

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 28, 1979

The House met at 3 p.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, B.D., offered the following prayer:

When a man's ways please the Lord, he makes even his enemies to be at peace with him.—Proverbs 16: 7.

Gracious Father, we ask Your guidance upon the people of our Nation. Give us the assurance that when we hear Your still small voice and faithfully do Your will, we will know the power of Your presence in our daily lives. May we not believe that only our intellect or talent or activity can bring about the spirit of trust between nations and peoples, but that we, in these quiet moments of prayer, can be strengthened by that heavenly peace that passes all human understanding.

We pray in His holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 2534. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2439) entitled "An act to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (H. Doc. 96-46), transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974."

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO CUT CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING COSTS

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I trust that all of my colleagues will agree that the first place to cut spending is by eliminating Government waste. We can make significant savings by cutting "frills" that serve no meaningful Government function.

Congressional printing and binding costs are expected to increase to \$76,212,000 in fiscal year 1980. Today, I am introducing three bills and a resolution to allow us to cut those costs below fiscal year 1979 levels.

The resolution would require that

statements and related materials printed in the Record be relevant to Government. With the cost of printing a page of the Record approaching \$400, I think we owe it to our constituents to stop being so nice with our words and instead treat their tax dollars more kindly. The Record should be a forum for policy issues, not niceties.

My bills would: First, eliminate authority for publishing in bound volumes copies of memorial tributes—already printed in the Record—in honor of deceased Members of Congress; second, strike authority for the Public Printer to, upon request, put expensive, hand-done bindings on Government publications for Members of Congress; and third, repeal statutory authority for preparing nearly 2,000 bound editions of the Record and for printing over 5,000 copies of the daily editions. The cuts would not eliminate needed copies of the Record for immediate or research use.

Jointly, these proposals would save over \$3 million each year. I would welcome the support and cosponsorship of every Member of this body.

CANCELLATION OF B-1 BOMBER PRODUCTION VIEWED AS A MISTAKE

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

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Secretary of the Air Force, John Stetson, invited me to fly a mission yesterday in the B-1 bomber to observe firsthand the capabilities of this remarkable weapons system.

This flight leaves me even more strongly convinced than ever that President Carter's 1977 decision to cancel B-1 production was a bad and potentially tragic mistake.

The Soviet Union appreciates fully the value of modern bombers and for some time has had in series production the bomber designated "Backfire," which is essentially the equivalent of the B-1. As if this were not enough, the Soviets are pushing ahead with development of two yet more advanced bombing aircraft.

Acting in apparently belated recognition of the important role modern bombers can play in strategic warfare the administration this year has come to our Committee on Armed Services to request authorization for an advanced strategic bomber study.

Our potential enemies will not be vulnerable to studies, so I maintain that our country's need is not for further studies but rather for production of the capable and badly needed B-1 bomber.

THREATS FROM YASSER ARAFAT

(Mr. SKELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, the recent outbursts of Yasser Arafat, the leader of the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization, comes in the form of threats in the wake of the Israel-Egypt Treaty, and our President's role in bringing this accomplishment about.

Mr. Speaker, Arafat stated, "Hit the head of the snake, the United States." He called for using "the oil weapon" against our country, and he called to cut off the hand of our President, President Carter.

This irresponsible talk is disgusting, and I know that each American resents this kind of action. It is somewhat ironic, however, that Mr. Arafat refers to America as a snake whose head he would sever. If he knew our history better, he might recall that one of our earliest revolutionary flags had the figure of a rattlesnake on it with the words, "Don't tread on me."

□ 1515

REPORT ON THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR FACILITY

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues in the House would like to be informed on the status of the situation at the Three Mile Island nuclear facility, located 10 miles south of Harrisburg, Pa., which has been a lead story in all the news today.

According to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Three Mile Island Nuclear Plant No. 2 shut down at 4 a.m. as a result of the loss of primary coolant, precisely why is not known at this time. At 7 a.m. an onsite emergency was declared by the Metropolitan Edison Co., which operates the plant, and according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission the plant was brought into a controlled condition at 11 a.m. and the plant is being cooled.

