

Yet, what a delight it is to pick up the two Boston newspapers and see Detroit date-lines plastered all over page one.

I wanted to kiss the Boston Globe for taking such a positive look at Detroit last Saturday, calling it not only the "Renaissance City" but a city which is simply trying.

It was left to CBS to show my favorite film clip on its morning show.

They showed my people pumping up the Detroit News hot-air balloon, while the commentator was extolling the efforts of the city to stage the Republican Convention.

He said, "But of course, not everything works out as planned," and almost on cue the big red and white balloon collapsed in a heap and the commentator concluded: "And that's how things are in Detroit."

I couldn't stop laughing.

I remember when I couldn't stop crying.

[From the Detroit News, July 15, 1980]

A LOOK AT TV BOOTHMANSHIP

(By Ben Brown)

You're a Detroit TV reporter with an eye on the next move up, maybe a job in New York or Los Angeles. Or maybe you just want a little professional acknowledgment, a pat on the back from someone more important than your mother's hairdresser.

So, here you are in Republican convention week, a week that belongs to Ronald Reagan and to the television news business. And in those broadcast trailers and booths in the adjoining downtown convention halls sit colleagues, idols and potential bosses—the very folks, in other words, who can make you beloved and rich.

Well, if you've watched the Detroit stations implant themselves in little "sky booths" in the Joe Louis Arena and then work through their first convention day, you already have a glimpse of the effect this wild context is likely to have on our local stars.

Channel 2's Robbie Timmons and Joe Glover are the least affected by their surroundings—too unaffected, in fact. They look as if they were sort of beamed down into their anchor chairs.

But superanchors Billy Bonds and Mort Crim are wonders to behold. Channel 7's Bonds—that fearless tyrant of Action News—has been genuinely transformed. I thought he'd been sedated for sure; but chances are he's just impressed, maybe even intimidated, by his surroundings.

Sharing host duties with Jim Herrington from a special section of the ABC News booth, Bonds worked against the NBC and CBS heavyweights yesterday morning for the opening session of the convention. At times, he turned away from the camera, mumbled quietly to the glass which separated him from the air above the arena, and looked for all the world as if he were considering a leap. I think the guy was actually feeling pangs of humility. Kinda gives you hope, doesn't it?

Crim and Channel 4, however, are in their glory. Suffering through two years of dismal news ratings and cranky attacks for not being Detroit enough—whatever that means—the station and its news department have discovered (or at least declared) their identity. So now, in a display of local boosterism that could make Coleman Young look like a slacker, Crim and company are celebrating the convention, the city, the future of industrial capitalism and life in general in Midwestern America.

The celebration is built into those slick news promotions that seem to air every 20 minutes or so, and it's formed the basis of two well-produced but vacuous convention specials. In the first special two Sundays ago, Crim announced the new mission: "It's image-making time for us in Detroit. . . . our big chance, if we don't blow it."

I'd rather hear that from city officials and the Chamber of Commerce, thank you—not from people who deliver the news.

To be fair, I have to admit that all this psyching up on Channel 4's part looks as if it will pay off. The station's expanded news—anchored partly on location in Joe Louis and partly in the studio—blew away the competition yesterday. But I still have this bad taste in my mouth.

If it was silly to criticize Channel 4 for its out-of-towner image—and I believe it was—isn't it just as silly (and phony) for the station to suddenly discover and celebrate its Detroitness?

DETROIT POLISHES ITS IMAGE—DELEGATES CAME CARRYING MACE BUT LEFT SMILING

(By Michael Dupont)

Dottie Young of Round Rock, Texas, packed away her Chem-Shield Mace gun and Katherine Moore's sister advised her in Show Low, Arizona to do the same.

They were delegates going to the Republican National Convention. They were unsure women going to Detroit.

Nearly 4,000 delegates carried that image to this week's convention: Detroit as tough, dangerous town. Rumors of citywide strikes, memories of fiery riots and tags of "Murder Capital, U.S.A." danced darkly in their heads.

By convention's end, the knowledge of Detroit they took home with them was something entirely different. The city's economy may not have boomed as much as merchants had hoped, but Detroit's image was soaring.

"It sounded like Detroit was an armed camp," recalled delegate Greg Leo of Portland, Ore.

"It's not so," the 28-year-old redhead firmly said. "It's like any other American big city, except the people are trying harder. There is a real can-do, helpful orientation about Detroit."

That can-do spirit enabled Iowa delegates to stage a lively welcome for George Bush at Wednesday's convention session. Hours before the session was to convene, Bush supporters lacked the shelf paper and markers necessary for their signwaving demonstration.

"We went into a Troy supermarket with a ridiculous request," recounted John Axel of Muscatine, Iowa, "and the manager and assistant bent over backwards to help us."

Supermarket employees picked through musty storerooms and dug under boxes to find sufficient quantities of the needed articles. The Iowans held their Bush celebration on schedule.

And the No. 1 concern of convention visitors never showed up. Not a single crime or violent act was committed against a delegate. Gerald Hale, chief of special operations for the convention police task force, reported Friday.

Hawaii's Allen Barr would not be surprised at that fact. He was already convinced Detroit police had done a superior job, with an attitude markedly different from the one he remembered as a boy growing up here.

"The police have been the tourist bureau for the city of Detroit," the Maui legislator offered. "Policemen could easily resent that, but they've been very courteous and helpful in answering even the most ridiculous questions."

"I have lingering wounds from run-ins with police here as a kid," Barr conceded. "But I'm impressed with their change of attitude. They've gone out of their way to put up with a lot of stuff."

Stuff like a Yippie sit-in on the Jefferson Avenue median near Cobo Hall or a Rock Against Reagan concert that turned violent at Clark Park. Both incidents were coolly handled by police officers with a minimum of force. Only 16 arrests were made.

While delegates were uniformly overwhelmed by the hospitality of Detroit, local businessmen were nowhere near as positive about their convention week experiences.

Detroit City Council members said Friday they had been fielding reports from merchants and restaurateurs complaining about poor sales during the GOP gathering.

"In talking with people, they seem to be disappointed," related Councilman Jack Kelly. "They were expecting big crowds, and they were wrong."

"The cabdrivers got a shafting," sneered Leonard Terry, spokesman for Checker Cab

Co. With 700 cabs, Checker operates Detroit's largest taxi fleet.

Councilman Clyde Cleveland took exception to the exaggerated hospitality fostered by the host committee. He said the bus transportation was "too good" and that there were too many free parties.

"It seems like all a Republican had to bring with him for the week was a \$10 bill," Cleveland whined. "The rest of the time he could eat free."

No disagreement could be found among delegates on that point. Katrina Stone of Corpus Christi, Tex., enthused Wednesday that her convention highlight was "I haven't spent a dollar since I got here."

Yet, not all sellers suffered. In the downtown area, Emily's Across the Street was flooded with 5,000 customers a day.

"Business has been unbelievable," store-owner Emily Gail said excitedly. "Every customer who came in here left with a shopping bag full of stuff."

Out in the suburbs, Somerset Mall's business was booming. But it boomed for a reason.

"We aggressively pursued the delegates and it seems to have worked," said Brenda Green, spokeswoman for the mall in Troy. "The results I'm getting are generally pretty good and I haven't heard a single complaint."

Somerset merchants contracted for two 51-passenger busses to supplement the mall's own van in shuttling delegates from nine nearby hotels. All 43 stores pitched in items like soap, fragrances, discount coupons and gift certificates to fill a small shopping bag distributed to members of 12 state delegations.

It's that kind of attitude that keeps the customers coming back.

"The long-range benefits of having the convention in Detroit will be significant," said Diane Edgecomb, president of the Central Business District Association. "The image of Detroit has changed dramatically."

Ask Leo Whaley, a 44-year-old carpenter from Cohutta, Georgia. A delegate to both the Kansas City and Detroit conventions, he says there's really no comparison between the two.

"It's got Kansas City beat all to hell," he assured.

"People have gone out of their way here to be hospitable," Whaley said. "I'm really surprised because I thought we were coming up here to big problems."

"The cabdrivers got a shafting," sneered Leonard Terry, spokesman for Checker Cab Co. With 700 cabs, Checker operates Detroit's largest taxi fleet.

Terry said drivers felt "disgusted and abused" because the Civic Host Committee got their hopes up for big convention business that never materialized. Day after day, cabbies watched scores of busses ferry delegates between hotels and the Joe Louis Arena.

"They tell the drivers to put their best foot forward, that we're the ambassadors, but then we don't get nothing but a hard way to go," he lamented.

The Bob-Lo boat also fared badly during the convention's week long run. Company spokesman Chris Bueter said convention restrictions caused \$400,000 in losses, as excursion boats sailed to Bob-Lo Island carrying far below capacity crowds.

After a devastatingly poor start, local restaurateurs recouped late in the week to achieve overall satisfying sales, according to a survey of 12 key Detroit eateries by the Michigan Restaurant Association.

"Business itself was spotty, but in almost every case it had improved by the end of the week," said Bob Morellion, spokesman for the association.

The early-week slump was due to the glut of free meals provided to visitors, and heightened by the absence of regular customers wanting to avoid convention crowds, Morellion explained.

[From U.S. News & World Report, July 14, 1980]

A SPIRITED GOP GEARS UP FOR ITS BIG SHOW

DETROIT.—Confident Republicans and eager Detroiters are all primed to formalize Ronald Reagan's presidential nomination in a fast-paced convention—one that is tailored to show off a party and a city both on the way back.

While the GOP prepares to put on a display of unity for 20,000 delegates, reporters and spectators—plus a vast TV audience—Detroit is determined to use the July 14-18 meeting to improve its own reputation across the country.

Often described as the world's largest one-industry town, the Motor City is counting on a smoothly functioning convention to bring in millions of dollars and help diversify, if only temporarily, an economy that rises and falls with automobile sales.

The only suspense in the script centers on the selection of Reagan's vice-presidential running mate. Still pondering that choice among eight finalists, Reagan says he will not reveal his decision until after his own nomination becomes official on July 16.

The preconvention mood is markedly upbeat among Republicans, who look to the November 4 election to wipe out any remaining political taint associated with the Watergate scandals of the 1970s.

GOP leaders claim things shape up so well that the party will have a real chance this fall to seriously challenge the Democrats for control of Congress as well as the Presidency.

Prospects for the White House race appear promising, at least in July. Reagan is running consistently ahead in the public-opinion polls against Democratic President Jimmy Carter and independent John Anderson by a margin as wide as 15 points in the latest CBS-New York Times survey.

The Republicans even have managed so far to avoid their customary election-year fight between conservatives and moderates. As one party official put it: "We are going to leave the infighting to the Democrats this year for a change."

SENSITIVE ISSUES

The only skirmishes at this convention are apt to come over adoption of the party platform on such delicate issues as the equal-rights amendment and abortion. But convention managers predict that, in the interests of party unity for the fall campaign, even those emotional controversies are not likely to get out of hand.

Instead of floor fights and angry debates, officials say, television cameras inside the city's new Joe Louis Arena will be focusing on 4,000 cheering delegates and alternates happily whooping it up for Reagan.

In fact, the convention schedule has been put together with viewers clearly given higher priority than the delegates. Explains one party planner: "The most important thing we can get out of our convention is TV coverage. Our own delegates are not the people we should be talking to; we want the TV audience."

Entertainment will share the spotlight with politics. With that goal in mind, the politicians, except for those making major addresses, have been asked to limit their speeches to a maximum of 8 minutes.

The party's stars—such as Reagan, his running mate, former President Gerald Ford and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger—will speak during prime-time television hours. Verbatim reading of some dull committee reports will be eliminated to keep the program moving along and viewers at home awake.

IMPROVING ITS IMAGE

Detroit, a traditional Democratic stronghold hosting its first major political convention, is spending an estimated 2 million dollars in private and public money to clean up the city for the benefit of delegates, re-

porters and TV audiences. The convention budget itself comes to another 4.4 million, all of it in federal funds.

Aside from the long-term goal of improving the local image, the immediate returns are considerable. The 1976 Republican convention in Kansas City brought that community an estimated 37 million dollars. This year, Detroit officials anticipate that conventioners will spend from 40 to 50 million in a local economy where the crucial auto industry is in the doldrums, overall unemployment is running 15 percent and joblessness among black youths ranges up to 55 percent.

Detroit also is hoping to shed any lingering image of a riot-scarred, crime-ridden city by demonstrating that it can compete effectively in the growth industry of attracting conventions. To that end, many merchants, restaurant operators and taxi drivers have pledged to refrain from gouging customers.

Coleman Young, the city's Democratic mayor, declares: "The entire world will see that Detroit, which once was declared dead, is indeed alive and well and has recovered from the maladies of our past."

Civic boosters contend that, despite its troubled past, Detroit has made major strides in the last decade. The city still has its slum areas, but also retains some attractive neighborhoods and is surrounded by suburbs ranging from modest to plush.

While crime remains a serious problem, officials say the rate of offenses has declined since the early 1970s, with particular improvement in the downtown area.

Urban blight, authorities acknowledge, is still troublesome but is being attacked through a multi-million-dollar rehabilitation program. A key part of that construction effort is the 357-million-dollar Renaissance Center—the Republican convention headquarters—a towering glass-and-steel complex built along the Detroit River.

Among other efforts being made to spruce up Detroit for the national convention:

Thirty-five derelict buildings have been demolished, and 50 others have been boarded up and painted. Abandoned cars have been towed from the downtown area and potholes repaired on streets and major freeways.

More than 10,000 shrubs and some \$500,000 worth of ash, crab apple, locust, maple and evergreen trees have been planted along the John Lodge Freeway. City-park fountains, many of them dry for years, are spewing water again. Flags and bunting will decorate 400 downtown lampposts.

Visiting Republican delegates and other conventiongoers will be showered with attention and gifts. They will be assisted during the week by 3,000 local volunteers, ranging from homemakers to corporate executives, who will do chores such as answering telephones and chauffeuring VIPs.

Stores are planning special promotions for convention guests. Expensive celebrations—mostly paid for by passing the hat among private donors and area businesses executives—are being laid on for local helpers and revelers as well as visitors and the press in keeping with the convention slogan: "Detroit Loves a Good Party."

The Ford Motor Company and General Motors Corporation will offer free plant tours, although the assembly line at Ford's huge River Rouge operation will be shut down for the firm's annual model changeover.

Sums up Thomas A. Murphy, chairman of General Motors who also serves as head of the city's civic host committee for the convention: "The whole world will be watching us. The last time we had a chance for so much attention was in 1967 when, unfortunately, we had the riots."

Even amid the euphoria over hosting the convention, Detroit faces serious problems. The population has declined by some 250,000 since 1970. Latest reports disclose that white flight has continued to the point where

blacks now make up 60 percent of the population.

In the best of times, the city has a history of labor tension. That tradition continued with the start of a strike in early July by more than one third of the city's municipal employees.

Local officials, too, are irked that one community group is offering GOP delegates a tour of the city's littered vacant lots and rat-infested tenements—an excursion billed as a visit to "the real Detroit."

THE RUSH FOR ROOMS

A lack of hotel rooms in the city has caused a scramble for accommodations stretching across the Detroit River into Canada and as far as Ann Arbor, an hour's drive away. Some 15,000 rooms have been allocated among 148 hotels and motels and nine university dormitories.

The Detroit convention offers special historical significance for the Republicans. The party held its first state-wide convention in 1854 in nearby Jackson, Mich. The all-male delegates assembled as Free Soilers, Free Democrats and Whigs, but left calling themselves Republicans.

The city was selected for the 1980 convention only after a three-year campaign and strong support from Bill Brock, the party chairman. Brock was anxious to symbolize the party's broadened appeal to black and urban voters by meeting in a heavily Democratic city in the industrial north, an area where many analysts predict the election might be settled.

Some Republican officials fought the selection, preferring Dallas instead. Other major convention bidders included New York, Miami Beach, Kansas City, Minneapolis and New Orleans.

An outspoken Republican moderate, Michigan's Governor William Milliken predicts that the convention "will emphasize that, just as Detroit is being rejuvenated, the Republican Party is being rejuvenated."

DETROIT POLISHES A TARNISHED IMAGE

Detroit officials have a special incentive to keep things peaceful at the Republican convention.

They are eager to convince the nation that the violent days of the 1967 riots are behind for good and that the label of "murder capital of the U.S." hung on Detroit in the early 1970s, is long out of date.

More than 2,000 Detroit police officers, 160 Michigan state troopers, 80 Wayne County sheriff's deputies and squads of Secret Service agents will be on duty to insure peace and order. Price tag: About 6 million dollars, including a 3.5-million federal grant.

Officers will be watching the water as well as the city's expressways and streets. The Coast Guard and customs agents from both the U.S. and Canada will patrol the heavily traveled Detroit River that flows past the convention complex.

AREAS SECURED

A guarded 3-foot-high metal barricade will seal off the four-block area surrounding Cobo Hall and Joe Louis Arena, the main convention facilities, to all except those wearing proper credentials. The downtown area and convention hotels will be secured by officers on foot, in cars and on horseback.

Five closed-circuit-TV cameras will be positioned on building rooftops for surveillance of pedestrian and auto traffic. Scanning devices will be used at convention entrances to detect any concealed weapons or explosives. Specially trained dogs will prowl the area sniffing for any bombs the scanners may have missed.

Demonstrators will be restricted to Kennedy Square, an area several blocks from convention headquarters in the Renaissance Center. One protest group called Citizens Reacting to a Sick Society (CRASS) has been

issued a permit for a "Rock Against Reagan" concert. A local chapter of the Irish National Caucus has a permit to protest "injustices" to the Catholic minority in Northern Ireland.

Said a police spokesman, with a concerned eye on Detroit's reputation: "So far, it looks like it will be very peaceful."

THE PRIVATE SECTOR

(By Oscar Frenette and Hal Youngblood)

Americans are a pushover for an underdog. We adore it when the skinny, ugly kid is the one who gets the girl in the last reel of the picture. We're big on "come-from-behind" stories, too. Give us touchdowns in the final seconds of the fourth quarter, eleventh-inning home runs, and a long-shot filly galloping down the home stretch for a photo-finish win! Those are as American as apple pie and mother-in-law jokes.

We also believe in Horatio Alger, "pulling ourselves up by our own bootstraps," and "giving credit where credit is due."

String all of these together, and they spell Detroit, Michigan, circa 1980, a great, all-American, they-said-it-couldn't-be-done story of this decade.

Detroit calls itself Renaissance City, with justifiable pride and good cause. What with its "billion-dollar look" in new downtown construction, a mind-boggling Medical Center in the final stages of completion, a brand-new sports palace—The Joe Louis Arena, new apartments and condominiums rising in the heart of the city, and a promised downtown mall to complement the dazzling \$350 million Renaissance Center. Detroit has a lot going for it!

As recently as 1970, Detroit was a city in deep trouble, still haunted by the ghost of the 1967 riot, plagued by sharp racial division, blighted by widespread urban decay, reeling from continuing population and industry losses, brutalized by street crimes, and throttled by an ever-shrinking tax base.

So, what happened in Detroit to so dramatically reverse the city's fortunes? Perhaps an attitude change by Detroiters, themselves, that is the opinion of Robert E. McCabe, President of Detroit Renaissance, Inc. a coalition of blue-chip corporate and big business leaders put together in 1970 to spearhead Detroit's drive for a comeback campaign. Says McCabe, "No one was sure that this thing, this coalition of big names was the answer. In fact, lots of people in this town didn't think that the big names, names as big as Henry Ford, were serious about doing something for this town. It took that private real estate development, the Renaissance Center, built by a group of 51 corporations, to convince some of them."

McCabe's views underscore the opinion held locally that the great awakening and resulting commitment by Detroit's private sector have made the real difference in Detroit's recovery bid. Increasingly, urban planners from other parts of the country are finding their way to Detroit looking for a role model in developing this kind of commitment.

It must be noted that the marshalling of resources from the private sector was aided by a massive flow of federal dollars siphoned into the recovery mainstream by Detroit's politically savvy, black Mayor, Coleman Young.

Young has proved to be an astute leader, involving every segment of Detroit, particularly big business. Young has used his early support of, and close association with, Jimmy Carter to wrench every penny available out of Washington. Young's willingness to work hand-in-glove with Detroit's corporate hierarchy has given him a solid reputation with them as "the best of all possible mayors."

Similarly, the Mayor's longstanding ties with Detroit's labor establishment—he was

once an organizer for the U.A.W.—and his symbiotic relationship with Michigan's pragmatic governor, William G. Milliken, enables him to "draw on those political accounts" as he needs to. The bottom line is that Detroit has benefitted greatly from having the right mayor at the right time.

As the GOP delegates and the platoons of other convention supernumeraries arrive in Detroit two weeks hence, the most visible statement of Detroit's recovery will be The Renaissance Center, a gleaming, "Crystal-city" complex of office towers, shops, restaurants, clubs, theaters, and the world's tallest hotel—Western International's Detroit Plaza—which will serve as headquarters for the convention.

"The Ren Cen," as the locals call it, towers over the rest of Detroit's orthodox skyline like a visitor from outer space, an architectural precursor of the Twenty-first Century. This is, of course, precisely the effect that Detroit's mentors had hoped the Center would project: a tangible enunciation that Detroit is alive, well, and headed into the next century right now.