High levels of radiation have been detected inside the containment area, with confirmed reports of radiation leakage both on and off the nuclear plant site. Fortunately, the levels of radiation reportedly detected are considered only slightly above the minimum detectable levels.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has dispatched a six member team to the site, made up of operations and environmental experts to survey the situation. In addition, there is a radiological assistance team on standby at Brookhaven.

Fortunately, there has been no reports of personnel injuries as a result of what one Nuclear Regulatory Commission official calls, the worst accident at a commercial nuclear plant in the history of commercial operation of nuclear powerplants.

Possible overexposure to radiation of personnel at the plant at the time of the

□ 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.

accident is not considered to be a problem at this time.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2534 PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT IN- CREASE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2534) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 5. Congress shall balance the Federal budget. Pursuant to this mandate, the Budget Committees shall report, by April 15, 1979, a fiscal year budget for 1981 that shall be in balance, and also a fiscal year budget for 1982 that shall be in balance, and by April 15, 1980, a fiscal year budget for 1981 that shall be in balance, and by April 15, 1981, a fiscal year budget for 1982 that shall be in balance; and the Budget Committees shall show the consequences of each budget on each budget function and on the economy, setting forth the effects on revenues, spending, employment, inflation, and national security.

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 6. (a) If a budget which is transmitted by the President to the Congress under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, would, if adopted, result in a deficit in fiscal year 1981 or in fiscal year 1982, the President shall also transmit alternate budget proposals which, if adopted, would not result in a deficit.

(b) Such alternate budget proposals shall be transmitted with the budget and, except as provided in subsection (c), shall be in such detail as the President determines necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(c) Alternate budget proposals for a fiscal year transmitted under subsection (a) shall include a clear and understandable explanation of specific differences between the budget and alternate budget proposals.

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am somewhat disappointed in the Senate amendments to the debt limit resolution. I had been in hopes that the other body would send back to the House a clear proposal for a balanced budget at a time certain. As a matter of fact, the other body did have a chance to do that if it had adopted an amendment which was presented by the senior Senator from Kansas, which would have had the effect of providing that there would be no further increases in the debt limit until the first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1980, was reported, and that either that resolution would call for a balanced budget or the resolution would be adopted by a three-fifths vote of both Houses.

□ 1520

Mr. Speaker, I think that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas is the way to go.

I must say that I am somewhat pleased by the fact that the other body has gone so far as to ask to be informed by the Committee on the Budget as to the effect that a balanced budget would have in each of these fiscal years. That is a step in the right direction, and it is progress; but it is not as much progress as can be made.

I think all of us, with very few exceptions, feel the necessity of working toward a balanced budget in a reasonable period of time. We on this side think that that reasonable period of time is when the first and second concurrent budget resolutions are adopted in the year 1980 for the fiscal year 1981. Therefore, it would be our hope, Mr. Speaker, that when I object—and I do intend to object—the majority would take this resolution to the Committee on Rules, which would bring it out with a rule which would make the Dole amendment in order. If, the rule does not so provide—we would try to defeat the previous question on the rule and amend it for the purpose of offering the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Kansas in the Senate. Then the whole matter could be rereferred to the Senate for the approval of that body or to the conference which might be requested.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me, please?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, of course.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the reason for the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Illinois truly is because of the fact that Treasury has put us on notice that if we consider this legislation today, we would have the opportunity of saving the taxpayers \$35 million.

I would like to point out, too, that with a delay, of course, there will be no savings. I would also like to point out that Senator Dole in the other body did support this modified amendment after his amendment was defeated, and I would like also to point out that the amendment to which the gentleman refers here on the floor of the House of Representatives was similar to the Dole amendment and was also defeated here.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I see no really useful purpose in delaying the consideration of this legislation. However, if the gentleman from Arizona feels that he has to object, the gentleman from Illinois has no control over that.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, of course, the gentleman from Arizona is not in the habit of trying to cost the Federal Government \$35 million or even 35 cents; but I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that if, indeed, it is possible for the House and the Senate to come up with a balanced budget in fiscal year 1980 for fiscal year 1981, the savings to the Government would be greatly in excess of the \$35 million.

I think the chance that the majority would agree with the minority that this is the way to go is a good one. I have great faith in the intelligence and in the dedication of most Members of the majority, especially in the light of their

campaign promises. I think they will agree with us tomorrow and that we will proceed to pass this resolution with the almost ironclad assurance that there will be a balanced budget by fiscal year 1981.

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

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

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minority leader for yielding and to commend him on his reservation and his intention to object.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is more than \$35 million involved here. If we are talking about \$35 million to the Treasury a day, I wonder how many 35 millions of dollars have been wasted while this matter has been over in the other body. There were several days when this matter could have been before the Senate, and it could have been back here a long time before this.

Mr. Speaker, let me just point out that the passage of the Senate amendment would bring about a very confused situation, to have the Committees on the Budget submit two separate budget resolutions, one in balance and one not in balance, to the Senate and to the House.

□ 1525

The Senator from Louisiana's amendment would probably confuse a lot of people who are for a balanced budget. I think precisely what we have here is some legislative sleight of hand on a very important matter. Seventy percent of the American people support a balanced budget. That is proven by the Gallup poll. I think this is something that deserves the attention of the House in full-scale debate, and the matter ought to go to the Committee on Rules and it should come out with a rule, as the gentleman indicated, to provide that the matter could be fully debated.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Committee on Rules will make it possible for the House to work its will on this matter, and I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 61]

Anderson, Ill.	Findley	McKay
Andrews, N.C.	Fisher	McKinney
Archer	Flood	Marks
Ashbrook	Foley	Mathis
Ashley	Frenzel	Mavroules
Beard, Tenn.	Garcia	Michel
Brooks	Gaydos	Mikva
Burton, John	Glaimo	Pepper
Burton, Phillip	Gibbons	Runnels
Carter	Goodling	Satterfield
Clay	Guarini	Scheuer
Conable	Hance	Staggers
Conyers	Hawkins	Stark
D'Amours	Hopkins	Stewart
de la Garza	Huckaby	Ullman
Diggs	Ireland	Vander Jagt
Dingell	Jones, Okla.	Vanik
Dixon	Lederer	Weaver
Drinan	McCloskey	Young, Fla.
Edgar	McDonald	
Evans, Del.	McEwen	

□ 1540

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California). On this rollcall 371 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2479, TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2479) to help maintain peace, security, and stability in the Western Pacific and to promote continued extensive, close, and friendly relations between the people of the United States and the people on Taiwan, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 24, 1979.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, clause 2(c), rule XXVIII, the reading is not required, and the unanimous-consent request is not necessary.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today on H.R. 2479, the Taiwan Relations Act, is similar in all fundamental respects to the bill as it passed the House March 13.

As Members will recall, the basic purpose of the legislation which we approved, by a vote of 345 to 55, is to establish a peace and security framework for our interests in the Western Pacific and for Taiwan and to continue our commercial and other relations with Taiwan following the President's action in switching official diplomatic recognition from the Taiwan Government to Peking.

When we went into conference with the Senate, we found that the principal objectives of their bill were rather similar to ours. While there were a number of secondary differences, the conferees were able to reconcile them in two meetings over a 24-hour period. We believe we have combined the best features of both bills. We think the resulting legislation is just as strong as the measure which the House passed, and in some respects, better. Therefore, we once again urge its passage by an overwhelming margin.

The principal features of the conference report and the resolution of differences with the Senate may be outlined as follows:

The Senate bill did not include in its title the Taiwan security objective of the legislation. The House bill listed this purpose at the start of its title. The conferees agreed to do this, and we followed this in the title with some phrases from

the Senate title. Likewise, for a short title, we use the House term "Relations" rather than "Enabling" which was in the Senate bill.

The first part of the conference report, as in the House bill, sets forth U.S. policy with regard to peace and security in the Western Pacific. The wording in essence is a melding of the provisions of the House and Senate bills which were quite similar in both bills. Members will note that any use of force against Taiwan will, under the conference report, be "of grave concern to the United States." It will be our policy to provide Taiwan with defense arms. Also, we retained in essence the House provision in behalf of the human rights of the 18 million people on Taiwan.