It is likely that the delegates will be impressed with Renaissance Center: most have been. If nothing else, its scale and proportions are staggering. The five glittering towers contain two million feet of glass, over 11 thousand windows with two acres of skylights hovering over ringed levels of boutiques, shops, 20 restaurants and lounges, movie theaters, a small legitimate theater now and even roving pushcart vendors. It is, in fact, an enclosed city-within-a-city. While the story may be somewhat apocryphal, it is said that world traveler-explorer Lowell Thomas got lost in the labyrinthine levels of the Center last year. Some have suggested that Stanley might not have found Livingston had he been at large in Renaissance Center.

In the present four 39-story office towers, 95 percent of the space is leased and 91 percent is already occupied by 186 companies, employing more than 12 thousand people.

Occupying 33 acres of Detroit's waterfront, which was previously an area of terminal blight—empty warehouses, unpaved parking lots, an aging flour mill, a rail yard, and a shabby, 13-block industrial zone—the futuristic Center has given back much of the glamor and pizzazz that Detroit's downtown core had lost in recent years. Approached from any direction, Renaissance Center looks like nothing so much as a scene out of the "Wizard of Oz"—the city at the end of the yellow brick road!

Renaissance Center is backed by a 31-member industrial partnership and was the largest private investment group ever assembled in the United States for a major real estate development. The permanent first mortgage loan of \$200 million is alleged to be the largest ever made for a single private real estate deal of this kind and the construction loan of \$200 million, backed by a consortium of 28 banks, including six banks in Detroit, is believed to be the largest ever for a project of this type in the U.S.

Not only has Renaissance Center had a profound effect on Detroit from an aesthetic point of view, it has already pumped as much as one billion dollars into the city's economy, triggered record convention business, served as a much-needed catalyst for additional new construction and renovation downtown, brought new jobs into the core city, and increased property values both in downtown Detroit and throughout the metropolitan area.

"Make no mistake about it, it was Mr. Ford's program from the start," that from Wayne Doran, Chairman of the Ford Motor Land Development Corporation, a subsidiary of Ford Motor Company, which is the managing general partner that developed and built Ren Cen. "He conceived it and stayed

with it from the initial planning stage to the ribboncutting."

Continues Doran, "The detractors, and there were some at the beginning, said that Renaissance Center would bleed the rest of downtown to death but that just hasn't happened. In fact, the reverse is true. We've served as a magnet for all of downtown."

About his boss, Doran says, "Mr. Ford was amazing! When he began talking to Portman (the Atlanta-based architect and developer who designed Peachtree Center and Renaissance Center, among others), he had to go look at everything that Portman had done to date to see if it would be good enough. This whole project was a labor of love for him."

Ford clout notwithstanding, the project was beyond one man. Nor, according to Doran, did Mr. Ford want the Center to be a memorial to himself. "A personal statement of his belief in Detroit, yes! A Henry Ford memorial, no. In fact," say Doran, "he refused to consider naming the project Ford Center."

In lining up support for his dream, Ford had to use the full weight of his considerable prestige and power in Detroit. Doran recalls his foray into General Motors. "It was something that only Mr. Ford could have done. He called Mr. Gerstenberg, who was chairman of General Motors Board then, and told him that he wanted about forty-five minutes or so of his time. What he got was three hours! That was the day after Labor Day, 1972. And we had to sweat out a decision from the GM people until just before Christmas.

"When Mr. Gerstenberg told Mr. Ford that GM was going to come in with us, Mr. Ford said it was the best Christmas present he'd ever had!" Doran recounted.

The Ford salesmanship didn't stop at GM. "The Deuce," as the industry insiders like to call Ford, called on Lynn Townsend at Chrysler and persuaded him to make a commitment for \$1.5 million from that company. At American Motors, Ford got still another half-million, even though American Motors presence in Detroit consists only of their headquarters office tower in suburban Southfield.

Former board chairman Roy Chapin acknowledged. "In the end, our investment in this was a psychological and emotional compulsion to be part of this because we are part of Detroit."

It is quite possible that the impact of Renaissance Center on Detroit is as much psychological as it is physical. Walter "Buzz" Luttrell, community affairs director for WXYZ-TV, sums up a view held by many of Detroit's black business community. "The Ren Cen was the first glimmer of hope that I saw that somebody was really going to do something for this town: I mean, really spending enough money to get the job done right. If nothing else, the numbers, the amount spent on this place, had to be impressive. We needed a symbol of hope and progress in this town and we got one. But our biggest challenge lies ahead, holding onto our recent gains through uncertain economic times."

Among the marquee names of Detroit's renaissance is that of financier-industrialist, Max Fisher. Head of the earliest and most successful United Jewish Appeal, he has, through his connections in high finance and high government circles, become a friend to and confidant of presidents and prime ministers. Fisher has earned the sobriquet, The Dean of Detroit.

Predictably, Fisher was among the first summoned by then Governor George Romney to an emergency session at Detroit City Hall during the first frightening hours of the Detroit riots in 1967. Fisher remembers that first call.

"The fires weren't out yet," said Fisher. "I got this call from George Romney, then one from Mayor Cavanagh. They asked me to meet with them, because we had to do something to save this town. They didn't have to tell me that. I could see as many as fifty fires burning at one time right from my office window."

Even before those fires were out, Fisher and the others summoned by Romney and Cavanagh would meet to form the nucleus of an organization that grew into New Detroit, Inc., Detroit's first urban coalition to study its political and social problems. It was composed of people from every walk of city and suburban life—from government, the private sector, minority groups, street people, church leaders, labor leaders, civic and block clubs.

Though a septuagenarian, Fisher is indefatigable and is still working for Detroit. Currently, he is chairman of Detroit Renaissance, Inc., and in association with real estate and shopping center developer, A. Alfred Taubman, is moving toward development of what Detroit needs most to realize final revitalization of the city—housing. Says Fisher, "You can't have a great city without great people living in it. Frankly, this is the project that's dearest to my heart right now."

Just as Renaissance Center was Henry's "baby," Max's "baby" will be a development called Riverfront West, in which Taubman is also involved. This will lie to the west of the Joe Louis Arena. When completed, it will consist of 2,500 housing units.

This project, along with the Washington Boulevard Apartment Tower, already under construction, and other housing units going up on Detroit's East Side, close to the Medical Center and New Center area, should dramatically boost the retail, restaurant, entertainment and cultural milieu of the central city. Optimists hope that such projects may lead to a beginning-of-the-end of the flight to the suburbs.

While housing developments in and around the central core of the city hold out much promise for better days ahead, brightening the downtown Detroit retail scene remains an unrealized dream.

The J. L. Hudson Company has maintained a presence downtown with its aging 24-story flagship store, in the face of diminishing profits. It is the last of the old-line glamor department stores left in the once-bustling Woodward Avenue corridor. Hudson's has watched the lights go out and the wrecking ball swing against Kern's and Crowley Miller's, the other two big retail grand dames. Saks Fifth Avenue's in-town store followed its customers to the suburban malls this past year. Now, Hudson's has announced that its downtown store faces a 1983 execution date.

However, to fill this void, the Taubman Company is participating in the final developmental process of an urban shopping center called Cadillac Mall, estimated to cost \$238 million. The plan, involving both public and private interests, would include a new Hudson store built, ironically, on the site of the old Kern's block. Currently, the project is stalled for the want of two other major retailers to join Hudson's to form a solid-base for the rest of the development.

Commenting on Hudson's future downtown, Hudson's chairman, merchant prince J. L. Hudson, Jr., says: "This town has shown remarkable resiliency in the past and I'm sure that, despite the current slump in retail sales, Detroit will come back and we'll find a way to build a downtown mall."

Youthful-appearing Mr. Hudson is no stranger to adversity in his city. He, too, was one of the civic leaders summoned by Governor Romney and Mayor Cavanagh to that hastily-called, initial meeting of the group destined to become New Detroit, Inc. Hudson was part of the shouting matches that all of

the New Detroit members had to endure in those early months of existence. Hudson is also a member of Detroit Renaissance, Inc. and has kept himself and his store in the forefront of local recovery efforts. The Hudson Company still stages its annual Thanksgiving Day Parade downtown (second only to Macy's) and, with The Stroh Brewery of Detroit, underwrites one of the biggest fireworks displays in the nation, as part of Detroit's annual Fourth of July Freedom Festival. Mr. Hudson echoes a sentiment advanced more and more frequently in Detroit these days. "Detroit has been up against the wall before and come back. This current economic crunch isn't going to help us any but it isn't going to stop this town either."

One of the places that the pulse of America can be taken is Detroit. Its vital signs are often indicators of the health of the national economy and the mood of consumers.

The future of the country may not depend upon Detroit but the city is one barometer, one harbinger, and a careful look may offer the possibility of a prognosis for the nation. Perhaps the blueprint developing in Detroit suggests a pattern for a new era in the evolution of the American system.

Detroit suffered a complete breakdown in the summer of 1967 which brought disaster that required national troops to constrain. The trauma may have been predictable: there was deep internal conflict and a history of highs and lows going back more than half a century.

In the beginning everyone thought it had been caused by organized insurrectionists. Someone or something has to be responsible. It took time before the city came to the realization that it could blame only itself.

Detroit then tried to come to terms with itself. Leaders in business and industry, the labor unions, the government, education, religion and the grass roots community, who saw each other as the enemy, who could barely tolerate one another, forced themselves to sit together and talk. The ranting gradually subsided into barely civil conversation until, almost imperceptibly, there grew a measure of trust. The finger-pointing and fault-finding gave way to tolerance and understanding and eventually matured into a measure of respect and even affection.

Even before the riot, Detroit was bleeding. In the early fifties one of the nation's first suburban shopping centers was built at Northland, followed by people and jobs from central city.

Detroit was the first city to build free-ways to speed circulation to the suburbs. By the mid sixties, the city's tax base had eroded seriously and this condition coincided with a dramatic increase in the black population. Blacks were approaching a majority when the conflagration struck in 1967 and many saw racism or racial conflict as the sole cause of the whole unhealthy situation, despite the fact that there were sound economic reasons for business and industry to pull out of the central city: outdated facilities, need for expansion, availability of land, modes of merchandising as well as the rising crime rate and security problems and parking and taxes. The encroaching decay of neighborhoods also chased people out.

Corporate leaders, almost to a man, credit Coleman Young for the rapport that has developed between the public and the private sectors.

The economic power in Detroit remains mostly white and the political power mostly black. That these two could harmonize seemed pretty far-fetched a few years ago. And to think that they could embrace union leaders and minority grass roots people to form a quartet was considered pure fiction.

And when Coleman Young, the Mayor of Detroit, backed by the coalition of those forces, talks about renaissance, you get the feeling that he is not just whistling in the dark.

New Detroit, Inc., the private-public coalition was created in the late 1960s to tackle political and social problems of the city: discrimination, crime and law enforcement, education, neighborhoods, housing, institutions, etc. Later Mayor Young asked two of its active members, James Roche and Lynn Townsend (former chairmen at GM and Chrysler respectively) to look into Detroit's income and expenditures, with the specific objectives of creating jobs and improving the city's tax base, and to make recommendations. They recommended that a permanent organization for economic development be established, known as the Detroit Economic Growth Corporation (DEGC).

"DEGC today involves the elected officials, the business community, organized labor and grass roots community leaders," notes Arthur Seder, chairman of American Natural Resources Company and chairman of the Executive Committee of DEGC.

The DEGC can assist business and industry where a government agency might be suspect. Because it has the respect of the business community, DEGC knows the buttons to push and the levers to pull. In some cases, DEGC actually helps administer government grants and uses them as leverage for private investment.

Tools and financial incentives which have been used by other areas to attract industry: tax abatement, tax-free industrial revenue bonds, development authorities, real estate and financial packaging services, employee training all are being used to hold on to what jobs are in Detroit and to meet the competition from the Sun belt states and suburban industrial parts.

Private sector involvement is absolutely essential to the redevelopment of the city of Detroit," said James Roche. "We are fortunate in being one of the pioneers of this approach. If we can't do it in Detroit, it can't be done."

The other three legs of the coalition felt equally about their involvement.

BUSINESS PEOPLE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY

Tom Murphy is the most outspoken and accessible GM chairman in recent years. He's made some 300 speeches since 1975, addressing groups throughout the U.S. and from Sweden to Australia.

"Yes, the coalition of people working together is the key . . . and the willingness to take a risk, that's what brought us from a wilderness to where we are today. Our forefathers took a risk just in the trip to come here."

"Today we face a No-Grow situation only if we are willing to accept it. We don't have to settle for this. We have more technology and the means to keep growing, if we're willing to take a fraction of the risk that our forefathers took!"

"We need to consider the future generations. The risks involved are not that great if put in the proper perspective. Take nuclear energy for example. At this stage we know more about that kind of energy than we have ever known about any other kind of energy at the equivalent stage of development. Think of when man first started using fire!"

"And think of gasoline. If it were just being proposed today as a source of energy, with the prevailing attitude of some people, why, we'd never use it."

"The coalition approach should apply at the national level—it's taken a long time for the media to notice the coming together in Detroit—whether we're talking city, nation or planet."

"In addition to chambers of commerce, we must have chambers of government, press conferences in addition to business conferences, and town meetings in addition to

sales meetings. We must be competitive in the marketplace of ideas."

"This is a marketplace that business has long neglected—a marketplace of participatory democracy, marketplace of civic action. And I feel this is the reason why our top executives must involve themselves. People respond best to other people—not to impersonal 'things' like a corporation. So if they are to compete effectively in the idea market, business leaders must also be public figures."

"Business is involved in almost every major issue confronting our country today: employment, equality, ecology, energy, economic growth. Some of these issues are being handled effectively, others are not."

"The whole point is that the objective of business, no less than that of government, must be the public's interest."

One of the hard realities facing Detroit's bid for a solid, long-term comeback is its reliance on the auto industry and its satellites to act as the city's breadwinner. Despite efforts by city and state agencies and scouting teams from the private sector to court other engineering-based industries-Detroit remains deeply dependent upon cars to keep itself rolling.

In recent months, local unemployment rolls have swelled from blows inflicted by the auto industry's deepening slump and the worst may be yet to come.

Curiously, one island of stability in the very heart of Detroit—and one which points to a possibility for more broad-based industries as an answer to the boom-bust cycle—also happens to be one of Detroit's oldest big-name companies: Burroughs Corporation.

In 1966, Burroughs officials had a hard choice to make; with other industries fleeing Detroit for outlying industrial parks, should they not do the same. According to Burroughs Board Chairman, Paul Mirabito. The decision to remain in Detroit was made before the 1967 riot and despite that devastating event, we decided to stay where we were and go ahead with plans to build our world headquarters here where our plant and offices have been since 1904. We thought it made sense then, and we know it worked out that way.

What Burroughs did was to strip the old factory structure (designed by the famous architect, Albert Kahn) to the steel skeleton—then, build a sleek, modern concrete headquarters building over those bare bones. The effect was that an area around Burroughs called New Center was given new life and vitality, and efforts by General Motors and the new owners of The Fisher Building to shore up Detroit's mid-town were given an enormous boost.

The Detroit coalitions cut across political, economic, racial and social lines and the results are sometimes surprising. For instance:

GM was one of four corporate contributors in the purchase of an out-of-business motel in midtown Detroit which was given to Henry Ford Hospital.

When a Woolworth store was going to close downtown, chairman of K-Mart, Robert E. Dewar, was helpful in convincing Woolworth's chairman, Edward F. Gibbons, to stay put.

When a famous old downtown hotel was closing for lack of business, it took only four days for the Detroit Economic Growth Corporation to take it over.

Privately owned parks within the grounds of GM headquarters are maintained by the company for use by the public.

GM bought 125 homes and 175 apartment units in a six-block area in the center of the city and is upgrading this neighborhood working with government agencies at all levels. The project has national significance because, if successful, it could be done in other

cities across the country where GM has plants. The objective is to make it economically feasible for small developers to continue the process of rebuilding a city—a new kind of urban renovation partnership which is preserving as much of the old as possible.

The new shuttle bus service that runs between the Cultural Center and New Center in midtown Detroit is the first system to be 50 per cent financed by the private sector.

Again, candidly, not only has Detroit's industrial base, its very livelihood, been under assault from Sun Belt raiders, but its pool of highly skilled and trained workers have been courted and lured south and westward. Further, a notion that Detroit's labor force is less productive and more costly than those in other parts of the country, has become something of a business cliché. Nothing could be further from the truth," says United Auto Workers International President, Douglas Fraser. The fact is, Detroit still has the largest and, overall, most productive labor force anywhere. You simply can't have the tradition and background that this town's worker has without having a solid, productive worker on the job. Anybody who wants to build anything, especially anything to do with a machine, and have it built efficiently . . . is smart to do it here. This town put the world on wheels and helped this country to win two world wars! How much proof do you need?

Detroit is sports mad: it's a marvelous lunacy bred-and-fed by such legends as "The Production Line" of The Red Wings Hockey Club's glory days and "The Fear-some Foursome" when The Detroit Lions made The Central Division truly black-and-blue. Names like Ty Cobb, Doak Walker, Gordie Howe, Al Kaline, and the star-crossed Denny McLain did Detroit proud.

It is, of course, no secret that Detroit's sports fortunes have fallen on the hardest of times in recent years, or that the town once called The City of Champions may be earning a new sobriquet. The City of Losers.

Still, there are bright spots. Red Wing fans are flocking to the brand-new Joe Louis Arena on the riverfront, despite that team's desultory performance. The Detroit Lions generally fill the futuristic Silverdome in Pontiac, thirty miles away, for the big games, notwithstanding their wretched 2-and-14 season last year, and the Silverdome (considered by many stadia experts to be the best covered football palace in the country) will host the 1982 Super Bowl. Even the local North American Soccer League franchise, The Express, does passably well in attendance, while the venerable, much-loved Detroit Tigers continue to draw heavily in the newly-refurbished Tiger Stadium, while "Sparky" Anderson works to bring his young team up to speed.

While smarting from the sting of disastrous seasons, like that of The Pistons (the worst ever for them and the worst in the NBA), the true-blue Detroiters never seems to lose hope, and talks endlessly about past glories. Few of those rival the come-from-behind win of the 1968 World Series by The Tigers, an event which many Detroit community leaders at the time credited with having saved Detroit from another "long, hot summer of '67."

Quite possibly, the best assessment of Detroit's sports fanaticism comes from the city's number one devotee and radio personality, WJR's J. P. McCarthy, who whimsically noted, "If there were a frisbee or tiddly-wink franchise available Detroit would have it, fill a stadium to watch it, this radio station would carry it play-by-play, and the team would probably be last in its division."

Since the days of the Tin Lizzie and even before, Detroiters suffered under the lash of a traditional view of their city as nothing

more than a "blue-collar, lunchbucket, beer-and-pretzel town." While that was never really true, notions like that die hard.

However, Detroit is gaining a new reputation these days: that of a major cultural center. At least two of Detroit's major cultural organizations are approaching world class status.

Under the direction of Maestro Antal Dorati, The Detroit Symphony Orchestra crashed through a barrier that had denied the orchestra a recording contract in over 17 years. A consortium of Detroit-based corporations underwrote more than \$300,000 to help finance an eight-nation European tour for the Symphony last year. Without exception, the orchestra drew rave notices from critics in Europe.

Since coming to Detroit three years ago, Dorati has staged three major international festivals. The first one, a Beethoven Festival, became a nine-part series aired nationally on PBS. Predictably, these musical spectacles have heightened interest and attention of the Detroit corporate sector. According to Peter Remington, Director of Development, "The Detroit Symphony Orchestra ranks second in corporate support among the major American symphony orchestras and it continues to grow at an unprecedented rate."

With the help of Detroit Renaissance, Inc., almost half of the orchestra's annual maintenance fund, some \$750,000 in 1979, was contributed by area businesses. The Ford Motor Company Fund singlehandedly provided the \$325,000 to televise nationally the Beethoven Festival.

The Detroit Institute of Arts (DIA) has been, traditionally, well-supported by Detroit's cultural community. Generally considered one of the top museums in the country, DIA is currently in the third year of a five-year plan to upgrade the gallery to world class status.

The Detroit Repertory Company, located in the very heart of Detroit's central black community, has used matching funds from the government, businesses who share inner-city concerns, and the Michigan Council of Arts to grow and upgrade the caliber of its productions.

Currently in the planning stage is a project to recreate Shakespeare's Globe Theater on Detroit's upper-riverfront area. Wayne State University's Theater Department, one of the most active and vital in the country, has engaged British Shakespearean scholar, C. Walter Hodges, to head the ambitious project. Wayne Theater head, Leonard Leone, says, "We are counting on the local private sector to lead the way in realizing this important effort for Detroit. They've come through for us before—and I'm sure they'll find creative ways to help us with this magnificent dream."

The serious problem lying ahead of Detroit's widespread and far-ranging cultural community is, certainly, not a lack of audiences or emotional support; certainly, not a lack of willingness on the part of the private sector; or even the aficionado to support them. It is, rather, the large demand from the groups on the available dollars.

The larger the company, of course, the more requests it receives for support. Last year, Ford Motor Company and the Ford Company Fund, received about 8,000 requests for grants and subsidies. They were able to respond affirmatively to nearly two thousand.