For implementation of the policy statement the conference report provides that we shall make available to Taiwan such arms as are needed for her self-defense. The President and the Congress will determine what these arms shall be, judging this solely according to Taiwan's needs. The determination will be reviewed by U.S. military authorities. The President is to inform Congress promptly of any threat to Taiwan's security and any danger to U.S. interests therefrom. The U.S. response to any such danger is to be determined by the President and the Congress, in accordance with constitutional processes.

The next section of the conference report is the key one for continuing and promoting commercial and other relations with Taiwan on a nongovernmental basis. The conferees agreed in effect to accept the broad provisions of the House bill and to include also the more specific Senate provisions which dealt with narrower questions. Thus, section 4(a) states broadly yet clearly that the laws of the United States shall continue to apply with respect to Taiwan as if derecognition had not taken place. Section 4(b) goes on to cite various specifics, such as applying U.S. legal references to "foreign countries" to include Taiwan, to continue Taiwan's capacity to sue and be sued in U.S. courts, to continue Taiwan's rights and obligations, and so on.

All treaties and other international agreements between the United States and Taiwan are continued in force, including multilateral conventions, except for the Mutual Defense Treaty. We accepted a Senate provision which also makes clear that nothing in this Act may be construed as supporting expulsion of Taiwan from any international organization.

Providing for continued Taiwan ownership of the Embassy property here in Washington was not an issue; it was in both bills and is in the conference report. Also, we had no difficulty agreeing on a compromise reflecting the intent of both Houses, which requests the President to extend to Taiwan's new instrumentality here the same number of offices and personnel as previously operated in the United States before the breakoff in diplomatic relations. Likewise, we have agreed on language providing for privi-

leges and immunities for the Taiwan instrumentality personnel here, on a reciprocal basis.

The conference report also includes a provision, taken from the Senate bill, which waives the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) \$1,000 per capita limitation with regard to investments on Taiwan. The provision is designed to stimulate confidence in business investments in Taiwan. However, we placed a 3-year limit on the waiver to avoid Taiwan's receiving this special status indefinitely in view of the prosperity of her economy.

On providing for a new U.S. nongovernmental entity to succeed the American Embassy on Taiwan, the conference report provides both for "The American Institute on Taiwan" as designated in the Senate bill, and for a Presidential option to designate some other nongovernmental entity, which was in the House bill. As a factual matter, the United States and Taiwan have already reached an agreement on establishing these entities, with the U.S. instrumentality being named "the American Institute on Taiwan" and that of Taiwan's being called the "Coordination Council for North American Affairs."

On definitions of terms in the legislation, the conference report adopts the House approach in defining "Taiwan," rather than focusing on "People on Taiwan," which was the Senate approach.

Finally, we agreed to the Senate provision for funding to carry out this act in fiscal 1980 and to the House provision for congressional oversight, with an amendment to include "other appropriate committee" as well as the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees in monitoring the provisions under this act.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, I believe the conference report to be a strong bill which is eminently satisfactory from the standpoint of the House.

It is, of course, an absolutely necessary bill from the standpoint of the interests of the United States. It reflects our strong desire for Taiwan's continued security and for continuing, without interruption, our commercial, cultural, and other nondiplomatic relations with Taiwan.

The conference report is needed to achieve these objectives. I urge its overwhelming approval by the House.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, some of us have a strong feeling that they do not wish to be a party to any legislation that terminates our diplomatic recognition of the Republic of China on Taiwan. For that reason I intend to vote against this. I understand that this is the best-we-can-get syndrome that is presented in the gentleman's argument. But I do have some concern about the change in the House provision on appropriations in an amendment that was offered by my colleague,

the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK), which required appropriations and authorization for all expenditures of this Institute conducting the affairs between these two nations.

I understand the other body authorized a provision dealing with such sums. But is that for only one fiscal year? And what assurances do we have that the appropriate congressional committees in both Houses of Congress will be able to control the fiscal affairs of this Agency in the future? Is it an open-ended authorization?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I can assure my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, that it is not an open-ended authorization. As the gentleman from Maryland knows, the Ashbrook amendment, to which he referred, which was adopted in the House, stated:

No agency of the United States Government may pay or otherwise make available to the designated entity, by contract or otherwise, any funds unless the Congress has expressly authorized and appropriated those funds to be made available to and used by the designated entity.