Detroit likes calling itself The Renaissance City. The City of the Eighties and, candidly stated, that takes guts, what with the ever-darkening storm clouds on the economic horizon. But then, Detroit never lacked courage. Detroit also feels, justifiably, that it has written a book on urban recovery through

coalition—bringing government, business, and labor into a closer working relationship with one another, and the community as a whole.

Nobody in Detroit seriously believes he's living in the land of Oz, or that tough times aren't ahead for a city so vulnerable to economic and social turbulence; everybody has his seat belt fastened. But, the mechanisms that stamped out a shiny new image for Detroit are in place—and working! And if there's anything dear to the heart of America's motor capital—it's a shiny new model to show off.

WELCOME IOWA CITY CABLE SUBSCRIBERS

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

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to take this opportunity to welcome some new faces to the House gallery. Through the phenomenon of cable television, approximately 30,000 citizens of Iowa City, University Heights, and Coralville are now able to watch House proceedings. Hopefully, C-Span's broadcast of congressional activities will diminish geographical barriers and bring people closer to the legislative process by bringing the legislative process into the homes of the people. Because of the intricacies of floor procedures, a committee of the House has put together an excellent pamphlet explaining how laws are made and how the Congress functions. Anyone wishing a copy of this pamphlet may get it by simply writing to me: Representative JIM LEACH, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C. Welcome again to all the new Hawkeye cablevision subscribers from Iowa City, University Heights, and Coralville.

LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE THE MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS

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

• Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which incorporates two suggestions put forward by the administration for improving the administration of the National Forest System.

The bill I am introducing today would amend two public laws that bear upon the exchange and withdrawal of lands in the National Forest System.

Subparagraph (1) would amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 2253) by extending the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a quitclaim deed to interests erroneously acquired by the United States when an exchange involves public domain land or resources. Interests of a private party who was not a proponent in an exchange of public do-

main may be acquired through error or inadvertent action. Since land acquired in exchange for public domain land or resources has been held to acquire the same status as the land or resources used in its acquisition, any erroneously acquired interest presently is not subject to disposal under the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 2253). There is presently no way for the Department of Agriculture to clear an erroneously acquired interest in land of a third party. The landowner must seek private legislation or judicial relief.

Subparagraph (2) amends section 24 of the Federal Power Act of 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 1075, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 818), to provide that any lands of the United States, reserved from entry, location, or other disposal as a result of a filing of an application for a proposed power project under provisions of this act, would be returned to their former status if no license application or new preliminary permit has been filed within 5 years after the expiration date of a preliminary permit granted by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or after a denial of a preliminary permit by the Commission.

The Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior would be required to notify the Commission of their intention to restore the reserved lands to their former status. The Commission would have 60 days to respond to the Secretary's notice before the restoration became final and the public land records were changed. The present language provides that these lands once such a filing for a proposed power project is made, will remain withdrawn until restored by specific action of the Commission regardless of whether the project is ever built.

Several hundred withdrawals exist on National Forest System lands. Management of these lands is impaired by this restriction. Resource development or land exchange cannot occur unless and until the Commission acts. This proposed amendment will have the effect of continuing in force any withdrawals on constructed projects but, in the case of lands withdrawn after enactment, will cause the restoration of lands where no project materializes. This proposal has been concurred in by the Department of the Interior.

The proposed amendments would not require additional outlays by the Federal Government. Savings to the Government should result in each case due to reduced administrative costs. •

BRINGING THE SEC UNDER THE FINANCIAL PRIVACY ACT

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

• Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, today, in cooperation with several of my colleagues, I am introducing legislation

which will bring the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) under the provisions of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978. This bill will provide our citizens with protections against potential misuse of SEC subpoena authority comparable to the protections they now enjoy regarding other Government requests for bank records.

I say comparable, because the legislation is different in three important ways from the Right to Financial Privacy Act. The differences are all contained in the new provision of the bill which provides for delayed notice to the customer of an SEC subpoena.

First, the delay of notice provision expressly outlines the statutory provisions which make an SEC request for bank records legitimate and appropriate.

Second, the delay of notice provision defines more explicitly than the Right to Financial Privacy Act those circumstances which might clearly jeopardize an investigation and thus justify delayed notice to the customer.

Third, like the statutory restrictions on the Internal Revenue Service, the bill permits the SEC to transfer information obtained through its subpoena power to the Department of Justice without notice to the customer identified in the information for limited purposes. Such transfer is permitted only for an investigation by the Department which is directly related to the investigation by the SEC. If the Department wants to use the information for any other purpose, it must notify the customer or seek a delay as provided for in the Right to Financial Privacy Act.

The legislation was drafted in consultation with the SEC and other interested parties; and, the Commission fully supports the legislation.

Because the current provision of the Right to Financial Privacy Act which exempts the SEC from the act expires in November, I urge the most rapid attention to this legislation. We must act to insure that the transition to coverage of the SEC by the law is smooth and disrupts the activities of the Commission as little as possible, while assuring adequate protections for the interests of the individual. I believe that this legislation achieves those goals. I look forward to its timely consideration and passage into law.●

FREE VLADIMIR KISLIK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the continual inhuman treatment and persecution of Vladimir Kislik, a Jewish refusenik in the U.S.S.R., are grave violations of the cause of human rights that all Americans support.

Since Vladimir Kislik first applied to emigrate to Israel in 1973, he has been subjected to constant harassment.

Mr. Kislik has been separated from his family since 1973 when his wife, Yevgenia, and son, Maxim, were allowed to leave for Israel. At this time, Kislik

was given the impression that he would soon be allowed to follow.

Kislik was a distinguished scientist at the Kiev Institute of Nuclear Research, and has had much scientific and popular literature published. Since the denial of his 1973 visa application, Kislik has not worked in the scientific field in any capacity, and has been able to find only menial jobs.

In 1974 Kislik was forcibly prevented from traveling to Moscow to meet with American Senators and Congressmen and, in that same year, was the victim of a brutal beating which the KGB refused to investigate.

Kislik was told officially in early 1975 that he would not be allowed to emigrate for at least another 5 years.

In May 1976 Kislik's phone was disconnected after he had spoken to his wife in Israel. After being warned by police to discontinue the scientific seminars which he organized, he was arrested and severely beaten by KGB officers.

Vladimir Kislik and six other refuseniks declared a 5-day hunger strike in 1977 to protest not receiving replies or even reasons for refusal to their visa applications.

Kislik was prevented from going to Moscow to attend a scientific symposium in 1979. Later in the year, he was one of a group of refuseniks arrested outside the Kiev OVIR office and detained for several hours.

Just recently, Mr. Kislik was again detained by Soviet authorities for a period of 15 days. Upon notification of a second 15-day detention, he initiated a hunger strike in protest. Due to his protest, Kislik was forcibly committed to a mental institution where he remains at this time.

Kislik has been accused of being a traitor, an Israeli spy, an agent working for foreign hostile countries, a black marketeer and swindler, and most recently, an idler avoiding work.

Mr. Kislik has no psychological or neurological disorders. Yet, he has been committed to a mental institution to prevent any more of his "anti-Soviet" activities, particularly during the Olympic games in Moscow. Kislik's commitment to the institution is his punishment; Kislik's desire to emigrate to Israel, the spiritual haven of the Jewish people, is his crime.

The case of Vladimir Kislik is yet another example of the Soviet's violation of the Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms section of the accord which the U.S.S.R. signed in Helsinki in 1975. It is time for the Soviets to end their mistreatment and persecution of Vladimir Kislik and abide by the accord. Vladimir Kislik must be freed and allowed to live in peace with his wife and son in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I and my distinguished colleague, Mr. LEHMAN, have today introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President express to the Soviet Government the condemnation of the Congress and all of the American people of these acts of harass-

ment and persecution and that Vladimir Kislik be permitted to emigrate from the Soviet Union, and further that if his emigration not be permitted, the matter be placed on the agenda of the review session of the Helsinki accord to be held in Madrid in November.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of all Members of the House for this resolution.

THE NEED TO INCREASE R. & D. IN ORDER TO IMPROVE AMERICA'S TRADE BALANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee held an oversight hearing on U.S. trade policy. Several witnesses stressed the importance of increasing our Nation's commitment to R. & D. in order to become more competitive in the world's export markets. Several of these witnesses supported H.R. 6632, a bill which I and 65 others have introduced to encourage industry-university research through the use of tax credits.

For the benefit of the Members, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD portions of the testimony of Mr. Victor Ragosine, on behalf of the American Electronics Association:

TESTIMONY OF MR. VICTOR RAGOSINE

Technological innovation in U.S. industry is a crucial element in the nation's ability to trade competitively in world markets. Our most innovative industries have been the bulwark of our trade: high technology electronics, capital equipment, pharmaceuticals, and agricultural products. We believe U.S. agriculture also belongs in this category because of its intensive R. & D. orientation (which has brought about continuous innovations to increase the quality and quantity of yields). As you well know, from 1960 to 1979, R. & D.-intensive manufacturing industries increased their export surplus from \$5.9 bn. to nearly \$30 bn. When agriculture is included, that surplus leaps to \$47.5 bn. in 1979. In contrast, during this same period our less innovative, non-R. & D. intensive manufacturing industries increased their trade deficit from zero to \$24 bn.

Innovation is important to our domestic economy and society, as well as to our exports. Innovation is key to real economic growth, increased employment, cheaper and better products, reduced inflation, conservation of energy and raw materials, and an improved standard of living. These benefits flow from the fact that innovation is central to increased productivity. Innovation not only generates new products and services, but allows existing products and services to be produced more efficiently.

A study by Professor R. Solow of MIT concluded that between 1909 and 1949 approximately 80 percent of GNP growth was due to technical change. Another study by Edward Denson showed that more than one-half of the increase in productivity in the United States resulted from technological innovation. . . .

INDICATION OF DECLINING U.S. INNOVATION

Given the critical role innovation plays for the health and strength of our businesses in the world economy, we are alarmed by the clear signs that it is declining in the United States:

(1) R&D spending as a percentage of GNP has declined by 27 percent in the last 15 years;

(2) The rate of growth in real industrial R&D has slowed since the 1960's;

(3) The more innovative, longer-term R&D funding by industry has especially declined;

(4) A steady decline in the rate of productivity increased from an annual average of 3.4 percent from 1948-1955 to a negative 0.4 percent in 1979;

(5) A decline from 18 percent to 11.8 percent in the U.S. world market share of manufactured goods from 1960 to 1976.

INDICATIONS OF ADVANCING INNOVATION ABROAD

At the same time, it is evident that other industrialized countries whose firms compete with us in markets here and abroad have and are continuing to make great strides in industrial innovation. The following table sets out some comparative data:

	Japan	West Germany	United States
Total R. & D. as a percentage of GNP from 1964 to 1976.....	1.5 to 1.9 percent.....	1.6 to 2.3 percent.....	3 to 2.3 percent. ¹
Average annual rate of productivity improvement from 1960 to 1978.....	8.5 percent.....	5.4 percent.....	2.6 percent.
Share of world exports from 1960 to 1977.....	4 to 8 percent.....	10.3 to 11.5 percent.....	18 to 11.8 percent.

¹ As a comparison of R. & D. efforts for nondefense and nonspace areas, these U.S. figures are deceptively high, since, for example, 36 percent of total U.S. spending for R. & D. in 1976 went to defense and space, whereas Germany and Japan spent less than 9 percent and 3 percent, respectively, in these areas.

These strides have not been accidental. They are the result of well thought out and consistently applied industrial policies. For example, consider some of the incentives other countries use to foster R&D and innovation.

1. The Japanese Government targets certain high-potential industries for development: automobile, steel and ship-building in the past—computers and semiconductors today. Companies in these areas can receive R&D subsidies (repayable only if the program is successful), accelerated depreciation allowances, and long-term, low-interest loans. In addition, a 20 percent tax credit is granted for increases in R&D expenditures by all businesses. Furthermore, companies that form joint research associations can immediately recover the cost of their investments in new machinery, equipment and facilities. Japan's Ministry of International Trade and Investment (MITI) wants to increase R&D spending to 3 percent of GNP by 1990.

2. The West German government provides low-interest loans for investments in R&D, a 7.5 percent tax-free cash grant for investment in R&D facilities and special accelerated depreciation allowances for R&D plant and equipment. In addition, in certain cases the income individuals receive for scientific activities is taxed at half the normal rate.

3. The French government provides highly favorable tax treatment to companies specifically formed to conduct R&D or apply innovative processes. In addition, special accelerated depreciation allowances are applicable to plant and equipment used for scientific or technical research. The sale of patent rights, technical and manufacturing processes and know-how are taxable at 15 percent as long-term capital gains.

4. The Canadian government allows a tax credit of at least 10 percent for R&D expenditures, and a basic deduction for R&D expenditures over the average of the previous 3 years' spending levels. The government also provides grants to companies that perform high-risk R&D in commercial areas.

These trends are unmistakable and cannot be ignored. AEA believes the disparity between our R&D policies and those of our major competitors bodes ill for the future.

Our most dynamic, R&D-intensive industries are being targeted for displacement in world markets, while other U.S. industries need to innovate more to remain competitive under the onslaught of foreign competition. Our nation's competitive strength lies in our continued ability to innovate and produce new, improved, cheaper products and processes, be it textiles, steel, autos, chemicals or electronics.

NEEDED TAX POLICY CHANGES

To reverse these threatening trends, AEA believes the United States must redirect its tax policies to stimulate industrial innova-

federally financed R&D in our colleges and universities.

By encouraging business contributions for colleges and university research, H.R. 6632 would help meet several important needs. First, of course, is the generation of research results which will contribute to industrial innovation, especially in the longer run. Second, underutilized talents of academic people could be brought to bear on research likely to lead to innovations for the marketplace. Third, increased cooperation would also better equip students for the job market by exposing them to the challenge of applying science to the needs of industry. Finally, it would have a very important side effect of increasing the supply of badly needed, technically oriented graduates for our most dynamic industries.

S. 2906

We strongly support H.R. 6632, but we believe it must be accompanied by new tax incentives for R&D performed by businesses themselves. Businesses need to be encouraged to increase their own internal R&D efforts. Their applied research and development projects are directly geared to marketplace innovation through the translation or commercialization of research results into new processes and products. The importance of corporate R&D efforts cannot be understated. Many experts believe, for example, that the key to Japan's and Germany's industrial success is applied research and development. These countries spend relatively little on basic research.

Corporate R&D is lagging in the U.S. Real growth in industrial R&D has slowed to nearly half the pace of the 1960's when it averaged 6.5 percent per year. From 1970 to 1979, real growth has averaged only about 3.5 percent. One of the key reasons for this is reduced corporate cash flows caused by high taxation.

Not only has real growth in overall spending slowed, but the nature of corporate R&D efforts has been changing. We believe that longer-term, riskier, and more innovative R&D by business is declining for several reasons:

Too much corporate R&D is being diverted to "defensive" efforts required by governmental health, safety, environmental and other regulations.

Too much R&D is being diverted to quicker-payout, lower risk programs (such as minor product modifications) because of uncertainties caused by high rates of inflation and vacillating government economic policies.

Congress and the Administration must recognize that R&D is by its very nature a risky investment. Most economists will agree that this risk tends to lead to underinvestment in many areas. Practical businessmen also recognize this.

On the positive side, however, the returns to the business and society as a whole can be substantial. For example:

A number of studies indicate that the rate of return on investment in R&D tends to be greater than equivalent investments in conventional physical capital.

A study by Edward Denison of Brookings implies that productivity gains from R&D investments may be several times greater than those from capital investments.

In essence, we are faced with a situation where a high risk investment has become even riskier, and less funds are available to venture.

For these reasons we urge you to establish a clear policy of encouraging greater corporate R&D efforts by enacting S. 2906. This bill, introduced by Senators Danforth and Bradley of the Senate Finance Committee, would provide a 25 percent tax credit for increases in R&D spending over the average annual R&D outlays for the previous three years. The bill includes provisions to insure that innovative start up companies receive maximum benefits by

H.R. 6632

Mr. Chairman, AEA is pleased by the leadership you have shown by introducing the Research Revitalization Act of 1980 which provides an incentive for businesses to contribute funds to colleges and universities for research.

Over the last 20 years, the federal government has been the major source of funds for research conducted by our colleges and universities. It now funds about 70 percent of all such research. During this same period, industry's share of total funding has declined. As a consequence, this research has become less relevant to the need of the industrial sector. The programs, facilities and resources of many colleges and universities are less able to assist industry in its search for commercially useful innovation today than in the past.

AEA believes the tax incentive approach of H.R. 6632 which encourages closer cooperation between industry and academia is far preferable to increasing the Federal Government's direct role in identifying and funding research likely to lead to industrial innovation. The bill allows businesses and universities to allocate research funds where they would be most beneficial to the country, and avoids the entangling red tape and inefficiencies which have been the bane of

allowing them to use pre-startup zero value spending to calculate their average for three years. Any unused credits could be carried forward seven years. S. 2906 would therefore be a targeted, cost-effective way to encourage additional R&D while minimizing Treasury's revenue loss. At the same time it would aid new companies struggling to commercialize new ideas or inventions.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the U.S. has had virtually no industrial R&D policy. Industrial R&D has been expected to generate its own momentum, while being progressively constricted by other policies. The net effect has been to reduce both its quantity and quality. Congress must reverse this trend by establishing an R&D policy whose cornerstones are tax incentives for industry-university cooperative efforts and for increased internal corporate R&D. We are encouraged by your understanding of these issues and look forward to working closely with you to correct them in the remainder of this Congress.●

OMNIBUS RECONCILIATION ACT

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, section 895 of H.R. 7765, the Omnibus Reconciliation Act pursuant to the first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1981, repeals the amendments contained in H.R. 1543 to improve the operation of the trade adjustment assistance programs for workers and firms under the Trade Act of 1974. The Committee on Ways and Means included repeal of H.R. 1543 as one of its recommendations, as reported in H.R. 7652 and included in title VIII of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act, for spending reductions totalling \$2 billion in fiscal year 1981.

The Committee on Ways and Means has requested the Committee on Rules to grant a modified closed rule for House consideration of the reconciliation recommendations reported by the committee which would make in order an amendment to section 895 of H.R. 7765, which would not be subject to amendment, to delay the effective date of H.R. 1543 to September 30, 1981. If the rule permits, I intend to offer such an amendment as a substitute for repeal of the bill.

H.R. 1543 passed the House on May 30, 1979, by voice vote, has been reported by the Senate Finance Committee, and is currently pending on the Senate calendar. The bill addresses a number of inequities in the programs under current law, improves adjustment aspects, and speeds up certification and benefit delivery. A major provision of the bill extends benefit coverage to workers and firms supplying component parts and services directly impacted by increased imports of the end product. The Congressional Budget Office estimates the cost of H.R. 1543 as \$822 million in fiscal year 1981, a reflection of high unemployment and increased need for the program in the automobile, steel, and other basic industries and their suppliers.

The amendment will achieve the same

spending reductions as called for in the first concurrent budget resolution while retaining the improvements in the trade adjustment assistance programs provided by the bill. The text of the proposed amendment follows:

Page 306, strike out lines 11 through 19, inclusive, and insert the following:

Subtitle D—Delay of Effective Date of Trade Adjustment Assistance Amendments

Sec. 895. Delay of effective date of trade adjustment assistance amendments.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the effective date of the Act to improve the operation of the adjustment assistance programs for worker and firms under the Trade Act of 1974 (H.R. 1543, 96th Congress) shall be September 30, 1981.

Amend the index to bill accordingly.

ESTHER FANNIE GRANTON

(Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to remember a person who was a very special inspiration to the black Americans who have served as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate over the past 24 years. Esther Fannie Granton, a Washington correspondent and columnist for Ebony and Jet magazines, recently passed away. She was loved by many and we are saddened by her death.

During her 66 years, Ms. Granton was known for her kindness and for her knowledge of the Washington scene. When new black Members of Congress arrived in Washington, Fannie Granton recorded the welcoming ceremonies and social gatherings for the Nation in "Washington Scene," a weekly column published in Jet. She was always available to assist the spouses and smooth the adjustment to the endless maze of social obligations and responsibilities replete among Washington political life.

For the younger black political workers and journalists, Fannie Granton was a concerned aunt and grandma whose enthusiastic greeting of "What's going on?" smoothed many egos which had been singed or deflated. In her uniquely unpretentious style, she would make the right introduction, advise the new host or hostess and serve as a crucible of quiet strength. "Miss Fannie's" knowledge of black Americans who visited or resided in Washington, D.C., over the last quarter century was unsurpassed.

Fannie Granton will be missed by the black Members of Congress. She made a vital contribution to the tone and texture of our lives as a special historian who recorded the movement of black Americans into the Washington political and social scene. Her presence was as stunning as the giant redwood for which our Nation is famous. Her impact is as enduring as her written words.

I would like to submit for the RECORD, two special statements, one by Ms. Granton's close friend and colleague, world

affairs journalist Ethel Payne, and the other by the renowned journalist Art Buchwald. Additional articles which recognized Esther Fannie Granton's contributions, also appeared in the Tuesday, June 17, 1980, issue of the Washington Star newspaper, the Wednesday, June 18, 1980, and the Monday, June 23, 1980, issue of the Washington Post newspaper, the Friday, June 20, 1980, issue of the New York Times, the Saturday, June 21 and 28, 1980, issues of the Afro-American newspaper, and the July 3, 1980, issue of Jet magazine. I am also submitting these articles for the RECORD:

[From the Afro-American, June 30, 1980]

E. FANNIE GRANTON

She was black. She was a woman. And she was one of the preeminent journalists of her time. We speak of Esther Fannie Granton, 66, who died in Washington last week.

These combining qualities were even rarer in the times in which she served. For E. Fannie Granton was writing and reporting even before the civil rights movement. What is more, her beat was the federal scene in Washington, D.C.—a bastion of segregation which was forced to recognize and appreciate her talents and charm.

For the past 24 years she moved around the capital like an expert—and she was—who had that special "nose for news," uncovering subtle patterns of bias, acting as a one-person-mediator to remedy injustice when it was within her power, and bringing the government itself to the people through her writings.

She covered the White House, Capitol Hill, the State Department, Embassy Row and every other conceivable arm or agency of power. Ambassadors wined-and-dined her. Presidents called on her for advice and counsel. Members of the Supreme Court also knew her.

She had that extraordinary and uncommon ability to sit through endless smoke-filled meetings and then rush out to translate what had happened into words of the common people, so that they could understand decisions that would affect their lives.

The deputy chief of the Washington Bureau of Johnson Publications, she had thousands of faithful followers who read her "Washington Scene" column in Jet magazine. "Fannie's column," as they used to say, "told it all."

Part of her success undoubtedly was due to her own breadth of interests. She had prepared herself well, at Howard, Shaw, Atlanta, and American universities.

Long a professional social worker, she always brought a personal dimension of concern and assistance to every situation. She was an unofficial social adviser to President Johnson. She helped make sure that blacks were included in federal functions (including social occasions) and that the loftiest didn't fail to greet the lowliest at such occasions.

Knowledge, grace, wit and independence, all were her personal characteristics. They leave us a memory of a woman whom everyone loved and respected.

[From the Washington Afro-American, June 21, 1980]

FANNIE GRANTON, A "GIANT" WOMAN

The Washington community, and more particularly persons in the journalistic field, this week mourn the unexpected and shocking death of a beloved citizen, E. Fannie Granton.

She was a "giant" among women in the Washington press corps and her passing

leaves a void in the community she served unstintingly for the past 24 years.

A religious student in her earlier days, Fannie entered the news medium when jobs were difficult for blacks, even more so for a black woman, to find. Never doubting that she had made the right move, Fannie later became one of the most sought after and highly respected female journalists in the Washington area.

Fannie Granton was accredited to the White House where she was well liked by "Lady Bird" Johnson. She was no stranger to the Kennedys, Nixons or the Fords. Her articles, following her travels to Africa with Mrs. Muriel Humphrey, wife of the former vice president of the United States and with Pat Nixon, wife of former president, Richard M. Nixon, won wide acclaim.

Quiet and unassuming, it might be said of her that she walked with kings and supped with queens, yet never lost the common touch. Whatever the role, she could act it out on stage and receive applause because of her magnificent performance.

She was perhaps best noted for her work in the Washington community with "ordinary people." She had a deep respect for gospel great James Cleveland and was his number one fan when he sang "Ordinary People, God Chooses Ordinary People."

Fannie loved people and devoted much of her life serving people. Her world spanned the entire community—social, political, educational and organizational. She had almost boundless energy and in the course of a week would attend and be a part of better than 25 social, political, organizational or educational functions. Many sought recognition in her column which was widely read all over the country.

It was fashionable to be mentioned in her weekly column. In the 24 years she labored in the vineyards of journalism in the D.C. area, she never wrote unkindly of anyone. She was responsible for the making of socialites in the Washington area and was known for her generous assistance to struggling journalists. Her myriad contacts would be worth millions on the open market today for social writers and socialites past and present.

There is no question that Esther Fannie Granton leaves a legacy. She radiated a warmth and a charm possessed by few. To know her was to love her. A credit to black journalism and all that dedicated black journalists stand for, Fannie Granton can never be replaced. The key to success, as Fannie saw it, was "a job well done."

Fannie Granton may be gone from among us, but she will never be forgotten. Her spirit will live eternally in the hearts and minds of many Americans.—Three O—Fannie!

[From the Washington Afro-American,
June 21, 1980]

E. FANNIE GRANTON, 66, FOUND DEAD AT HER HOME

Esther Fannie Granton, 66, deputy chief of the Washington bureau of Ebony and Jet magazines, and ranking black newswoman on the White House press corps, was found dead Monday at her Washington apartment at 1623 Lanier Place, N.W.

A coroner's report was not available at press time, but her relatives believe she died of natural causes. She was reported last seen alive on June 11 at a public function in the District.

Ms. Granton was on two weeks vacation and was due back at work Monday. She was a very punctual person and when she failed to show up as scheduled, and following calls to her office that she had not appeared at

functions she was due to attend, concern grew as to her whereabouts.

The police were called and it was then that she was discovered dead in her home.

Ms. Granton had served for 24 years with the Johnson Publishing Co. office, the first black owned publishing firm to maintain downtown operations at 1750 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Starting off handling the business management of the bureau, Ms. Granton eventually moved into the journalistic phase by covering social events and political affairs. She served as a correspondent for the largest black magazines from the Eisenhower era, often covering White House news conferences and accompanying presidents and first ladies across the country.

She endeared herself to presidents and first ladies by her efforts to ensure that they met the important black guests at White House events. She often talked to social secretaries about involving the first ladies on social welfare projects involving blacks.

Ms. Granton's vast audience read her Washington Scene column in JET weekly magazine, which contained an up-to-date rundown on events in the nation's capital involving government officials, African diplomats and Members of Congress. Demands for her appearance at major social events kept her assignments on a seven-days-a-week basis, but she never complained.

Militant, aggressive and always confident, Ms. Granton worked assignments in the city ranging from the March on Washington to the inauguration of Mayor Marion Barry, whom she had first met during her coverage of her civil rights years before.

Born, Fannie Granton in Newport, Va.

She finished Armstrong High School in Washington and graduated from Shaw University in Raleigh, N.C. with a degree in religious education. Later, she graduated with a degree in social work from Atlanta University, and after a few years with the National Urban League in New Jersey, Texas, and Washington, D.C., decided to attend law school at American University.

She joined Johnson Publications in 1956. She was a member of the Washington Press Club, the Senate Department Press Association, and the Capitol Hill galleries.

She is survived by a sister, Alice Anderson; a brother, Louis Granton; 2 nieces, Karla Anderson and April Granton; and 2 nephews, Louis Brown and Charles Anderson.

A memorial service for the late Ms. Granton will be held Saturday, June 21 at the National Presbyterian Church and Center, 4101 Nebraska Ave., N.W., beginning at 4 p.m.

Members of the public are welcome to attend the service.

Instead of flowers, contributions should be donated to the Fannie Granton Scholarship of the Howard University School of Communications.

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1980]
ESTHER F. GRANTON, AT 66; A JOURNALIST IN CAPITAL

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Esther Fannie Granton, Washington correspondent for the Johnson Publications Company, publishers of Ebony and Jet magazines, died of a heart attack in her apartment here Monday. She was 66 years old.

Miss Granton, who joined the organization's Washington bureau in 1956, covered nearly every segment of the Washington political and social scene, from the White House, Congress and the Supreme Court to the civil rights movement. At death, she was Johnson's deputy bureau chief in Washington.

As a recognized authority on black affairs in Washington, Miss Granton often served as

an unofficial adviser to the White House, suggesting names of people to be invited to White House functions and arranging introductions. She once said that she considered handling misunderstandings and oversights at such functions to be part of her job as a reporter.

Miss Granton was considered an institution by her colleagues and Washington officials and was honored for her contributions at a party here last year.

Miss Granton was born in Newport News, Va. She grew up in Washington and attended Howard University for a short time, later earning a degree in social work from Atlanta University. She was a social worker for several years.

She is survived by a sister, Alice Anderson, and a brother, Louis Granton.

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 1980]

ESTHER FANNIE GRANTON

Today's huge corps of journalists assigned to official Washington may have its hands full explaining the mysteries of the White House, Congress, the Supreme Court or Embassy Row, but only a veteran few really appreciate what it took to be a black American correspondent in those circles decades ago. Esther Fannie Granton, who died here the other day at the age of 66, was a respected member of that pioneer club. Not only did she provide grace, wit and informative commentary for the readers of Ebony and Jet over the last quarter-century, but Miss Granton also earned a special place in the hearts of the presidents and their families who were her assignment.

Though she maintained her independence as a reporter, Miss Granton had so many friends and acquaintances and sources in a still quite segregated world that she became sort of an unofficial social adviser to the White House on black people. In this liaison mission, she would suggest names of people to be invited to White House functions; and, without great fanfare, she would see that presidents and others were introduced. If there were oversights on the part of officials, there would be a firm advisory from Miss Granton; or if a misunderstanding appeared in the making, she would do her best to smooth things.

Miss Granton wrote a weekly "Washington Scene" column for Jet and other reports as correspondent and finally deputy chief of the Washington bureau of Johnson Publications. She was an authority on the connection of the black community with the national political life of Washington; and through her interviews, readers shared impressions of members of Congress, Supreme Court justices and Cabinet members. Fannie Granton's friends in the news business—black and white—also valued her insight and counsel. We were counted among them.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1980]
COLUMNIST E. FANNIE GRANTON, 66, DIES, AUTHORITY ON BLACK AFFAIRS IN DISTRICT

(By J. Y. Smith)

Esther Fannie Granton, 66, a correspondent and columnist for Ebony and Jet magazines and a recognized authority on black affairs in Washington, was found dead Monday in her Washington apartment. The cause of death was a heart attack.

Miss Granton had worked for the Johnson Publications Co., the publishers of Ebony and Jet, for the past 24 years and was the deputy chief of its Washington bureau at the time of her death. She was widely known for "Washington Scene," a weekly column published in Jet.

She covered the White House, Capitol Hill, the State Department, Embassy Row, the

civil rights movement and other subjects. She wrote about matters of interest to blacks and it is said that no black ever appeared on a White House guest list whose name she did not record for her readers.

Beyond that, Miss Granton became a kind of unofficial social adviser to the White House on blacks. She suggested names of blacks who should be invited to the White House, saw that presidents and first ladies were introduced to them when they got there, and sometimes helped correct oversights on the part of officials. She once said that she considered this part of her job as a reporter, and as a reporter she covered an important aspect of life in Washington that previously had been unknown to those who were not part of it.

"She knew the community so well, she new exactly the right person to call to help smooth over (a) dreadful mistake," John Calhoun, an aide in the Ford White House, said at a party honoring Miss Granton a year ago. "And she was the first person I would call when we needed to know people, especially press people for briefings."

At that party, Miss Granton told an interviewer she was able to do what she did simply because "I know all those people. The knowledge comes from living here for years, having started with the old segregated social agencies, working with Southeast House, I knew Flaxie Pinkett's dad. Having gone to Howard . . . knowing the Mordecai Johnsons."

Miss Granton was born in Newport News, Va., and grew up there and in Washington. She graduated from Armstrong High School here and then attended Howard University. She interrupted her studies there to take a degree in religious education at Shaw University in Raleigh, N.C. She earned a degree in social work from Atlanta University, and for the next several years she was a professional social worker.

She worked with the National Urban League in New Jersey and Texas. In the mid-1940s, she returned to Washington. She was a social worker with the National Capital Housing Authority and worked with the Southeast and Southwest community houses. She also studied law at American University.

In 1956, she joined the Washington bureau of Johnson Publications, and one of the first things she did was help organize an open house party in connection with the second inaugural of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in 1957.

"Members of the Supreme Court, the Congress and everyone else came," Miss Granton recalled last year. "It was the talk of the town."

At first, Miss Granton was the business manager of the Johnson bureau. She gradually worked her way into reporting and writing.

As a White House correspondent she made several trips with former president and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and accompanied Mrs. Patricia Nixon on two overseas trips.

A frequent guest at White House embassy and similar functions, she herself was a hostess whose guests included many of the people about whom she wrote.

Miss Granton was a member of the Washington Press Club.

Her survivors include a sister, Alice Anderson, of Lanham, and a brother, Louis Granton, of Washington.

[From the Washington Star, June 17, 1980]

E. FANNIE GRANTON DIES; MAGAZINE NEWSWOMAN

Esther Fannie Granton, 66, deputy chief of the Washington bureau for Ebony and Jet magazines and the ranking black news-

woman in the White House press corps, was found dead yesterday at her home on Lanier Place NW.

An associate said Miss Granton was due to return to work yesterday following a two-week vacation and that her absence caused her coworkers to investigate. She apparently died between Thursday and yesterday, the associate said. Police said that the death appeared to be from natural causes.

Miss Granton was the chronicler of Washington's black society through her weekly Jet column, "Washington Scene."

Miss Granton was a former social worker, a veteran of settlement houses and government welfare agencies, when she joined Johnson Publications Co. in 1954 when the magazine publisher opened its Washington bureau.

She was proof that the power to attract could flourish on intelligence, kindness and goodwill, without great wealth, position or beauty. She wielded the power of the pen, but she did not rise through her job. She got the job because she knew the people.

She did not look like a social arbiter, although she was swamped by calls from mothers who thought their daughters belonged on the cover of Jet, and by numerous groups giving teas.

Miss Granton did not look like the mistress of a salon, but her annual birthday parties were attended by ambassadors, presidential assistants, doctors and lawyers, and her home and office were long a check-in station for the cognoscenti and the young people on their way up.

For the last 24 years Miss Granton was associated with the Johnson Publications Co. office, said to be the first black-owned publishing firm to maintain downtown operations. The company's Washington office is at 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. NW.

She began working for Johnson by handling the business management of the bureau, but she eventually moved into the journalistic phase by covering social events and political affairs. She was a correspondent for the largest black magazines since the Eisenhower era, often covering White House news conferences and accompanying presidents and first ladies across the country.

Miss Granton was born in Newport News, Va., and moved with her family to Anacostia when she was 11 years old.

Miss Granton called herself "a passive person," but she took on more than her share of the sad, dirty work in human relationships. She sat every day with one of her brothers who died of cancer. She campaigned for venereal disease education when it was still an unmentionable.

A year ago, Miss Granton was honored at a "We Love You Fannie" reception organized by one of her young admirers. Last year, before the reception was held, a reporter asked Miss Granton how she came to prevail in the world of fashion and power while breaking all its rules. "I don't think I make any demands on people," she said. "You know people with a lot of money and power are extremely jealous of each other. I don't have any of these things. I have always found people to be very nice to me. You hear so-and-so say, 'so-and-so doesn't like me.' I've never had that."

Miss Granton endeared herself to presidents and first ladies by her efforts to ensure that they met the important black guests at White House events and she often talked to social secretaries about involving the first ladies on social welfare projects involving blacks.

Miss Granton was a graduate of Armstrong High School here and she received a degree in social work from Shaw University in North Carolina. Later she received a graduate degree in social work from At-

lanta University. She also studied law at American University.

She was a member of the Washington Press Club.

She leaves a sister, Alice Anderson, and a brother, Louis.

FOR FANNIE GRANTON (By Art Buchwald)

Fannie Granton was a Jewish mother to all of us. She could tell us when we had gone too far and bawl us out when we hadn't gone far enough. She also made excellent chicken soup when we felt lousy.

Like all good Jewish mothers she looked after her own, and had a sharp tongue for anyone who would do us harm. We shall miss her wisdom and her spirit. She has left her mark on all of us, and she will be missed by every one whom she touched over the years.

Washington needed Fannie, if for no other reason than that she kept the rest of us from going over the cliff.

If I know her, she's probably sitting on some cloud now, listening to a white angel say, "Fannie, what do your people think about Sugar Ray Leonard?"

[From The Afro-American, July 5, 1980]

REMEMBRANCE: TRIBUTE TO MISS FANNIE GRANTON

(By Ethel Payne)

As it must, to each of us, death came to Fannie Granton a few days ago.

She went as quietly as she had lived—no fanfare, no fuss, no bother.

The initial shock at the news of her passing left us numb. She was a fixture in the life of Washington that somehow it just seemed that she would be here doing the little things that made the difference.

Fannie was the perfect alter ego for Simeon Booker, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Johnson Publishing Company. With just a chuckle or a shake of her head she could counter the dry, witty barbs that are his trademark. Between boss and assistant there was an unusual relationship, a camaraderie which is not often seen in this town where competition has been raised to a high art form.

I guess it was Fannie's disposition which was responsible for the relaxed atmosphere that characterized the JPC offices at 1750 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. It is a way-station for the lunch-time drop-ins, a listening post for what is happening in official Washington.

Many of us came to bask for a few minutes in the calm of Fannie, to be comfortable over cokes and conversation, to get away from the pressures of the day for a spell. Maurice Sorrell would come in from his photo dark room to join in the banter.

Fannie sat there in the middle of the long table, telephone at hand and scissors for clipping the stacks of newspapers, listening with infinite patience to gripes and jibes. If Booker got out of hand, she had only to glance reprovingly over her glasses to make him simmer down.

In her own way, she was the doyenne of Pennsylvania Avenue social gatherings. The office is only a block and a half away from the White House. To most folks, it was an extension of the Executive Mansion, because Fannie had ties into the First Ladies' office, whoever they were. The parties weren't the routine, office-types since Fannie gave them an extra touch, including her culinary productions served right from the pots.

She must have gotten some of her traits from her father, one of the most lovable characters I've ever known. He lived to a great age and enjoyed every moment of it. Papa enjoyed people period, especially the ladies. When he had an operation on his eyes for cataracts at past 90 years and was

bandaged for awhile, I asked Fannie one day how he was getting along.

"Well," she said, "he's kind of depressed, but he'll be all right as soon as he can watch the girls again."

Fannie's birthday parties were an annual event with folks trooping in and out. They were always celebrated on Sundays to accommodate working friends and relatives.

When I first came to Washington in 1953 as correspondent for the Chicago Defender, the persons whom I remember with fondness for helping me out included Fannie and Simeon.

After the bureau was opened in 1954, she used to double up with laughter at the "friendly" rivalry between Booker and me over news scoops.

We traveled to Ghana in 1957 for the independence ceremonies. On the way back, the vice-presidential party made a stop in Rome.

There at a U.S. Embassy reception, the chance remark of a diplomat's wife gave me one of the biggest stories of the trip. She let it be known that she was very unhappy over her husband's next assignment as American ambassador to "that crumb country, Ghana."

I eased out and in 15 minutes, I found the nearest cable office and put the story on the wire. By the time I returned Simeon had picked up the remark. We passed each other on the stairs, I with a smug smile, knowing full well that he too was headed for the cable office! Weeks later after our return, Fannie just chuckled on hearing about the incident.

Far from being a "Goody-Two-Shoes," Fannie set her own standards of integrity, but she took people as they came, never fawning over anyone. I confess that I used to get exasperated sometimes when I would explode that so and so was a real s.o.b. Fannie would smile faintly, but never concur. All she did was sit there like the Sphinx while I fumed, "Oh shucks, Fannie, you know I'm right."

Her death shook us up, but Fannie had prepared well, and "the celebration of the life of Fannie Granton" was a testament to the quality of her living, and the inner strength which inspired those who knew her.

No funeral, no flowers, just a simple memorial service she said in her will, and that's the way it was, well, almost because it was so elegant and eloquent, in its simplicity. In the beautiful sanctum of the National Presbyterian Church with its stained glass windows, the setting was perfect for the occasion.

Fannie, you were almost raised to sainthood by the solemnity! Even saints had their faults, and if I were a good Catholic, I'd recommend you for canonization.

At any rate, I don't think Washington has ever seen anything quite like it. Those friends, neighbors and kin who filled the church must have drawn a great deal of comfort and joy from the service, for there were no tears, only a deep, spiritual feeling of calm as we left.

Fannie, I'm glad I met you on this journey through life. It was a privilege to know you, to share many moments of understanding and to benefit from your wisdom and strength. We are all a little better for your having been here. Those of us who are left behind will remember well as we continue on our way.

Postscript: Fannie Granton stipulated in her will that in lieu of flowers, she would like contributions to go to the Howard University School of Communications for a scholarship

established in her name to assist young, aspiring journalists. Not only should we give to this, but the Howard University School of Medicine, to which she gave her body, would be another worthy recipient for a memorial gift.

[From Jet Magazine, July 3, 1980]

E. FANNIE GRANTON, 66, DIES OF NATURAL CAUSES

(By Simeon Booker)

When E. Fannie Granton didn't show up at her office punctually one Monday morning, co-workers at the Washington Bureau of Jet Magazine knew something was wrong. For almost a quarter of a century, "Miss Fannie" came to work at 7:30 a.m. instead of 9, and worked nights and weekends in a non-stop newscovet effort.

To further confirm suspicions, telephone calls from friends, dinner sponsors and fraternity officials came, inquiring as to why the 66-year-old Miss Fannie hadn't shown up at their functions as promised. Her reputation was unblemished. When she accepted an engagement she showed up... period.

Eight hours later, police were forced to climb through the back window of her co-op apartment and found Miss Fannie asleep in her bedroom. Asleep forever due to natural causes. Miss Fannie had a virtually unbroken work schedule for Johnson Publishing Co. spanning 24 years. Despite the fact that she was on a two-week vacation, she had been seen three times that week at various functions.

Atty. George Haley, who had seen her at a recent African economic meeting, said, "She was lively as ever. Smiling, saying she was enjoying her vacation."