□ 1550

The conference report, in section 16, adopted the Senate funding provision. This authorizes the appropriation to the Secretary of State for fiscal year 1980 to carry out provisions of this act. The conference report, in effect, includes the main point of the Ashbrook amendment, which was to have a specific authorization. No such authorization was needed for fiscal year 1979. Those funds as the gentleman will recall, and as the gentleman from Wisconsin has advised in committee, have already been appropriated to the State Department for the American Embassy on Taiwan. The State Department has asked the Appropriations Committee for a reprogramming so the moneys can be used for the American Institute in Taiwan, so this satisfies the need in 1979.

For fiscal year 1980 and thereafter we anticipate, as indicated in the Statement of the Managers, that the funding will, as usual, be through the annual funding process for the State Department and that both authorizing and appropriating committees will be able to maintain full control over this funding as before.

Mr. BAUMAN. So that each year the State Department in its authorization and appropriation bill must come before the appropriate committee to justify the spending and explain what they have done about it before.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. BAUMAN. Could the gentleman answer one last question? That is, what is the attitude of the Communist Chinese Government toward this legislation?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to advise the gentleman that the People's Republic of China is furious, is very unhappy, and I think this could be very convincing to the gentleman from Maryland if he had any concerns about the legislation that we had passed.

I would hope that he would now support it, because it is displeasing to the Communist government.

Mr. BAUMAN. Have they indicated they would break relations with the United States over this legislation?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am in no position to advise the gentleman from Maryland as to what is the thinking of the Communist in any country, and especially the Communist government in Peking. I do not believe they would do that.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, it has not met my test, I would say to the gentleman.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. I think it should be understood, however, that the bill that was finally arrived at is consistent with the negotiations conducted by the President; and it does not embody any government-to-government relations. Now, the point that the People's Republic of China objected to was the question of the security provisions; however, those security provisions would not have been necessary had the People's Republic of China renounced the use of force to accomplish their political aims.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is not too often that I include in my remarks a quote from the Washington Post, but I intend to ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the editorial of the Washington Post of March 27, entitled, "Peking Political Education." The editorial says in part:

The People's Republic of China has now pronounced unacceptable the legislation in which the Congress sought to strengthen, beyond the administration's measure, the formal assurances the United States is offering Taiwan.

A bit further, it says:

Although Peking is upset it does not appear to be so upset that it will react rashly, least of all, say, by denormalizing.

I think we have served through our committee, and the Congress, a lesson to the PRC that the Congress is a very important body, and that our Government is a government of the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary: It is a lesson that I hope they will keep in mind. (The full text of editorial follows:)

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 27, 1979]

PEKING'S POLITICAL EDUCATION

The People's Republic of China has now pronounced "unacceptable" the legislation in which the Congress sought to strengthen, beyond the administration's measure, the formal assurances the United States is offering Taiwan. Most of the congressional increments were a good idea; and it's not such a bad idea, either, that Peking has been afforded this occasion to deepen its political education.

The increments do not alter the basic framework of normalization, and this is to the good. But by tone as much as by word, they make explicit a certain caution about China's ultimate intentions and a considerable degree of sympathy for Taiwan. In other words, they make explicit what we take to be the feelings of most Americans. It must have

come as something of a shock to the Chinese to discover that the arrangements they had laboriously worked out with the executive branch were tampered with by the legislature. Welcome to America. "Normalization" means not merely regularizing official relations but opening up those relations to the normal buffeting of the American political process.

Although Peking is upset, it does not appear to be so upset that it will react rashly, least of all, say, by "denormalizing." Only a handful of those congressmen who supported the new language could have wished to provoke that result. American diplomats are working overtime to limit the damage. But we think it can only strengthen Chinese-American relations for the long run for the two countries to learn that their political systems, and not alone their diplomatic establishments, must meet and interact.

The Chinese are not shy about defining their own national interest. Americans should be no less forthcoming. This is by way of saying that Peking should consider the effect its invasion of Vietnam had on congressional consideration of the Taiwan legislation. The spectacle of China disregarding American urgings and sending troops across a border into a neighboring country surely helped spur Congress to strengthen the assurances being offered Taiwan. We would even go a step further and suggest that that spectacle served as a useful brake on any incipient American tendency to regard normalization as a wholly unmixed blessing for the United States in its continuing attempt to "contain" Soviet power. Normalization is desirable, we believe, but, like any other political act, it carries limits and risks. It is better that Americans proceed with a knowledge of what the risks are.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BAUMAN. Based on the knowledge I have gleaned recently about the numbers and quality of the Members who will be visiting Red China during the Easter recess, I am sure the Red Chinese will have a firsthand chance to learn about the quality of almost every Member of the House of Representatives before the year is out.

□ 1555

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, my only regret is that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) is not a member of that expeditionary force because if he were, he could get some idea of the composition of the PRC and of the differences of opinion which we have in this legislative body.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Maryland has been invited to go as a member of the minority delegation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I regret that the gentleman did not take that opportunity.

Mr. BAUMAN. The gentleman has not made up his mind as yet.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I endorse the comments of my distinguished colleague, Mr. ZABLOCKI, and fully support the conference report to H.R. 2479, the Taiwan Relations Act. The legislation we have

before us will better provide for the peace and security of the more than 17 million people on Taiwan. Moreover, the conference report not only contains essential provisions of the previously passed House bill, but also reflects the congressional concerns over many of the deficiencies of the administration's original legislative request—deficiencies which could have been corrected at even an earlier date given more informed congressional consultation by the administration.

The conference report takes several significant steps beyond the administration's original bill. An essential security amendment, which I offered, stating that any economic boycott or embargo to prevent Taiwan from engaging in trade with other nations would be considered a threat to the security of Taiwan—is preserved in the conference report. In particular, the conference agreement on our declaration of policy toward Taiwan preserves several important House amendments including the intent of the Congress to provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character and to maintain Taiwan's capacity to resist any force or other coercion which would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of Taiwan. Moreover, the preservation and the enhancement of the human rights of the Taiwan people, as provided by a House amendment, are reaffirmed as U.S. objectives in the conference report. Still other provisions of the conference report protect Taiwan's embassy property, Taiwan's position in any international financial institution or organization, as well as the status of nuclear export applications.

As for congressional oversight concerning the Taiwan Relations Act, a conference substitute was adopted. This substitute would allow the House Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as other appropriate committees of the Congress to monitor the provisions of the conference report on H.R. 2479.

I believe that the conferees have developed legislation which is a significant improvement over the administration's original request. I believe that the conference provisions in general and the security provisions in particular are vital to our continuing commitment to the people of Taiwan. I therefore urge my colleagues to favorably consider the conference report to H.R. 2479.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I believe our position has been very accurately and properly stated by the chairman and the ranking minority member.

I should add, Mr. Speaker, that, as we know, at this point in the discussion of a conference report it is standard procedure for someone to eulogize the chairman and ranking minority Member and to commend them for heroic jobs in conference vis-a-vis the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is necessary in this case. I do not think, given the limited problems, that they

were particularly heroic or brilliant. But they were good.

However, I do wish to say that the House committee staff under the leadership of our chief of staff, Dr. Brady, dazzled the staff of the other body. The Members would have been proud of the House staffers as they totally outmaneuvered the Senate staff on every point.

I do commend this measure. I certainly do not approve of the policy and decision announced on the 15th of December, but this measure makes the best of what is a bad situation. Whether one is pleased or displeased with this policy, I commend support of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, on March 24, the House and Senate met in conference to discuss the Senate's amendments to H.R. 2479, the Taiwan Relations Act.

I would like to call attention to one amendment approved in conference that "states that nothing in this act shall contravene U.S. interest in the human rights of Taiwan's approximately 18 million inhabitants." This provision makes clear the intent of Congress that any effort by the People's Republic of China (PRC) to impose restrictions on Taiwan or encroach on its people would constitute a violation of the human rights of the people on Taiwan.