The last person to talk to Miss Fannie was a longtime friend, Savannah Warfield Clark, who was surprised to find Fannie at home on Friday evening and "not in the street." Fannie said that she "was too tired and getting ready for a busy weekend, going to Syracuse, N.Y., early Saturday morning."

News of Fannie's passing saddened the Nation's Capital, Miss Fannie's hometown for most of her life, and where she had worked with politicians, bureaucrats and civil rights workers to end a segregation era and welcome a more fruitful period of integration.

Washington's fraternity paid tribute to the Black woman who had moved up to the front ranks, as the senior Black member of the White House Press Corps, and with a list of accomplishments which included serving as president of the Capitol Press Club to the first Black woman officer of the Downtown Washington Press Club.

As noted by the Washington Post: "Not only did she provide grace, wit, and informative commentary for the readers of Ebony and Jet over the last quarter-century, but Miss Granton also earned a special place in the hearts of the Presidents and their families who were her assignments."

A native of Newport News, Va., Miss Granton moved to Washington at the age of 11, graduated from Armstrong High School, Shaw University, earned a degree in social work at Atlanta U., studied law at American U., and served as a settlement house organizer and urban league social worker before becoming one of the first staff members of the Washington Bureau.

Starting as a secretary-office manager, Miss Fannie soon moved into the reporting ranks, covering social news and gathering information for Ebony Magazine. Eventually, she became "The old pro," informed on every aspect of D.C. life locally and nationally, and having thousands of "contacts" in every profession.

President Lyndon Johnson greeted her as "Miss Fannie" and read her articles. Mrs.

Rosalynn Carter invited her many times to the White House for special events. Long accustomed to the protocol, Miss Fannie usually introduced newcomers to the members of the First Family and won lifetime friendships.

Beyond her reporting, Miss Fannie was an institution; "Grandma" to a new generation of Blacks who moved into high-level political positions. D.C.'s current mayor, Marion Barry, was a street militant when he first encountered Miss Fannie. Secretary of the Army Clifford Alexander often referred to Miss Granton as "The original soul sister."

Last year more than 1,000 Washingtonians gathered to pay tribute in a gigantic "I Love Fannie" party. As many VIPs showed up for this downtown function as at her bureau inaugural parties and her annual office Christmas party. Said one admirer, "Fannie was a gem. She walked with the bigtimers, but never lost that humility."

That was her legacy. When Atty. Wiley Branton, dean of the Howard Law School, disclosed contents of her will, the stipulations were that there be no wake, no funeral, and that her body be donated for medical research. Instead of flowers, contributions were to be sent to her own scholarship fund at the Howard University School of Communications. Even in death, Miss Fannie was not interested in making news. She was still the reporter moving on toward heavenly assignments.

Miss Granton is survived by one brother, Louis Granton; a sister, Alice Anderson; and two nieces and two nephews.

[From the Washington Post, June 23, 1980]

FANNIE GRANTON MADE PEOPLE FEEL SPECIAL

(By Dorothy Gilliam)

As we walked across the porch and opened Fannie Granton's front door, our noses smacked into the smell of cinnamon and onion. Her father, about 90 then, slow-talked stories he'd heard from his early days in the South while Fannie cooked beef in a cinnamon marinade and turkey with onion. The old man spun folk tales, telling how the Devil was outsmarting God but that John, that noble hero, was outsmarting the Devil. Fannie, wooden spoon in hand, laughed softly at the folklore. Her father was a "killer" and she knew it.

Older women sometimes cloak themselves in disguises that are hard for young people to penetrate. It's not so much that they're trying to be secretive as they're trying to protect themselves: probably because they've been around longer.

When Fannie Granton died last week at the age of 66, I was among the hundreds of people she knew, for she was the hub of black Washington's information network.

She's been a constant in my life for more than 15 years, but I never saw the day when the child drooped, the day to ask what made her tick, the lessons she had learned, questions about failures and regrets.

Fannie Granton made her first foray into journalism when she was over 40, after working mostly as a social worker for several segregated agencies here. She probably studied social work because it spelled security for women in her generation. She rose to become a columnist for Jet Magazine, where she chronicled the events of the once-private world of Washington's black society. She later became deputy chief of the Johnson Publishing Company's bureau here.

She traveled to Africa with presidents and first ladies and covered the civil rights movement. Over time, I saw her become a better woman, her multiple interests and activities a reflection of the concerns that black women share.

She used what power she had to promote and encourage others, but she never expected payment in return. Not unexpectedly she had a lot of friends. By chronicling black society, she made people feel they were somebody special.

In my early years in Washington in the 1960s, Fannie was a constant counsel. She connected me with people who could help me find housing when I came as a young reporter for The Washington Post. She talked down my fears about discrimination against blacks who worked for white newspapers, cheered me on when I was discouraged about people who balked at being interviewed.

She provided invitations to her home where she seemed most totally herself—a little apart from social Washington and full of the congeniality and warmth people refer to as "down home."

In those early years she lived in Anacostia, and it seemed appropriate because Southeast was more like the South back then than part of a large city. To a Southern girl away from home, being entertained by Fannie was like going home to Mama.

But like a lot of young women, I was too busy learning the ropes, meeting new people, expanding my dreams. And the older friend was turned to less and less to answer questions or give advice.

So I watched Fannie take care of a father who lived to be over 100, a sister and a brother, but never learned the source of her maturity. I never learned how she really felt about never marrying. I never asked her why she willingly buried herself in her job, making everyone else's social life her social life.

So on the Sunday afternoons that we ate the cinnamon beef, we talked instead of black politicians' private lives and foibles, the civil rights movement and the progress of blacks in government.

She moved from Anacostia as her work grew more demanding. Occasionally I'd see her walking down Columbia Road headed for her roomy apartment on Lanier Place, wearing clothes so plain they escaped your notice, sensible flat shoes and, often, a nondescript hat.

Although she covered the White House, State Department and Embassy Row—and she was known as the unofficial social adviser to the White House on blacks—she was friends with many who'd never set foot in the White House, and she enjoyed being part of that circle. In turn, her friends loved and protected her—willingly chauffeuring the reporter who never got a driver's license.

On May 20 last year, I joined several hundred Washingtonians who paid tribute to Fannie on her 65th birthday. She described herself then simply as a "plunger" and stopped the lofty tributes by announcing that she planned to be around a long time. "So let's bring on the records now and rock." Even rocking, she looked dignified.

When I spoke to her, she diverted attention from herself. "Bring the children by some time, they must be really big by now."

I promised I would, but never got around to it. Now I'm doubly sorry. That visit might have opened Fannie up, not only to me, but to yet another generation. ●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. TAUZIN (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for July 25 and 28, on account of a necessary absence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

Ms. OAKAR.
Mr. LEHMAN.
Mr. HOPKINS.

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 Member (at the request of Mr. PORTER) to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material:)

Mr. PORTER, for 20 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DOUGHERTY) to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material:)

Mr. LEACH of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEAVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PREYER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland and to include extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,572.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and to include extraneous matter, on the Hammerschmidt amendment to H.R. 7631 in the Committee of the Whole today.

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

Mr. CHENEY.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in three instances.

Mr. DORNAN.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

Mr. McCLOY.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. ROTH in two instances.

Mr. ABDOR.

Mr. EVANS of Delaware.

Mr. PURSELL in two instances.

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

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

Mr. McDONALD.

Mr. GAYDOS.

Mr. ALBOSTA.

Mr. BONKER.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. SANTINI.

Mr. MILLER of California.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. NEDZI, 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 pro tempore:

H.R. 5580. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into certain agreements to further the readiness of the military forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 28, 1980, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4899. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a list of contract award dates for the period July 15 through October 15, 1980, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 139; to the committee on Armed Services.

4900. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Logistics, and Financial Management), transmitting notice that a study has been conducted of the refuse collection function at U.S. Army Armament Research and Development Command, Dover, N.J., and that a decision has been made that performance under contract is the most cost-effective method of accomplishing it, pursuant to section 806 of Public Law 96-107; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4901. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b (a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4902. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics), transmitting a report on the actuarial valuation of the Department of Defense military retirement system, pursuant to section 121(a)(2) of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, as amended (92 Stat. 2541); to the Committee on Government Operations.

4903. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting notice of a proposed altered system of records, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a (o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

4904. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing continued occupancy under a succeeding lease of space located at 1815 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va., pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

4905. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing continued occupancy under a suc-

ceeding lease of space located at 400 First Street NW, Washington, D.C., pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

4906. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on actions to improve the military manpower mobilization system (FPCD-80-58, July 22, 1980); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Armed Services.

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. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 5935. A bill to protect the privacy of medical information maintained by medical care facilities, to amend section 552a of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 96-832, pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Committee on Small Business. Small Business Committee allocation of budget totals to subcommittees for fiscal years 1980 and 1981. (Rept. No. 96-1194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 658. A bill to correct technical errors, clarify and make minor substantive changes to Public Law 95-598; with amendment (Rept. No. 96-1195). 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. DONNELLY:

H.R. 7832. A bill to extend from 5 to 10 years (until Nov. 30, 1987) the period during which spouses and surviving spouses who are eligible for Government pensions may qualify for an exemption from the pension offset provisions in title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLORIO (for himself, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MADIGAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 7833. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage the recycling of used oil, and for other purposes; to the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 7834. A bill: Rock Island Railroad Employee Assistance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland:

H.R. 7835. A bill for the relief of the city of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PREYER (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. STARK, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. REUSS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. LA-FALCE, and Mr. CAVANAUGH):

H.R. 7836. A bill to provide that the Securities and Exchange Commission shall be subject to the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978, except as provided in the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Ur-

ban Affairs and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANTINI (for himself, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 7837. A bill to provide for the cession and conveyance to the States of federally owned unreserved, unappropriated lands, and to establish policy, methods, procedures, schedules, and criteria for such transfers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVER:

H.R. 7838. A bill to improve the management of the national forests through amendment of certain public laws affecting public land exchange and withdrawals, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 7839. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to modify the termination date for veterans eligible for educational assistance provided under such chapter; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WON PAT:

H.R. 7840. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay compensation to individuals of Japanese descent residing on the territory of Guam during World War II for damages caused such individuals by the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H. Con. Res. 388. Concurrent resolution authorizing and requesting the President to establish May 29 as a day of remembrance of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

H. Con. Res. 389. Concurrent resolution condemning the harassment and persecution by the Soviet Government of Vladimir Kislik; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. WINN, and Mr. QUAYLE):

H. Con. Res. 390. Concurrent resolution with respect to an international treaty banning lethal and incapacitating chemical weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. Res. 754. Resolution to call on the President to declare a national emergency for the purpose of suspending the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII memorials were presented and referred as follows:

512. By the SPEAKER. Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the Santa Monica Mountain National Recreational Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

513. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to SSI/SSP recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ADDABBO presented a bill (H.R. 7841) for the relief of Mrs. Frieda Simonson, which

was referred 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. 4223: Mr. DRINAN, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 4343: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. PATTEN.

H.R. 5060: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 5225: Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. STEED, Mr. ERDAHL, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 5401: Mr. GRADISON and Mr. PEASE.

H.R. 6637: Mr. EMERY.

H.R. 6978: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 7108: Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ROE, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 7489: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 7548: Mr. McDADE and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 7643: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. HOLLOWBECK, and Mr. ROE.

H.J. Res. 289: Mr. CHENEY.

H.J. Res. 390: Mr. CHENEY.

H.J. Res. 511: Mr. BOWEN.

H.J. Res. 551: Mr. BARNES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. CLAUSEN, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LENT, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. SNOWE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. ZABLOCKI.

H. Con. Res. 343: Mr. WALKER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

H. Res. 745: Mr. ERDAHL and Mr. HOLLOWBECK.

H. Res. 748: Ms. HOLTZMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

400. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, relative to utility rates, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENTS

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

H.R. 7631

By Mr. LUJAN:

—Page 34, after line 9, insert the following:
PURCHASE OF PROPERTY TO EXPAND SANTA FE NATIONAL CEMETERY

For expanding the Santa Fe National Cemetery in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 1006), \$600,000.

FACTUAL DESCRIPTIONS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Prepared by the Bill Digest Section, American Law Division of the Congressional Research Service pursuant to clause 5(d) of House Rule X. Previous listing appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 13, 1980 (page 14660). Cumulative listing may be found in the

Digest of Public General Bills and Resolutions.

H.R. 7451. May 28, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide an additional personal tax exemption for a taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent who is handicapped.

H.R. 7452. May 28, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a limited, refundable income tax credit for household expenses to any taxpayer who maintains a household in which a dependent aged 65 or over resides.

H.R. 7453. May 28, 1980. Judiciary. Requires the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to reimburse specified employees of the Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, who lost specified benefits through their conversion from the Wage Board pay scale to General Schedule position.

H.R. 7454. May 28, 1980. Agriculture; Interior and Insular Affairs. Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a program of salvage of down, damaged, or associated timber and to mitigate the damage which has occurred to the renewable resources on and in the vicinity of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest as a result of the eruption of Mt. St. Helens.

H.R. 7455. May 28, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Directs the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to place the name of a specified individual on the register of Chicago region eligibles for the position of Federal Aviation Administration air traffic controller.

H.R. 7456. May 29, 1980. Judiciary. Provides that the United States District Court for the Central District of California shall be held at Long Beach, California, in addition to Los Angeles, as currently provided.

H.R. 7457. May 29, 1980. Judiciary: Ways and Means. Requires appropriate State authorities to give full faith and credit to a valid child custody determination by a State court.

Amends the Social Security Act to allow the Parental Locator Service to include information for the enforcement of child custody determinations or parental kidnapping provisions.

Prohibits the intentional restraint of a child in violation of a valid State custody determination.

H.R. 7458. May 29, 1980. Veterans' Affairs. Permits veterans to refinance previously guaranteed mortgage loans which are secured by homes they still own and occupy.

H.R. 7459. May 29, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants for the establishment and operation of National Centers for Personal Computers in Education.

H.R. 7460. May 29, 1980. Agriculture. Amends the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to transfer the administration of the food stamp program to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

H.R. 7461. May 29, 1980. Ways and Means. Allows individual taxpayers under the Internal Revenue Code an income tax deduction for travel deposits to attend the 1980 summer Olympics, which were lost due to the boycott of such games.

H.R. 7462. May 29, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of tax-exempt industrial development bonds, issued as the obligation of a State, to finance railroad facilities.

H.R. 7463. May 29, 1980. Foreign Affairs; Judiciary; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Ways and Means. Seeks to promote export trading companies. Authorizes the Export-Import Bank to provide loans and guarantees to such companies. Amends the

Webb-Pomerene Act to exempt such companies from antitrust restrictions. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to make such companies eligible for treatment as domestic international sales corporations (DISC) and Subchapter S corporations.

H.R. 7454. May 29, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Expedites the decisionmaking process with respect to the siting of new coal-fired powerplants. Provides, where possible, that such plants be located in the general area where the energy is to be distributed.

H.R. 7465. May 29, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Clean Air Act to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to grant, with the consent of the State Governor, waivers of specified air pollution control requirements for coal-fired power plants using innovative technological systems of continuous emission reduction.

Directs the Administrator to develop and implement plans to assess to effectiveness of a system of fees from and rebates to owners or operators of emissions sources to achieve national or secondary ambient air quality standards in specified regions.

H.R. 7466. May 29, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Permits Federal agencies and Federal advisory committees to employ personal assistants for handicapped employees or members at their official duty station and while on travel status.

H.R. 7467. May 29, 1980. Ways and Means. Repeals the estate tax, the gift tax, and the tax on generation-skipping transfers under the Internal Revenue Code.

H.R. 7468. May 29, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends title XIX (Medicaid) of the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal medical assistance percentage will be 100 percent for individuals during periods in which they have been incorrectly certified as SSI recipients.

H.R. 7469. May 29, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to direct that the average fuel economy standard for 1995 and later model years shall be 40 miles per gallon.

H.R. 7470. May 29, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Provides for payments in lieu of taxes to be made from the Bonneville Power Administration fund to State and local taxing authorities for those transmission facilities of such Administration on which construction was completed after April 30, 1980.

H.R. 7471. May 30, 1980. Extends the temporary increase of the public debt limit.

H.R. 7472. May 30, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide that meals furnished by employers to employees which are excluded from such employees' income shall not be subject to taxes under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act or the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

H.R. 7473. May 30, 1980. Judiciary. Amends the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to require that a criminal case in a Federal district court having three or more judges in regular active service be reassigned if all defendants in such case jointly file timely notice.

H.R. 7474. May 30, 1980. Science and Technology. Directs the Secretary of Energy to prepare a comprehensive program management plan of research, development, and demonstration of ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC) systems.

Establishes the OTEC Advisory Committee to advise and report to the Secretary.

H.R. 7475. May 30, 1980. Judiciary; Armed Services. Makes the Federal tort claims procedure the exclusive remedy in medical mal-

practice actions resulting from federally authorized National Guard training activities.

H.R. 7476. May 30, 1980. Judiciary. Declares a certain individual to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7477. June 3, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to extend the authority to impose the tax on noncommercial aviation fuel, the tax on civil aircraft use, and the taxes on air transportation of persons and property.

Reduces the civil aircraft use tax rate for the transitional period of July 1, 1980, through October 1, 1980.

Amends the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970 to extend the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

H.R. 7478. June 3, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Second Liberty Bond Act to raise the ceiling on the investment yield on U.S. savings bonds. Increases the face amount of specified bonds which may be outstanding at any time.

H.R. 7479. June 3, 1980. Foreign Affairs; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Judiciary; Ways and Means; Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Small Business; Agriculture; Education and Labor. Establishes a national export policy for the United States.

H.R. 7480. June 3, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States to impose a tariff on imported shrimp.

H.R. 7481. June 3, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to exempt a certain portion of royalty owner oil production from the windfall profit tax.

H.R. 7482. June 4, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Authorizes the President to present a gold-plated medal, on behalf of the Congress, to those athletes selected through the Olympic trial process to be members of the United States Summer Olympic Team of 1980.

H.R. 7483. June 4, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow commercial fishermen an income tax credit for fuel costs of their fishing vessels.

H.R. 7484. June 4, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends title II (Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance) of the Social Security Act to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits.

H.R. 7485. June 4, 1980. Government Operations. Provides for payments in lieu of taxes to be made by the United States to local governments for property which is exempt from real property taxation under Federal law and which is located within the jurisdiction of the local government and owned by a foreign government or international organization.

H.R. 7486. June 4, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Directs the General Services Administration to establish the Federal Protective Service for the protection of property under the jurisdiction of the Administration. Provides for the pay, training, and retirement of the members of such Service.

H.R. 7487. June 4, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to impose a manufacturers' excise tax on the sale of light gauge steel drums.

H.R. 7488. June 4, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Amends the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to increase civil and criminal penalties for violation of specified transportation safety and accident reporting laws.

H.R. 7489. June 4, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Public Works and Transportation. Provides grants and loans for production and utilization of anthracite coal, and other financial assistance for the planning, program coordination, and use of anthracite coal resources.

H.R. 7490. June 4, 1980. Judiciary. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a specified amount to Herbert J. Thomas Memorial Hospital in the State of West Virginia.

H.R. 7491. June 4, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Provides exemptions from the Investment Company Act of 1940 and Investment Advisers Act of 1940 for specialized investment companies engaged in furnishing capital to unseasoned enterprises which are unable to obtain capital on favorable terms through conventional means and which frequently need and receive significant managerial assistance and for certain investment advisers.

H.R. 7492. June 4, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Declares that a Federal employee shall be considered to be disabled for purposes of disability retirement if the employee is unable to perform useful and efficient service in his or her position because of disease or injury and is not qualified for any vacant position at the same level.

H.R. 7493. June 4, 1980. Appropriations. Makes supplemental appropriations and rescinds certain budget authority for fiscal year 1980.

H.R. 7494. June 4, 1980. Armed Services. Provides for an investigation of the acquisition of lands on Natagorda Island, Texas, by the Federal Government in 1940. Preserves certain rights in that land to the former owners.

H.R. 7495. June 4, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Establishes Inauguration Day, January 20, following the election of the President, as a legal public holiday.

H.R. 7496. June 4, 1980. Merchant Marine and Fisheries; Ways and Means. Provides additional funds for certain projects relating to fish restoration.

H.R. 7497. June 4, 1980. Judiciary. Declares two named individuals to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7498. June 4, 1980. Judiciary. Declares a named individual to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7499. June 5, 1980. Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Provides financial and technical assistance with respect to the use of commercial fishing methods, in certain Great Lakes waters, that are consistent with sound fishery conservation and management practices.

H.R. 7500. June 5, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 to make certain technical amendments to such Act. Revises the regulatory program implementing such Act.

H.R. 7501. June 5, 1980. House Administration. Amends the Federal Campaign Act of 1971 to permit certain organizations and corporations to solicit political contributions from members' families.

H.R. 7502. June 5, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Allows State Medicaid plans to provide medical assistance for institutional services for mentally retarded individuals who are not otherwise eligible for such assistance because they are not treated as residents of the State.

H.R. 7503. June 5, 1980. Agriculture. Establishes a ceiling of nine percent on interest rates on price support loans for 1979 and 1980 crop agricultural commodities.

H.R. 7504. June 5, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow an investment tax credit for costs related to a theatrical production.