A further decision of the conference committee was that "the President and the Congress are to decide the nature and quantity of (defense) arms and services solely according to their judgment of Taiwan's needs * * *". This provision is meant to insure that Taiwan's defense needs are determined by its authorities and those of the United States without regard to the views of the PRC. Any attempt by the PRC to interfere in this process would be completely contrary to the interests of the United States.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GUYER).

Mr. GUYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the work of the conferees on this conference report because, like many others, I had a lot of apprehension and a lot of reservation about what we might do to mend some of the damage. I had questions, for example, about whether or not the PRC would be a successor government. I had questions about bank deposits. I wondered about existing treaties, whether they would be honored, things such as the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation, the Air Transport Services Agreement, Atomic Energy Cooperation for Civil Uses Act, and many others. The thing that astounded me was that when the cavalcade of charm swept through our country, it dawned on us at dawn's early light that in return for total diplomatic relations we really had not received very much. We still did not have a commitment, a concession, a compromise, a guarantee, or a down payment. But someplace along the line we do want to do something to see that the American image is not tarnished, that

our reputation for being a reliable ally is safeguarded, and that these good people do have a sense of security and well being together with our friendship.

I agree that this is probably the very best assurance that we could put together, and while I had very little to do with it, I intend to support that because of the integrity of the people and the final form in which they have brought this to the floor. I think internationally it is good. It is good to help restore our integrity, and I want to commend the chairman and those who worked on the conference committee.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report where I do feel that it fulfills the responsibility that has been given to us as a Congress in seeing to it that we carry out the provisions of the agreements that were reached by the President and at the same time afford it the protection that we want it to, to the question of the security of Taiwan itself. Therefore, regardless of the position that has been taken by the PRC in indicating that this was creating new avenues, the final report that was made by the conference committee is in complete agreement and in complete accord with the agreement that was reached by the President with the Peoples Republic of China. I ask my colleagues to support this report.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. KELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does not the conference report just quite clearly establish that the Congress joins the administration in recognizing that the Government of Taiwan is the Communist government in Peking?

Mr. WOLFF. No, it does not.

Mr. KELLY. Then why do we not recognize the government on Taiwan as it exists?

Mr. WOLFF. Because we have recognized the government of Peking and de-recognized the Government of Taiwan, and that has absolutely no relationship to the fact that we recognize Peking's authority over Taiwan.

□ 1605

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

Mr. WOLFF. Yes, I would be delighted to yield.

Mr. KELLY. Is it not the situation that the government, Communist government in Peking has announced as a result of action of the United States taken by the administration that they, in fact, are the sovereign government of Taiwan?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time

of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York 1 additional minute.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this is a position that the Peking Government has taken over the years, but it has absolutely no effect upon the United States.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANNEMEYER).

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today on continuing relations between the United States and Taiwan while a definite improvement over President Carter's version still leaves much to be desired.

As I have stated previously, the basis for relations with the continuing Government of the Republic of China on Taiwan is the unrealistic notion that this government and country does not exist. Obviously it exists and sensible U.S. policy would be to diplomatically recognize its existence. Nongovernmental relations as this bill deals with is an affront to our own country and to our friends and allies in Taiwan.

The security language in the legislation should be much stronger. In addition, justified concern has been raised about the provision of "defensive" weapons to Taiwan. A proper defense of Taiwan necessitates control of the air and waters of the Taiwan Straits. Unfortunately, before so-called normalization with Peking, the Carter administration has been reluctant to provide such weapons to Taiwan. I seriously question the willingness of the Carter administration after recognition of Peking and derecognition of Taiwan to sell the necessary weapons to provide for Taiwan's defense.

As I stated previously, the congressional bill is much better than the President's but it has a number of other smaller difficulties in addition to the ones that I have already discussed. These include the instrument for relations itself, the weakening of language on the number of offices and personnel Taiwan will be allowed to have in the United States, no specific inclusion of the antiboycott law, and the lack of a specific call for diplomatic immunity for Taiwan's representatives.