H.R. 7505. June 5, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide for a 20 percent investment tax credit for industrial property utilized to conserve energy. Increases the amount of the investment tax credit energy percentage for spe-

cially defined energy property and alternative energy property.

H.R. 7506. June 6, 1980. Government Operations. Prohibits a Federal agency from: (1) requiring any person to maintain records for a period in excess of four years; and (2) commencing an action against a person who violated a regulation after four years have expired since the violation occurred.

H.R. 7507. June 5, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends title II (Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance) of the Social Security Act, to reaffirm that benefits payable thereunder are exempt from all taxation.

H.R. 7508. June 5, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Solid Waste Disposal Act to exempt municipalities with a population of 5,000 or less, or counties with a population of 10,000 or less or less than 20 persons per square mile and not within a metropolitan area, from specified prohibitions against open dumping of solid waste.

H.R. 7509. June 5, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow individual taxpayers an income tax credit or deduction for the purchase of crime prevention devices.

H.R. 7510. June 5, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Veterans' Affairs. Provides that the interest rate on mortgages secured by one- to four-family residences and insured or guaranteed under specified provisions of law be negotiated between the borrower and the lender. Prohibits lenders from charging discount points on such mortgages in excess of their acquisition costs.

H.R. 7511. June 5, 1980. Veterans' Affairs. Increases the rates of veterans' compensation for: (1) wartime disability compensation; (2) additional compensation for dependents; and (3) clothing allowance paid to certain disabled veterans.

Increases the rates of veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation for: (1) a surviving spouse; (2) surviving children; and (3) supplemental children's benefits.

H.R. 7512. June 5, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to retain as a national reserve, lands of the outer Continental Shelf included in a certain proposed lease sale. Prohibits the Secretary from leasing such lands for oil or gas production or development, except as recommended by the President and not disapproved by the Congress.

H.R. 7513. June 5, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the duty-free entry of potassium bicarbonate.

H.R. 7514. June 5, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Provides for the conveyance of certain lands in Mammoth Lakes, California, to the Mammoth Unified School District, Mono County, and the Mono County Water District.

H.R. 7515. June 5, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends title IV (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) of the Social Security Act to substitute block grants for open-ended Federal matching. Gives States a fiscal incentive to reduce error, waste, and fraud in the aid to families with dependent children program. Provides fiscal relief to the States. Encourages the States to require work as a condition of eligibility for aid to families with dependent children payments. Establishes a demonstration project to provide a pilot test of the State's ability to design and implement their own welfare programs.

H.R. 7516. June 5, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 to make the small offerings exemption for specified securities consistent with such exemption under the Securities Act of 1933. Increases the amount of other specified securities entitled to the small offerings exemption.

H.R. 7517. June 5, 1980. Government Operations. Requires each Federal agency to pre-

pare an annual employment impact statement for its proposed procurement practices.

H.R. 7518. June 5, 1980. Education and Labor; Government Operations. Prohibits any employee of the Bureau of Labor Statistics from disclosing data requested under a pledge of confidentiality in connection with a statistical program which could reasonably be uniquely associated with the identity of any individual or establishment to which the data pertains.

H.R. 7519. June 5, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946 to prohibit the Indian Claims Commission, in determining the amount of payment to be made by the United States to an Indian claimant, from setting off against such payment any money or property given to, or funds expended gratuitously for such claimant after June 30, 1951.

H.R. 7520. June 5, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide that any income received or accrued by a tax-exempt mutual or cooperative electric or telephone company from qualified pole rentals, or by a cooperative telephone company from the sale of display listings in a directory furnished to company members, shall not be treated as unrelated business income subject to tax.

H.R. 7521. June 5, 1980. Government Operations. Requires an individual to be a U.S. citizen to be eligible for any benefits wholly funded by the Government.

Terminates any Federal assistance to any program which uses such assistance to provide benefits to individuals who are not U.S. citizens.

H.R. 7522. June 6, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a refundable income tax credit to individual taxpayers for specified amounts of residential energy costs saved by such taxpayers during a taxable year in comparison with costs incurred in 1979.

H.R. 7523. June 5, 1980. Judiciary. Declares a named individual to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7524. June 5, 1980. Judiciary. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a specified sum to a named individual in full satisfaction of a claim against the United States for losses suffered as a result of Air Force personnel erroneously refusing to accept household goods of such individual for storage and subsequent commercial shipment.

H.R. 7525. June 5, 1980. Judiciary. Declares two named individuals to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7526. June 9, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to liability for accidents at nuclear facilities.

H.R. 7527. June 9, 1980. Ways and Means; Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Judiciary; Post Office and Civil Service. Institutes revisions in the health care delivery system. Assists all Americans in obtaining health care. Restrains increases in health care costs.

H.R. 7528. June 9, 1980. Ways and Means; Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code to provide for: (1) protection of individuals against catastrophic medical expenses; and (2) employer-offered health plans to meet minimal requirements in order to receive certain tax benefits.

Amends the Public Health Service Act and the Social Security Act with respect to enrollment in health maintenance organizations.

H.R. 7529. June 9, 1980. Ways and Means. Directs the Secretary of Labor to develop model legislation and to make grants, and provide technical assistance, to States to de-

velop, enact, and implement short-time unemployment compensation programs for individuals with reduced workweeks based on qualified employer plans.

H.R. 7530. June 9, 1980. Judiciary. Amends the classification of a named individual as a child for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7531. June 10, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Amends the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to permit operations by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation in China.

H.R. 7532. June 10, 1980. Ways and Means; Rules. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to impose an additional excise tax on imported automobiles manufactured in a foreign country, imports of whose automobiles account for more than ten percent of the new automobiles sold in the United States for the most recent 12-month period for which data are available.

H.R. 7533. June 10, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide that deferred compensation plans shall not be deemed as not satisfying minimum vesting standards even if there is a reasonable likelihood that the accrual of benefits or forfeitures under such plans will tend to discriminate in favor of employees who are officers, shareholders, or highly compensated.

H.R. 7534. June 10, 1980. Appropriations. Appropriates a sum for construction of facilities and acquisition of equipment in connection with a rapid transit project connecting Midway Airport and providing rapid transit service to the Southwest Side of Chicago.

H.R. 7535. June 10, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Amends the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act to eliminate the limitation on the amount of leave a teacher employed overseas by the Department of Defense may accumulate. Requires that such a teacher receive credit for any sick leave earned at a prior Government job, and for sick leave and teacher's leave earned at the Department when reappointed to another agency, provided that any break in service does not exceed three months.

H.R. 7536. June 10, 1980. Armed Services. Amends the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) to change the costsharing formula for emergency inpatient medical and dental care for members, certain former members, and dependents.

H.R. 7537. June 10, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to provide financial assistance to municipalities to be used for the closing of open dumps and the construction of sanitary landfills, in compliance with specialized requirements of such Act.

H.R. 7538. June 10, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to permit an income tax deduction from gross income for agency fees, court costs, attorney's fees, and other necessary expenses incurred in the adoption of a child.

H.R. 7539. June 10, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to extend the tax exclusion of interest on industrial development bonds to obligations issued to finance hazardous waste disposal facilities.

H.R. 7540. June 10, 1980. Judiciary. Redesignates the United States Customs Court as the United States Court of International Trade. Expands the jurisdiction and powers of such Court and sets forth procedures with respect to actions in such Court.

Makes similar revisions with respect to the Court of Appeals for International Trade, Patents, and Trademarks.

H.R. 7541. June 10, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to postpone the recognition of losses which are generated by tax shelters involving the sale and

purchase of offsetting positions in certain types of personal property.

Provides that certain obligations of the United States and its political subdivisions shall be treated as capital assets for capital gains tax purposes.

H.R. 7542. June 11, 1980. Makes supplemental appropriations and rescinds certain budget authority for fiscal year 1980.

H.R. 7543. June 11, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Prohibits the inclusion of a scenic shoreline drive in the management plan for the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan.

H.R. 7544. June 11, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Designates the U.S. Federal Building in New Haven, Connecticut, as the "Robert N. Glaime Federal Building."

H.R. 7545. June 11, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Trade Act of 1974 to make workers eligible for trade adjustment assistance if: (1) their firms' sales or production threaten to decrease absolutely; or (2) their firms provide essential parts or services to articles adversely affected by increased imports.

H.R. 7546. June 11, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to permit tax-free industrial development bonds to be used to finance the construction and acquisition of office space and computer facilities at airports.

H.R. 7548. June 11, 1980. Agriculture. Amends the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to permit farm credit system institutions to revise their services to borrowers.

H.R. 7549. June 11, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Authorizes the generation of electrical power at the Palo Verde Irrigation District diversion dam in the State of California.

H.R. 7550. June 11, 1980. Judiciary; Foreign Affairs. Establishes a Commission on the International Application of Antitrust Laws. Charges such Commission with examining the international aspects of United States antitrust laws and related statutes, court rules, and administrative procedures and with making recommendations to the President and to the Congress on the results of such study.

H.R. 7551. June 11, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Education and Labor. Provides financial assistance for programs for the prevention, identification, and treatment of adult abuse, neglect, and exploitation. Establishes a national center on adult abuse.

H.R. 7552. June 11, 1980. Armed Services. Authorizes the Secretary concerned of the Armed Forces to conduct a safety investigation of any aircraft accident under his or her jurisdiction. Prohibits public disclosure of certain parts of any such investigation.

H.R. 7553. June 11, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from income taxation interest income received by a nonresident alien individual or foreign corporation on investments in U.S. corporations or partnerships.

H.R. 7554. June 12, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Securities Act of 1933 and the Investment Company Act of 1940 to provide incentives for small business investment.

H.R. 7555. June 12, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends title II (Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance) of the Social Security Act to prevent payment, in certain cases, of disability insurance benefits for a physical or mental condition arising from an individual's commission of a crime or the individual's incarceration in a penal institution. Excludes from the definition of "full time student" any individual incarcerated in a penal institution following a felony conviction. Deems convicted felons to have refused rehabilitation services under certain circumstances.

H.R. 7556. June 12, 1980. Ways and Means.

Amends the Internal Revenue Code to reduce the rate of excise tax on tires.

H.R. 7557. June 12, 1980. Agriculture. Authorizes appropriations for fiscal years 1981 through 1985 to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a program of matching grants to States to assist "1890 land grant colleges", including Tuskegee Institute, in acquiring and improving agricultural and food research facilities and equipment.

H.R. 7558. June 12, 1980. District of Columbia. Amends the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to establish a formula for determining the amount of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7559. June 12, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to prescribe procedures to increase compliance with reporting requirements for dividend and interest income.

H.R. 7560. June 12, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow an income tax credit for the purchase of fuel-efficient passenger automobiles. Permits a full ten percent investment tax credit for fuel-efficient automobiles without regard to the useful life of such automobiles.

H.R. 7561. June 12, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate the age requirement for the one-time exclusion of gain from the sale or exchange of a principal residence.

H.R. 7562. June 12, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a deduction to any taxpayer furnishing professional design services for cash contributions to his service liability trust and for cash amounts paid to a captive insurer (wholly or partially-owned by the taxpayer) for service liability insurance.

H.R. 7563. June 12, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide tax incentives for businesses in economically depressed areas.

H.R. 7564. June 12, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Sets forth the intent of the Congress in connection with certain school grant indemnity land statutes and the Taylor Grazing Act.

H.R. 7565. June 12, 1980. Judiciary. Divides the current United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit into two circuits, the Fifth Circuit, composed of the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas, and the Eleventh Circuit, composed of the States of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia.

H.R. 7566. June 12, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to revise the rules for the deductibility of expenses for attendance at a foreign convention.

H.R. 7567. June 12, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs; Judiciary. Confers jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims and the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear all claims which the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma may have against the United States with respect to certain lands and assets.

H.R. 7568. June 12, 1980. House Administration. Amends the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to limit the aggregate volume of honorariums which may be accepted in any calendar year by certain employees of the House of Representatives from any particular individual or organization. Imposes certain limits with respect to the outside earned income permissible for certain of such employees.

H.R. 7569. June 12, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Trade Act of 1974 to make workers eligible for trade adjustment assistance if: (1) their firms' sales or production threaten to decrease absolutely; (2) their firms provide essential parts or services to articles adversely affected by increased imports; or (3) they constitute a significant number of workers in a trade impacted area which is eligible for adjustment assistance for communities.

H.R. 7570. June 12, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Provides that funds which are to be distributed per capita to individual members of an Indian tribe may be so distributed by the Secretary of the Interior or the governing body of any such tribe.

H.R. 7571. June 12, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Authorizes grants to States in order to provide assistance to low-income households for residential heating costs.

H.R. 7572. June 12, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that appearances by actors in motion pictures or theatrical productions shall not be subject to the requirement of specified provisions of such Act.

H.R. 7573. June 12, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to extend, by 24 months, the deadline for completion (by the Secretary of the Interior, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, and the Cook Inlet Regional Corporation) of the nomination of Federal lands or property for such Corporation in exchange for other Federal lands which such Corporation would otherwise receive out of the Cook Inlet Area.

H.R. 7574. June 12, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant preferences to small refineries in the sale of oil.

H.R. 7575. June 12, 1980. Judiciary. Declares a named individual to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7576. June 13, 1980. Foreign Affairs; Judiciary. Requires the Attorney General to determine whether: (1) U.S. business conduct and arrangements in various countries to expand exports conflict with basic antitrust principles; and (2) a more liberal enforcement policy for overseas activities would impede implementation of the antitrust laws.

H.R. 7577. June 13, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Requires that certain drugs and pharmaceuticals be prominently labeled as to the date beyond which potency or efficacy becomes diminished.

H.R. 7578. June 13, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Amends the Housing Act of 1959 to exempt certain housing projects for the elderly from the prevailing wage rate provision of such Act.

H.R. 7579. June 13, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Amends the Public Buildings Act of 1959 with respect to the acquisition of public buildings by exchange.

H.R. 7580. June 13, 1980. Education and labor. Directs the Secretary of Education to make per capita grants to reimburse elementary schools and institutions of higher education for part of the cost of foreign language instruction.

Directs the Secretary to conduct a survey of the effectiveness of foreign language training in secondary schools and community colleges.

H.R. 7581. June 13, 1980. Judiciary. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a specified sum to a named individual in full satisfaction of a claim against the United States.

H.R. 7582. June 13, 1980. Judiciary. Permits a named individual to file a claim within one year after the date of enactment of this Act for refund of overpayment of taxes imposed under the Internal Revenue Code.

H.R. 7583. June 13, 1980. Appropriations. Makes appropriations for fiscal year 1981 to the Department of the Treasury, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and specified independent agencies.

H.R. 7584. June 13, 1980. Appropriations. Makes appropriations for fiscal year 1981 to

the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies.

H.R. 7585. June 16, 1980. Veterans' Affairs. Allows the Veterans' Administration to furnish outpatient medical services to any veteran exposed to ionizing radiation as a result of atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons.

H.R. 7586. June 16, 1980. Judiciary. Amends the Gun Control Act of 1968 to increase the prison sentences for anyone using or carrying a firearm during the commission of a felony which may be prosecuted in Federal court.

H.R. 7587. June 16, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to repeal a provision relating to forfeitures.

H.R. 7588. June 16, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Designates the United States Post Office and Courthouse Building in Concord, New Hampshire, as the James C. Cleveland Building.

H.R. 7589. June 16, 1980. Small Business. Amends the Small Business Act to increase to \$110,000 the amount of a borrower's disaster loans eligible for a three percent rate.

H.R. 7590. June 16, 1980. Appropriations. Makes appropriations to the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority for energy and water development for fiscal year 1981.

H.R. 7591. June 17, 1980. Appropriations. Makes appropriations for fiscal year 1981 for specified agricultural, rural development, domestic food, and international programs of the Department of Agriculture and certain related agencies.

H.R. 7592. June 17, 1980. Appropriations. Makes appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1981.

H.R. 7593. June 17, 1980. Appropriations. Makes appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal year 1981.

H.R. 7594. June 17, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to specify conditions under which accruals or forfeitures in a tax-qualified deferred compensation plan, which would otherwise be deemed discriminatory, will not be considered to have taken place.

H.R. 7595. June 17, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code and the Social Security Act to provide that social security taxes and income tax withholding shall not apply to certain chore services performed by an individual under an arrangement with a State program.

H.R. 7596. June 17, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Directs the Department of Health and Human Services to halt implementation of certain regulations relating to clinical laboratory personnel.

H.R. 7597. June 17, 1980. Armed Services. Allows disabled individuals eligible for custodial care under the CHAMPUS program on October 18, 1978, to continue to receive such care concurrently with hospital insurance benefits provided by Medicare.

H.R. 7598. June 17, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a deduction to any business enterprise engaged in the manufacture, importation, distribution, lease, or sale of any product for contributions to its product liability trust account and for amounts paid to a captive insurer (wholly or partially-owned by the taxpayer) for product liability insurance.

H.R. 7599. June 17, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Designates various areas as components of the national wilderness preservation system in the national forests in the State of Texas.

H.R. 7600. June 17, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from gross income interest earned on series EE U.S. savings bonds.

H.R. 7601. June 17, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow, for estate and gift tax purposes, effective disclaimer of an interest created by a transfer of property made before November 15, 1958.

H.R. 7602. June 17, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Library Services and Construction Act to: (1) permit grants to States to be used for State agency long-range planning for library services; (2) require that 15 percent of appropriations be available for direct grants to existing cooperative networks of libraries; and (3) declare that nothing in any law prevents U.S. communications common carriers from rendering free or reduced rate communications interconnection services for nonprofit library and educational activities.

Amends the Department of Education Organization Act to provide for an Office of, and Assistant Secretary for, libraries and Information Services.

H.R. 7603. June 17, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow, in lieu of the amortization of amounts for pollution control facilities, a deduction in the year in which such amounts are paid or incurred.

H.R. 7604. June 17, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the nonrecognition of gain from the sale of small business stock to an employee stock ownership plan if the proceeds from such a sale are reinvested in small business stock within 18 months of the date of the sale.

H.R. 7605. June 17, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the International Travel Act of 1961 to repeal provisions providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for tourism.

Authorizes appropriations for the U.S. Travel Service. Terminates the limitation on the number of employees in the District of Columbia office.

H.R. 7606. June 17, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the tax treatment of employee stock ownership plans.

H.R. 7607. June 17, 1980. Armed Services. Extends certain assignment rotation rights to civilian Defense Establishment employees from Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

H.R. 7608. June 17, 1980. Judiciary. Declares a named individual to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7609. June 17, 1980. Judiciary. Authorizes the granting of a visa and admission to the United States for permanent residence to a named individual.

H.R. 7610. June 18, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to revise the manner of computing the benefits provided under such Act. Provides for certification of physicians eligible to provide medical care to workers covered by such Act. Provides for an attorney to serve as the representative of the special fund established under such Act. Establishes a benefits review board, the members of which are appointed by the President. Establishes an advisory committee to evaluate the manner in which the provisions of such Act are carried out.

H.R. 7611. June 18, 1980. Government Operations. Prohibits the receipts and disbursements of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and any amount in such Trust Fund from being included in the totals of the budget of the United States Government.

H.R. 7612. June 18, 1980. Ways and Means.

Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide that proceeds from identical wagers will not be aggregated for purposes of determining whether the excise tax on wagering should be withheld.

H.R. 7613. June 18, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, to be responsible for structural and other building repairs, maintenance, security, information, interpretation, janitorial services, utilities, and all similar services necessary to the operation of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

H.R. 7614. June 18, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a limited income tax exclusion of interest earned on savings accounts on deposit with certain financial institutions. Disallows income tax deductions for interest paid on credit card debt.

H.R. 7615. June 18, 1980. Judiciary. Transfers the counties of Alleghany, Ashe, Watauga, and Wilkes from the Middle to the Western Judicial District of North Carolina.

H.R. 7616. June 18, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Establishes a national center for clinical pharmacology in the Department of Health and Human Services.

H.R. 7617. June 18, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to oil shale leaseholders additional leases for lands outside the oil shale lease lands for any purpose, other than the actual mining of oil shale, connected with operations pursuant to such oil shale leases.

H.R. 7618. June 18, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from income taxation any income resulting from the transfer of stock to an individual exercising a stock option under an incentive stock option plan.

H.R. 7619. June 18, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the National Labor Relations Act to specify that no faculty member or group of faculty members in any educational institution shall be deemed to be managerial or supervisory employees solely because the faculty member or group of faculty members participate in decisions with respect to courses, curriculum, personnel, or other matters of educational policy.

H.R. 7620. June 18, 1980. Judiciary. Declares a named individual to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7621. June 19, 1980. Judiciary. Rules. Amends the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for a one-House congressional veto of a Presidential determination to exceed the annual 50,000 refugee admission ceiling.

H.R. 7622. June 19, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Requires the Postal Service to maintain the frequency of mail delivery service in effect on June 1, 1980.

H.R. 7623. June 19, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Occupational Safety and Health Act to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue warning notices to employees before issuing citations. Sets forth procedures for the issuance of warning notices and citations.

H.R. 7624. June 19, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to apply the excise tax on the sale of coal at the coal preparation plant.

H.R. 7625. June 19, 1980. Judiciary. Divides the current United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit into two circuits, the Fifth Circuit, composed of the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas, and the Eleventh Circuit, composed of the States of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia.

H.R. 7626. June 19, 1980. Armed Services. Increases certain special pay and allowances for members of the uniformed services.

H.R. 7627. June 19, 1980. Government Op-

erations. Authorizes the Archivist of the United States to commence actions to recover records unlawfully removed from Federal agencies.

Requires the Administrator of General Services to provide an opportunity for public comment on the proposed disposal of agency records.

H.R. 7628. June 19, 1980. Government Operations. Declares that the Archivist of the United States shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Transfers to the Archivist specified records management functions of the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

H.R. 7629. June 19, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Authorizes the President to present a gold-plated medal, on behalf of the Congress, to those athletes selected through the Olympic trial process to be members of the United States Summer Olympic Team of 1980.

H.R. 7630. June 19, 1980. Judiciary. Authorizes the classification of a named individual as a child for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7631. June 19, 1980. Appropriations. Makes appropriations for fiscal year 1981 to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, specified independent agencies, and government corporations.

H.R. 7632. June 20, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Terminates the export controls imposed by the President on agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union.

H.R. 7633. June 20, 1980. Ways and Means. Expresses the sense of the Congress with respect to certain withholding taxes.

H.R. 7634. June 20, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Clean Air Act to revise the formula for determining the amount of any noncompliance penalty. Eliminates a specified minimum amount for such penalties.

H.R. 7635. June 20, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Terminates the export controls imposed by the President on agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union.

H.R. 7636. June 20, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to: (1) permit the nonrecognition of gain from the sale of a principal residence even though the purchase price of a new residence is less than the sales price of the old residence; (2) extend the rollover period for the reinvestment of residential sales proceeds eligible for capital gains nonrecognition treatment; (3) allow an income tax deduction for contributions to an individual housing account; and (4) limit the allowable amount of the income tax deduction for interest paid on home mortgages.

H.R. 7637. June 20, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Provides for the exchange of certain lands within Tuolumne County, California.

H.R. 7638. June 20, 1980. Judiciary. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a specified sum to a named individual in full satisfaction of a claim against the United States.

H.R. 7639. June 20, 1980. Judiciary. Authorizes the classification of a named individual as a child for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7640. June 23, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Provides water to the Papago Tribe of Arizona and its members. Settles tribal and individual water rights claims in portions of the Papago Reservations.

H.R. 7641. June 24, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends title XIX (Medicaid) of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicaid coverage of acupuncturists' services.

H.R. 7642. June 24, 1980. Ways and Means; Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends part B of title XVIII (Medicare) of the Social Security Act with respect to acupunc-

ture treatment in States which license or certify individuals who furnish such treatment.

H.R. 7643. June 24, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a taxpayer to elect to treat expenditures paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for depreciable business property as currently deductible business expenses.

H.R. 7644. June 24, 1980. Education and Labor. Establishes a municipal arts program for the purpose of making available artistic and cultural opportunities in the Nation's cities.

H.R. 7645. June 24, 1980. Judiciary. Divides the current United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit into two circuits, the Fifth Circuit, composed of the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas, and the Eleventh Circuit, composed of the States of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia.

H.R. 7646. June 24, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Education and Labor; Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Establishes a program under which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may provide funds to local educational agencies for the renovation of underutilized school buildings. Amends the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide that school facilities under the jurisdiction of local educational agencies which have experienced declining student enrollments shall be given priority for the receipt of funds under specified provisions of such Act.

H.R. 7647. June 24, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a refundable income tax credit for electric utility fuel surcharges resulting from a shutdown of nuclear power generating facilities.

H.R. 7648. June 24, 1980. Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Directs the Secretary of the Interior to issue renewable annual permits to enable eligible applicants to commute across the Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge in the State of North Carolina.

H.R. 7649. June 24, 1980. Veterans' Affairs. Designates the outpatient clinic of the Veterans' Administration Medical Center in Fresno, California, as the "Victor Maghakian Clinic."

H.R. 7650. June 24, 1980. Judiciary. Authorizes the granting of a visa and admission to the United States for permanent residence to a named individual.

H.R. 7651. June 24, 1980. Judiciary. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a specified sum to a named individual in full satisfaction of a claim against the United States arising from a wrongful death action.

H.R. 7652. June 25, 1980. Ways and Means; Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Makes expenditure reductions and raises revenues in accordance with the budget reconciliation process by revising provisions concerning Medicare and Medicaid, unemployment compensation, trade adjustment assistance, mortgage subsidy bonds, estimated income payments by corporations, oil and chemical excise taxes, telephone excise tax, taxation of foreign investments in U.S. real estate, and social security taxes paid by the employer.

H.R. 7653. June 25, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Provides for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Father Michael J. McGivney, founder of the Knights of Columbus.

H.R. 7654. June 25, 1980. Armed Services. Requires the Board of Regents of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences to establish a program of training in military medicine for individuals enrolled in the Armed Forces health professions scholarship program.

H.R. 7655. June 25, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to reduce income tax rates for each category of individual taxpayers.

Provides for a system of accelerated

capital cost recovery for investment in business facilities and equipment.

H.R. 7656. June 25, 1980. Agriculture; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans for the construction of facilities to produce ethanol for blending with motor fuel.

H.R. 7657. June 25, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Establishes general statutory authority for the head of a Federal agency to appoint experts or consultants for temporary services.

H.R. 7658. June 25, 1980. District of Columbia. Amends the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 to require the Secretary of Transportation to contract with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority for a comprehensive study of extending the rail rapid transit line specified in the adopted regional system.

H.R. 7659. June 25, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Amends the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to make the enhancement of the economic and social well being of people residing and owning property in the Tennessee and Mississippi River Basin a purpose of such Act.

H.R. 7660. June 25, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the duty-free entry of specified freight containers.

H.R. 7661. June 25, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a certain portion of the Little Pee Dee River in the State of South Carolina for potential addition to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

H.R. 7662. June 25, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Sets forth compensation to be paid by any foreign government which tolerates the taking of U.S. citizens as hostages. Vests assets of such government in the United States if the hostages are not released within a specified period.

H.R. 7663. June 25, 1980. Veterans' Affairs; Post Office and Civil Service. Expands eligibility of former prisoners of war for certain health care benefits.

H.R. 7664. June 25, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the National School Lunch Act to extend the appropriations authorizations for the summer food program for children and the Secretary of Agriculture's commodity purchasing authority.

Amends the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to extend the appropriations authorizations for: (1) special payments to schools without food service programs or hot meal facilities; (2) State administrative expenses, including unused fund availability; (3) special supplemental food programs for pregnant women, infants, and young children; and (4) nutrition education and training.

Sets forth procedures and requirements for States and service institutions participating in such programs.

H.R. 7665. June 25, 1980. Judiciary. Divides the current United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit into two circuits, the Fifth Circuit, composed of the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas, and the Eleventh Circuit, composed of the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and the Canal Zone.

H.R. 7666. June 25, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Increases the amounts of regular and optional group life insurance available to Federal employees. Provides optional life insurance on family members.

H.R. 7667. June 25, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Investment Company Act of 1940 to revise exemptions from such Acts to include within such exemptions government employee benefit plans.

H.R. 7668. June 26, 1980. Intelligence; Foreign Affairs. Amends the National Security Act of 1947 to revise the congressional over-

sight procedures with respect to intelligence operations conducted by the United States.

H.R. 7669. June 26, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Establishes a permanent boundary for that portion of the Acadia National Park which lies within the town of Isle au Haut, Maine.

H.R. 7670. June 26, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends title II (Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance) of the Social Security Act to make adjustments in the allocation of social security tax receipts between the Federal old age and survivors insurance trust fund and the Federal disability insurance trust fund.

H.R. 7671. June 26, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Terminates the export controls imposed by the President on U.S. agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union.

H.R. 7672. June 26, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963 to exempt labor unions from coverage as farm labor contractors.

Grants a limited exemption from registration requirements to specified farms, processors, canneries, gins, packing sheds, and nurseries, and their employees.

Exempts from such coverage specified family farmers, processors, canners, ginnerys, packing shed operators, and nurserymen, and their employees.

Revises certain requirements of disclosure of information to workers by farm labor contractors.

H.R. 7673. June 26, 1980. Rules. Establishes a citizens oversight panel to accept complaints filed against Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives and, when appropriate, to direct the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to conduct a formal investigation of any such complaint.

H.R. 7674. June 26, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service; Government Operations. Revises the authority for appointment and compensation of experts and consultants. Provides statutory guidelines concerning the award of contracts for the procurement of goods and services from consultants and contractors.

H.R. 7675. June 26, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Directs the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases to conduct studies to determine the safety and efficacy under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of dimethyl sulfoxide as a topical analgesic. Provides that, if the drug is so determined to be safe and effective, new drug applications may be approved under such Act based on the evidence submitted by the Institute.

H.R. 7676. June 26, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Amends the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the National Housing Act, and the Federal Credit Union Act to provide insurance for the full amount of public funds deposited in insured banks, thrift institutions, and credit unions. Repeals the restriction on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's authority to limit the aggregate amount of funds that may be deposited in insured banks.

H.R. 7677. June 26, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Provides for the regulation of motor carriers of passengers.

H.R. 7678. June 26, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow an income tax credit for the purchase of a new highway vehicle.

H.R. 7679. June 26, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow married individuals filing jointly an income tax deduction from gross income to offset the effect known as the "marriage penalty" under the income tax rates.

H.R. 7680. June 26, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Public Health Service Act to establish a program

of grants to financially distressed hospitals serving the medically indigent.

Establishes a National Advisory Council on Hospital Financing Stabilization and Reorganization.

H.R. 7681. June 26, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends title II (Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance) of the Social Security Act to make homemakers eligible for OASDI benefits.

H.R. 7682. June 26, 1980. Armed Services. Revises procedures for the Armed Forces with respect to ordering Reserves to active duty.

H.R. 7683. June 26, 1980. Judiciary. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a specified sum to two named individuals in full satisfaction of a claim against the United States.

H.R. 7684. June 26, 1980. Judiciary. Directs that the military service of a named individual shall be credited in determining the amount of survivor annuity payments due his survivor.

Directs the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to make a lump sum payment to a named individual for the amount of specified survivor annuity payments.

H.R. 7685. June 27, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to postpone for one month (from July 1, 1980, to August 1, 1980) the date on which the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation must pay benefits under terminated multiemployer plans.

H.R. 7686. June 27, 1980. Judiciary. Amends current law creating a Federal cause of action for the violation of a person's civil rights under color of State law to limit the availability of such action to the deprivation of constitutional rights and civil rights and equal protection laws.

H.R. 7687. June 27, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Provides that no increase in pay for Members of Congress and certain other Federal officials may take effect unless the Federal budget is in balance.

H.R. 7688. June 27, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide homeowners with an income tax credit for the construction of residences which incorporate a passive solar energy system.

H.R. 7689. June 27, 1980. Science and Technology. Amends the Presidential Science and Technology Advisory Organization Act of 1976 and the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to provide additional information to the Congress to provide a basis for implementing multiyear research and development authorizations.

H.R. 7690. June 27, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide homeowners with an income tax credit for the construction of residences which incorporate a passive solar energy system.

H.R. 7691. June 27, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to extend the period (rollover period) during which a taxpayer must reinvest the proceeds from the sale of a principal residence if a new residence in order to qualify for the non-recognition of any gain from such sale.

H.R. 7692. June 27, 1980. Judiciary. Provides for the cancellation of student visas for Iranians studying in the United States, and for their departure within 30 days.

H.R. 7693. June 27, 1980. Agriculture; Interior and Insular Affairs. Designates management of certain lands in the Sam Houston National Forest, Texas, for uses other than wilderness.

H.R. 7694. June 27, 1980. Armed Services; Post Office and Civil Service. Provides civilian career employees of the Department of Defense who are residents of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the same relative rotation rights as apply to other career employees. Authorizes the Delegates in Congress from Guam and the Virgin

Islands to have two appointments each, rather than one appointment, to each of the service academies. Authorizes the establishment of a National Guard of Guam.

H.R. 7695. June 27, 1980. Judiciary. Declares a named individual to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7696. June 30, 1980. Veterans' Affairs. Amends the Post-Vietnam Era Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1977 with respect to increased participation.

H.R. 7697. June 30, 1980. Government Operations; Ways and Means. Amends the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 to authorize appropriations for revenue sharing under such Act.

Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow individual taxpayers an income tax credit for the payment of State and local taxes, in lieu of the currently authorized income tax deduction.

H.R. 7698. June 30, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Directs the Secretary of the Interior to reconsider a specified mineral patent application and to issue a patent if it is determined that the requisite mining claim was properly filed.

H.R. 7699. July 1, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code, with respect to the penalty for failure to pay tax due to negligence or intentional disregard of rules and regulations (but without intent to defraud), to change the amount of the penalty.

H.R. 7700. July 1, 1980. Veterans' Affairs. Provides an educational assistance program for persons who enlist, reenlist, or otherwise enter the Armed Forces after December 31, 1980. Provides for the cancellation of certain educational loans in the case of individuals who perform service in the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces.

H.R. 7701. July 1, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to permit the Secretary of Education to waive certain requirements of such Act relating to matching funds for services provided under schoolwide projects to children who are not educationally deprived.

H.R. 7702. July 1, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Designates certain public lands in the State of California as wilderness.

H.R. 7703. July 1, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Revises the boundary of the Congaree Swamp National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

H.R. 7704. July 1, 1980. Ways and Means. Permits a taxpayer who is required to change his method of accounting pursuant to Revenue Ruling 80-60 (inventory valuation) and Revenue Procedure 80-5 to effect such a change only for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1979.

H.R. 7705. July 1, 1980. Judiciary. Grants a Federal charter to the Former Members of Congress.

H.R. 7706. July 1, 1980. Judiciary. Amends the Federal Claims Collection Act of 1966 to permit agencies to contract with commercial claims collection services for the collection of claims of the United States.

H.R. 7707. July 1, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to extend certain provisions of the Price-Anderson Act with respect to excess energy costs incurred following the closure of a nuclear powerplant due to a nuclear incident.

H.R. 7708. July 1, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends title II (Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance) of the Social Security Act to provide that surviving divorced wives, as well as widows, may marry after attaining age 60 without affecting their entitlement to widow's insurance benefits.

H.R. 7709. July 1, 1980. Ways and Means.

Amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States to increase the quantity of cigarettes which may be entered duty-free by U.S. residents, for their personal use, returning from specified insular possessions.

H.R. 7710. July 1, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Restricts the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services with respect to the regulation of vitamin and mineral products for over-the-counter use.

H.R. 7711. July 1, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the American River in the State of California as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

H.R. 7712. July 1, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to the effect of such Act on certain State laws regulating insurance.

H.R. 7713. July 1, 1980. Government Operations; House Administration; Post Office and Civil Service; Judiciary. Directs the Administrator of General Services to submit to Congress a prospectus for establishing a central presidential library to replace new presidential archival depositories.

Increases the annual allowance to which the spouse of a former President is entitled.

Sets forth the official expenses which the Administrator may provide to former Presidents.

Revises the length of time during which the United States Secret Service is authorized to protect a former President, a former Vice President, and the spouse, widow, widower, or child of a former President.

H.R. 7714. July 1, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Requires the Director of the International Communication Agency to make available a copy of the film "The President's Country" for distribution within the United States.

H.R. 7715. July 1, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from the gross estate of an individual the value of an annuity under a State-defined benefit plan for judges or their beneficiaries. Exempts from the gift tax the election of an option to designate a beneficiary of a plan.

H.R. 7716. July 1, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends title II (Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance) of the Social Security Act to impose limitations with respect to the benefits otherwise payable to convicted felons under such title.

H.R. 7717. July 1, 1980. Science and Technology. Establishes a national program of ground water environmental research.

H.R. 7718. July 1, 1980. Judiciary. Amends the Federal criminal code to establish criminal penalties for whoever robs or attempts to rob any controlled substance.

H.R. 7719. July 1, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to limit the authority of local educational agencies to use Federal funds received under specified provisions of such Act for construction of a school facility to cases in which no reusable closed public school facility is within three miles of the proposed school facility.

H.R. 7720. July 1, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs; Judiciary. Confers jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear all claims which the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma may have with respect to loss of mineral interests.

H.R. 7721. July 1, 1980. Judiciary. Declares a named individual to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7722. July 1, 1980. Judiciary. Declares four named individuals to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7723. July 1, 1980. Judiciary. Declares

three named individuals to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7724. July 2, 1980. Appropriations. Makes appropriations for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service within the Department of Agriculture, specified programs within the Department of Energy, Indian programs within the Departments of Health and Human Services and Education, and related Federal agencies.

H.R. 7725. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to exempt independent producer oil and royalty owner oil from the windfall profit tax.

H.R. 7726. July 2, 1980. Armed Services. Reduces from 60 to 55 the age at which a member of the Armed Forces may retire for non-regular service. Provides that the retired pay of such a member retiring before the age of 60 shall be reduced in a manner determined by the Secretary of Defense.

H.R. 7727. July 2, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the eligibility of members of the military Reserves and of the National Guard for basic educational opportunity grants by \$500.

H.R. 7728. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow an employer an income tax credit for payment of compensation to an employee for periods during which such employee participates in armed forces summer camp training.

H.R. 7729. July 2, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Amends the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide that any sums not yet deposited into the War Claims Fund be deposited into miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury. Reserves a specified portion of such funds to be used for an ex gratia payment to Switzerland.

H.R. 7730. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to reduce individual income tax rates. Provides for cost of living adjustments to individual income tax brackets and the personal income tax exemption amount. Increases the minimum income levels at which a taxpayer is required to file an income tax return.

H.R. 7731. July 2, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Terminates the export controls imposed by the President on agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union.

H.R. 7732. July 2, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs; Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Establishes a revised process for decisionmaking in regard to significant non-nuclear energy facilities.

H.R. 7733. July 2, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study whether there may be a relationship between exposure of members of the Armed Forces of the United States to nuclear radiation in Hiroshima and Nagasaki immediately after World War II and various symptoms currently exhibited by such members.

H.R. 7734. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate the requirement that States reduce the amount of unemployment compensation payable for any week to an eligible individual by the amount of certain retirement benefits received by such individual.

H.R. 7735. July 2, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Amends the Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act of 1980 to restrict State limitations on interest or other charges with regard to the extension of consumer credit. Permits creditors to impose transaction fees and access fees pursuant to open-end credit plans.

H.R. 7736. July 2, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Foreign Affairs; Judiciary. Seeks to promote export trading companies. Permits banking organizations to invest in such companies. Authorizes the Export-Import Bank to provide loan guarantees to

such companies. Amends the Webb-Pomerene Act to exempt such companies and export trade associations from antitrust restrictions. Directs the Secretary of Commerce to establish an office to promote export trade associations within the Department.

H.R. 7737. July 2, 1980. Government Operations. Limits the amount of land which may be owned by the Federal Government.

H.R. 7738. July 2, 1980. Government Operations. Requires each executive agency and independent agency to reduce Federal paper-work costs relating to small business by 33 percent over a three year period.

H.R. 7739. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to: (1) reduce corporate income tax rates; (2) make permanent the tax exclusion for interest and dividends; (3) increase the investment tax credit for used business property; (4) allow a tax credit for cash investments in small business concerns; (5) provide for the nonrecognition of gain from the sale of a small business which is reinvested in replacement property; (6) reduce individual capital gains tax rates for small business investments; and (7) permit an estate tax exclusion for the value of certain small business property.

H.R. 7740. July 2, 1980. Judiciary. Amends the Federal criminal code to establish criminal penalties for whoever certain power transmission lines or facilities in which the United States has a security interest.

Provides criminal penalties for the malicious destruction or interference with the operation of certain energy facilities.

H.R. 7741. July 2, 1980. Judiciary. Requires Federal agencies to: (1) invite, accept, and consider alternative approaches to a proposed rule which would achieve the objectives of such rule at a lower cost to small businesses and organizations; (2) publish those proposals with a justification of the selection of the final rule; and (3) publish a plan for reviewing their rules to determine whether they are efficiently achieving legislative goals.

H.R. 7742. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to double the amount of the income tax exclusion for interest and dividend income and to increase the amount of such exclusion to \$3,000 for taxpayers age 65 or older. Permits taxpayers to receive a refundable income tax credit in lieu of the tax exclusion for interest and dividend income. Makes such tax exclusion permanent.

H.R. 7743. July 2, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Authorizes the Corps of Engineers in performing certain emergency repairs and restoration of flood control works to make improvements which provide a higher level of flood protection.

H.R. 7744. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means; Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends title XVIII (Medicare) of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under part B of the Medicare program for supplies and services furnished by hospitals to individuals who have been determined to be terminally ill.

H.R. 7745. July 2, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Black Lung Benefits Act to provide that certain amounts available for disbursements under such Act shall be available for payment of benefits and reimbursements in the case of miners whose last coal mine employment occurred before July 1, 1973.

H.R. 7746. July 2, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Makes certain technical amendments to the Mineral Lands Leasing Act.

H.R. 7747. July 2, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Judiciary. Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the unauthorized interception and use of subscription telecommunications. Protects the privacy of the users of such telecommunications.

H.R. 7748. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means.

Amends title II (Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance) of the Social Security Act to suspend the payment of old age or disability insurance benefits to any individual who is confined in a penal institution or correctional facility. Provides for the payment of such benefits to the individual's dependents or to such institution or facility, if specified conditions are met.

H.R. 7749. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to: (1) increase the unified credit against the estate and gift taxes; and (2) increase the gift tax exclusion.

H.R. 7750. July 2, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make it unlawful, with a specified exception, for a foreign corporation to acquire U.S. securities if the country of such corporation places greater restrictions on the acquisition of securities in such country by U.S. corporations.

H.R. 7751. July 2, 1980. Education and Labor. Makes it the continuing duty of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to compile and publish the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Requires that no changes be made in the factors used in the formation of the CPI or any similar index, except as authorized by law, if such changes would reduce the amount of the cost of living increases provided by specified Federal retirement programs.

H.R. 7752. July 2, 1980. Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Amends the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the vacancies at the Merchant Marine Academy, currently allocated to the Canal Zone, to be filled by nominees of the Panama Canal Commission from among the children of residents of those areas in Panama made available to the United States pursuant to the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and children of U.S. Government personnel residing in Panama. Makes daughters, as well as sons, eligible for nomination.

H.R. 7753. July 2, 1980. House Administration. Establishes five regional presidential primary election districts for electing delegates to the national nominating conventions. Directs the Federal Election Commission to assist the participating States in conducting such regional primaries.

H.R. 7754. July 2, 1980. Judiciary; Rules. Prohibits a Federal agency rule from becoming effective if a committee of either House of Congress reports a resolution disapproving the rule and that House does not reject the resolution within a specified period.

H.R. 7755. July 2, 1980. Agriculture. Establishes a program to direct financial and technical assistance to those geographic areas of the United States which have severe and chronic soil erosion, soil erosion related, or irrigation water management problems.

H.R. 7756. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to: (1) allow an income tax credit to employees and self-employed individuals for the payment of social security taxes; (2) reduce income tax rates on corporate income; (3) provide for accelerated depreciation for businesses in economically depressed area; and (4) allow corporations and individuals an income tax credit for compliance with voluntary wage and price guidelines.

H.R. 7757. July 2, 1980. Agriculture. Provides grants to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee Institute, in the purchase of equipment and land, and the planning, construction, alteration, or renovation of buildings with respect to increasing their capacity to conduct food and agricultural research.

H.R. 7758. July 2, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Makes technical changes in specified provisions of the Public Health Service Act and other Federal law regarding health planning.

H.R. 7759. July 2, 1980. Interstate and Foreign

Commerce. Amends the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to authorize certain appropriations for energy conservation programs for schools and hospitals and buildings owned by units of local government and public care institutions.

H.R. 7760. July 2, 1980. Government Operations. Provides for the adjustment of geographic boundaries of standard metropolitan statistical areas for the purpose of Federal assistance programs.

H.R. 7761. July 2, 1980. Judiciary. Authorizes the Secretary of the Army to pay the claims of a named individual arising out of an automobile accident involving a military vehicle.

H.R. 7762. July 2, 1980. Judiciary. Declares two named individuals to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7763. July 2, 1980. Judiciary. Declares a named individual to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7764. July 2, 1980. Judiciary. Declares three named individuals to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 7765. July 21, 1980. Budget. Provides for revenue reconciliation as provided by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

H.R. 7766. July 21, 1980. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to extend for one year the provision providing refunds of Federal motor fuels taxes imposed on fuels used in certain taxicabs.

H.R. 7767. July 21, 1980. Veterans' Affairs. Allows veterans with service-connected disabilities who are eligible for military retired pay for non-regular service to receive compensation for such disabilities from the Veterans' Administration and to receive such retired pay without reduction to either such compensation or such retired pay.

H.R. 7768. July 21, 1980. Education and Labor. Amends the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to prohibit the issuance of a citation by the Secretary of Labor after the initial inspection of any coal mine or other mine.

H.R. 7769. July 21, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to prohibit the issuance of any notice of violation by the Secretary of the Interior after the initial inspection of a surface coal mining and reclamation operation.

H.R. 7770. July 21, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Designates the Environmental Research Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, the Andrew W. Breidenbach Environmental Research Center.

H.J. Res. 557. May 28, 1980. Judiciary. Constitutional Amendment—Allows the enactment of certain laws by popular vote.

H.J. Res. 558. May 28, 1980. House Administration. Reappoints a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.J. Res. 559. May 28, 1980. House Administration. Reappoints a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.J. Res. 560. May 29, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Designates March 19, 1981, as "National Agriculture Day."

H.J. Res. 561. May 29, 1980. Judiciary. Constitutional Amendment—Prohibits any person who has been convicted of a felony from being a Representative or Senator.

H.J. Res. 562. June 3, 1980. Ways and Means. Extends the temporary increase of the public debt limit.

Disapproves the President's imposition of import fees on petroleum and petroleum products.

H.J. Res. 563. June 5, 1980. Judiciary.

Constitutional Amendment—Prohibits deficit spending and increases in the national debt. Sets forth a schedule for repayment of the national debt.

H.J. Res. 564. June 9, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Extends the congratulations of the Congress to the Order of the Sons of Italy in America for their 75th anniversary. Proclaims Sunday, June 22, 1980, as "National Italian-American Day."

H.J. Res. 565. June 10, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Requests the President to designate June 1 through June 6, 1981, as "National Management Week."

H.J. Res. 566. June 10, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Withdraws the United States from the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and related agreements.

H.J. Res. 567. June 11, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Provides for the designation of the first week in May of each year as "Be Kind to Animals Week."

H.J. Res. 568. June 12, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Authorizes and requests the President to issue a proclamation designating October 12 through October 19, 1980, as "Italian-American Heritage Week."

H.J. Res. 569. June 13, 1980. Amends the Second Liberty Bond Act to temporarily increase the public debt limit.

H.J. Res. 570. June 13, 1980. Amends the Second Liberty Bond Act to temporarily increase the public debt limit.

H.J. Res. 571. June 13, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Disapproves the rationing contingency plan transmitted to the Congress on June 12, 1980.

H.J. Res. 572. June 13, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Extends the congratulations of the Congress to the men and women of the United States who have made the space programs possible.

Directs the President to designate the period of July 13 through July 20, 1980, as "Space Week 80."

H.J. Res. 573. June 16, 1980. Interior and Insular Affairs; Agriculture; Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Provides for the removal of certain restrictions relating to the leasing of energy resources on public lands, the Outer Continental Shelf, and other lands that contain certain resources under the control of the Federal Government.

H.J. Res. 574. June 17, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Disapproves the rationing contingency plan transmitted to the Congress on June 12, 1980.

H.J. Res. 575. June 19, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Disapproves the rationing contingency plan transmitted to Congress.

H.J. Res. 576. June 19, 1980. Judiciary. Constitutional Amendment—States that the right to life is vested in each human being from the moment of fertilization.

H.J. Res. 577. June 25, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Disapproves the rationing contingency plan transmitted to Congress.

H.J. Res. 578. June 26, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Proclaims June 4, 1981, as "Jack Jouett Day."

H.J. Res. 579. June 26, 1980. House Administration. Establishes the Commission on Presidential Nominations to make an investigation regarding the presidential nominating process. Directs the Commission to report to the President and the Congress respecting such investigation, including recommendations for the 1984 presidential elections.

H.J. Res. 580. June 30, 1980. Ways and Means. Directs the President to negotiate with Japan for a voluntary agreement to temporarily restrict imports of Japanese automobiles and trucks.

H.J. Res. 581. July 1, 1980. Judiciary. Constitutional Amendment—Provides that Representatives in Congress be apportioned on the basis of the number of U.S. citizens in each State.

H.J. Res. 582. July 1, 1980. Judiciary. Constitutional Amendment—Provides for single six-year terms for the President and Vice President. Repeals the 22d article of amendment to the Constitution.

H.J. Res. 583. July 2, 1980. Appropriations. Increases the limitation on program activity authorized for the Export-Import Bank with specified restrictions.

H.J. Res. 584. July 2, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Provides for the commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Philip Mazzei.

H.J. Res. 585. July 2, 1980. Judiciary. Constitutional Amendment—Provides for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

H.J. Res. 586. July 2, 1980. Appropriations. Increases the limitation on program activity authorized for the Export-Import Bank with specified restrictions.

H.J. Res. 587. July 22, 1980. Appropriations. Provides additional program authority for the Export-Import Bank.

H. Con. Res. 347. May 28, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Expresses congressional support for the President's proposals on improving the United Nations' peacekeeping capabilities.

H. Con. Res. 348. May 30, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should seek the cooperation of Cyprus and Turkey in resuming negotiations to resolve the Cyprus problem.

H. Con. Res. 349. May 30, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Expresses the sense of the Congress that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate should make every effort to develop legislative proposals which maintain the cost-of-living adjustment for Federal retirees.

H. Con. Res. 350. May 30, 1980. Ways and Means. Declares that it is the sense of the Congress that the enactment of a withholding tax on interest and dividend payments would be detrimental to the economic well-being of the United States.

H. Con. Res. 351. June 3, 1980. Ways and Means. Expresses the sense of the Congress that social security benefits are and should remain exempt from Federal taxation.

H. Con. Res. 352. June 4, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should direct the U.S. representative to the United Nations to propose the establishment of a Special Committee to seek advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice regarding questions of international law submitted by national courts.

H. Con. Res. 353. June 4, 1980. Judiciary. Calls upon the President to designate as refugees those Cubans who have arrived in the United States in the last 60 days so that State and local governments currently responsible for them can qualify for Federal assistance.

H. Con. Res. 354. June 4, 1980. Judiciary. Urges the President to expel those Cuban immigrants who have participated in rioting and other civil disturbances at various processing centers.

H. Con. Res. 355. June 4, 1980. Judiciary. Urges the President to immediately order the expulsion from this country of those Cuban immigrants who have participated in rioting and other civil disturbances at various processing centers.

H. Con. Res. 356. June 5, 1980. Judiciary. Urges the President to expel those Cuban immigrants who have participated in rioting and other civil disturbances at various processing centers.

H. Con. Res. 357. June 5, 1980. Judiciary. Urges the President to expel those Cuban immigrants who have participated in rioting and other civil disturbances at various processing centers.

H. Con. Res. 358. June 5, 1980. Education and Labor; Judiciary. Expresses the sense of the Congress that the Constitution of the United States does not preclude periods of silence (for private prayer, meditation, contemplation, or introspection) in the public schools to be used at the discretion of individual students, even if such periods are supervised by a school official.

H. Con. Res. 359. June 10, 1980. Makes corrections in the enrollment of S. 562.

H. Con. Res. 360. June 10, 1980. House Administration. Directs the additional printing of copies of the report accompanying H.R. 7235 (H. Rept. No. 96-1035, economic regulation of railroads).

H. Con. Res. 361. June 11, 1980. Armed Services; Post Office and Civil Service. Expresses the sense of Congress that the provisions of law requiring biennial cost of living adjustments for Federal civil service and military retirees should not be changed.

H. Con. Res. 362. June 11, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Urges the President to secure greater international cooperation with respect to the large number of Cubans fleeing Cuba. Expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should seek the discussion of such situation in an appropriate international forum.

H. Con. Res. 363. June 11, 1980. Foreign Affairs; Ways and Means. Urges the President to negotiate with Japan concerning foreign trade matters.

H. Con. Res. 364. June 13, 1980. Ways and Means. Expresses the sense of Congress that the imposition of any withholding tax on interest and dividend payments would be detrimental to the American economy.

H. Con. Res. 365. June 17, 1980. Armed Services; Post Office and Civil Service. Expresses the sense of Congress that any reconciliation bill or resolution which reduces public service subsidies to the Postal Service or eliminates the biannual cost-of-living adjustments for retired Federal or military personnel would contradict established Federal policy and should be defeated.

H. Con. Res. 366. June 19, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Education and Labor; Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Ways and Means. Promotes the competitiveness of U.S. industry in the world automobile and truck industry.

H. Con. Res. 367. June 19, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Disapproves the proposed export of low-enriched uranium to India.

H. Con. Res. 368. June 19, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Disapproves the proposed export of low-enriched uranium to India.

H. Con. Res. 369. June 19, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Disapproves the proposed export of low-enriched uranium and replacement parts to India.

H. Con. Res. 370. June 19, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Education and Labor; Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Ways and Means. Promotes the competitiveness of U.S. industry in the world automobile and truck industry.

H. Con. Res. 371. June 19, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Recognizes the period of August 9 through August 21, 1980, as a time of commemoration of the tricentennial of the Pueblo revolt of 1680.

H. Con. Res. 372. June 23, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Disapproves the proposed export of low-enriched uranium to India.

H. Con. Res. 373. June 24, 1980. Judiciary. Expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States not admit more than 650,000 immigrants, including refugees, in fiscal year 1980, and that the President shall submit to the Congress an annual U.S. immigration goal.

H. Con. Res. 374. June 24, 1980. Armed Services; Post Office and Civil Service. Expresses the sense of Congress that reconciliation instructions directing various congres-

sional committees to achieve legislative savings shall not apply to semiannual cost-of-living adjustments for civil service and military retirees.

H. Con. Res. 375. June 25, 1980. Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Expresses the sense of the Congress that the Director of the Mint should consider implementing measures to alleviate the penny shortage.

H. Con. Res. 376. June 25, 1980. Ways and Means. Expresses the sense of Congress that the present level of the trade deficit with Japan is intolerable and threatens the future of trade between our nations. Urges Japan to cooperate in correcting such deficit.

H. Con. Res. 377. June 30, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Expresses the sense of the Congress that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate should make every effort to develop legislative proposals which maintain the cost-of-living adjustment for Federal retirees.

H. Con. Res. 378. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means. Expresses the sense of the Congress not to impose additional Federal income tax withholding on interest and dividends.

H. Con. Res. 379. July 2, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Expresses the sense of the Congress that the Postmaster General should issue a postage stamp in honor of the American hostages in Iran.

H. Con. Res. 380. July 2, 1980. Ways and Means. Urges the President to negotiate with Japan to obtain a commitment from Japanese automobile manufacturers to increase U.S. production of automobiles in proportion to increases in U.S. sales in return for open access to the U.S. auto market.

H. Con. Res. 381. July 2, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Expresses the sense of the Congress that the President bring before the United Nations Security Council the probable violation of the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972 by the Soviet Union (the Sverdlovsk incident).

Calls upon the President to report, with any recommendations, to Congress concerning the status and capabilities of U.S. defenses against biological weapons.

H. Con. Res. 382. July 2, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Expresses the sense of the Congress that U.S. foreign policy should reflect a national strategy of peace through strength with specified principles and goals.

H. Con. Res. 383. July 21, 1980. Ways and Means. Disapproves the determination of the President not to provide import relief for the leather wearing apparel industry.

H. Con. Res. 384. July 22, 1980. Ways and Means. States the intent of the Congress that social security benefits payable to prison inmates be surrendered to defray the current costs to the taxpayer of supporting prisoners in penal institutions as well as supporting their dependents on public assistance.

H. Res. 683. May 29, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7098.

H. Res. 684. May 29, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7113.

H. Res. 685. May 29, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7115.

H. Res. 686. May 29, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7152.

H. Res. 687. May 29, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7265.

H. Res. 688. May 29, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.J. Res. 554.

H. Res. 689. May 29, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that it offer its congratulations to Americans who participated in the second Olympic Winter Games for the Physically Disabled in Gieo, Norway, and to the organizations who helped to promote the event.

H. Res. 690. May 29, 1980. Foreign Affairs.

Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives regarding U.S. assistance to Yugoslavia to maintain its independence.

H. Res. 691. May 30, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7428.

H. Res. 692. June 3, 1980. Rules. Amends the rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit Members from authorizing any other individual or any other Member to cast their votes or record their presence in the House or Committee of the Whole.

H. Res. 693. June 3, 1980. Judiciary. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the Standing Committee on Federal Judiciary of the American Bar Association and the Attorney General take all measures necessary to end discrimination against potential lifetime Federal judges who do not qualify solely as a result of age barriers.

H. Res. 694. June 3, 1980. House Administration. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that if no candidate for the Presidency receives a majority of electoral votes in December, 1980, the Members should choose as the President the candidate having the greatest number of popular votes in the November 1980 election.

H. Res. 695. June 4, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 6790.

H. Res. 696. June 4, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7301.

H. Res. 697. June 4, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.J. Res. 531.

H. Res. 698. June 4, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Extends the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the Order of the Sons of Italy in America for their 75th anniversary.

H. Res. 699. June 10, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 6783.

H. Res. 700. June 10, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 5164.

H. Res. 701. June 10, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 6979.

H. Res. 702. June 10, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 6711.

H. Res. 703. June 10, 1980. Public Works and Transportation. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that neither the Secretary of Transportation nor the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall promulgate any regulations or take any actions which would result in a reduction of public air service into Washington National Airport.

H. Res. 704. June 10, 1980. Judiciary. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the President instruct the Attorney General to prosecute all persons who violate the Logan Act and the executive order prohibiting travel to Iran, thereby giving color of right to illegal actions by the Government of Iran.

H. Res. 705. June 11, 1980. Judiciary. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the vandalism of patriotic monuments should be prosecuted and those convicted of such offense punished to the fullest extent of the law.

H. Res. 706. June 12, 1980. Ways and Means. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be no expansion of the Federal income tax withholding on interest and dividends.

H. Res. 707. June 13, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7542.

H. Res. 708. June 16, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Reaffirms U.S. support for human rights in Taiwan. Calls on Taiwan to relax restrictions on freedom of expression and to return to democratic development. Urges a spirit of reconciliation in connection with the Kaohsiung incident.

H. Res. 709. June 16, 1980. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should convene a White House Conference on Energy Conservation.

H. Res. 710. June 17, 1980. Rules. Amends the Rules of the House of Representatives to require information on House votes by Members of Congress in their postal patron newsletters.

H. Res. 711. June 17, 1980. Rules. Amends Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that committee and subcommittee ratios reflect, to the closest degree possible, the party ratio in the House as a whole.

H. Res. 712. June 18, 1980. Elects specified Members to the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H. Res. 713. June 18, 1980. Elects a named Member to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. Res. 714. June 18, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 6418.

H. Res. 715. June 18, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7584.

H. Res. 716. June 18, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7235.

H. Res. 717. June 18, 1980. Appropriations. Disapproves a specified portion of the proposed deferral of budget authority (D80-65) for Environmental Protection Agency grants for waste treatment works.

H. Res. 718. June 19, 1980. Provides for a procedure to concur in the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 521.

H. Res. 719. June 19, 1980. Waives certain points of order against the bill H.R. 7590.

H. Res. 720. June 19, 1980. Waives certain points of order against the bill H.R. 7592.

H. Res. 721. June 19, 1980. Waives certain points of order against the bill H.R. 7593.

H. Res. 722. June 20, 1980. Provides a procedure for response to subpoenas by Members, officers, or employees of the House of Representatives.

H. Res. 723. June 20, 1980. Provides further procedures during the consideration of H. Res. 722.

H. Res. 724. June 24, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 6811.

H. Res. 725. June 24, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7051.

H. Res. 726. June 24, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 7244.

H. Res. 727. June 24, 1980. Waives certain points of order against the bill H.R. 7631.

H. Res. 728. June 24, 1980. Provides additional debate time and waives certain points of order against the conference report on S. 932.

H. Res. 729. June 25, 1980. Education and Labor. Calls upon the President to declare a national emergency for the purpose of suspending the Davis-Bacon Act.

H. Res. 730. June 25, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Extends the congratulations of the House of Representatives to Wayland Academy of Beaver Dam, Wisconsin, on 125 years of achievement in education.

H. Res. 731. June 26, 1980. Waives certain points of order against the conference report on S. 1308.

H. Res. 732. June 26, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 6704.

H. Res. 733. June 26, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 6386.

H. Res. 734. June 26, 1980. Sets forth the rule for the consideration of H.R. 6667.

H. Res. 735. June 26, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Deplores the politicization of the Mid-Decade Women's Conference. Urges the U.S. delegation to oppose any politically motivated resolutions at the Conference.

H. Res. 736. June 26, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that international congressional fellowships for foreign nationals constitute a valuable resource for the Congress.

H. Res. 737. July 1, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Deplores Soviet violations with respect to Afghanistan. Calls for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

H. Res. 738. July 1, 1980. Foreign Affairs. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the U.S. delegation to the Copenhagen Conference on the United Nations Decade for Women should sign the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women and oppose any resolutions which do not relate directly to the goals of the Conference.

H. Res. 739. July 2, 1980. Elects certain named Representatives to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 740. July 2, 1980. Post Office and Civil Service. Commends Dr. M. Stanley Liv-

ingston upon the 50th anniversary of his original work in the field of cyclic acceleration.

H. Res. 741. July 2, 1980. Judiciary. Refers to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims a bill for the relief of two named individuals.

H. Res. 742. July 2, 1980. Judiciary. Refers to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims a bill for the relief of two named individuals.

H. Res. 743. July 21, 1980. Provides that the Speaker of the House certify the Report of the Committee on Standards of Official

Conduct with respect to the proceedings against a named U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia.

H. Res. 744. July 21, 1980. Education and Labor. Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain aspects of the model adoption legislation and procedures which the Secretary of Health and Human Services is required to issue under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978.

H. Res. 745. July 22, 1980. Foreign Affairs; Judiciary. Calls for an investigation into the activities of a named individual.