Once this legislation is passed and signed into law we in the Congress have a serious responsibility to insure that Peking does not attempt to subvert or conquer Taiwan. I will continue to push for a realistic policy toward Taiwan which includes diplomatic recognition.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN), a member of our committee.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, with some reservations, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2479, the Taiwan Relations Act. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I believe the text agreed to by the conferees is probably the most we can reasonably do to redeem our Government in view of the unwise and pre-

mature recognition last December of the People's Republic of China.

As my colleagues know, I opposed then, as I still oppose now, the President's diplomatic recognition of Red China. In the ensuing months, nothing has happened to cause me to change my mind. To the contrary, for instance, I reminded my constituents following Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping's visit here that we ought not fall prey or victim to all the happy smiles, warm handshakes, and cordial hospitality which awaited Teng at every stop on his tour. More recent events on the war front in Southeast Asia, including extensive Chinese military involvement, have reinforced my view that we should deal with the Communist leaders of China at arms, length whenever and wherever possible rather than deal while locked in fond embrace.

The legislation before us today, however, is primarily directed at continuing to the maximum extent possible the relations and ties which we had for 30 years with our friends and allies on Taiwan—the only free China. While the President, as Chief Executive, made the unilateral, but regrettable, decision to tear up our 1954 treaty with Taiwan, we in the Congress can surely write into statutory law, not subject to reversal by Presidential whim, that good and responsible relations with Taiwan will continue, notwithstanding the President's December action. What we have then in this bill constitutes a full recognition of Taiwan, in effect if not in fact.

H.R. 2479 is necessary for the maintenance of peace, security, and stability in the Western Pacific. It is needed for the continuation, preservation, and promotion of our commercial, cultural, and other relations with Taiwan. The bill declares in no uncertain terms that peace and stability in that part of the world are in the political, security, and economic interests of the United States, and are also matters of international concern.

This legislation underscores our Nation's policy that the administration's decision to establish diplomatic relations with Red China rests upon the expectation that Taiwan's future will be determined through peaceful means. Otherwise, any threat to peace and security in the Western Pacific will be a matter of grave concern to the United States.

The bill mandates that our Government make available to Taiwan such guarantees of defense articles and defense services, including arms of a defensive character, as are necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability. This determination will be made jointly by Congress and the President, and will include advice from U.S. military authorities.

The President is directed to inform the Congress promptly of any threat to the security or to the social or economic system of Taiwan and of any resulting dangers to our own interests. Any such danger would be dealt with by appropriate action in accordance with law.

It might be well to note at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the section of the

bill regarding Presidential notification of Congress is not a vague, nonbinding "sense of the Congress" provision. Instead, it directs the President in straightforward terms to keep Congress completely informed and to make Congress an equal partner in dealing with threats to Taiwan. We should remember that it was the President's failure to consult with Congress prior to his December announcement, as requested in last year's foreign aid bill, that fueled much of the continuing protest here on Capitol Hill.

This legislation also provides that our laws will continue to apply with full force to Taiwan, even in the absence of formal diplomatic relations. For those purposes, Taiwan shall remain a foreign country, nation, state, government, or similar entity—whatever the particular law in question dictates. Taiwan's rights and obligations under our laws shall not be abrogated, infringed, modified, denied, or otherwise affected by the absence of diplomatic relations and recognition.

In addition, the conference bill continues in force all United States-Taiwan treaties, international agreements, and multilateral conventions existing on the date of derecognition, unless and until terminated in accordance with law.

This legislation provides for a Federal-State-local tax exempt, nonprofit corporation, the American Institute in Taiwan, to conduct and carry out programs, transactions, and other relations with respect to Taiwan. The bill contains provisions for furnishing of property and services to and obtaining services from the Institute.

Mr. Speaker, behind the chairman, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BROOKS, as ranking majority member of the House Government Operations Committee, I can attest unequivocally to the essential nature of congressional oversight of actions taken by the executive branch. As a result, I am pleased that this bill provides that the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and other appropriate committees of Congress, shall monitor the implementation of this act, the institute's operations and procedures, the legal and technical aspects of the continuing relationship between the United States and Taiwan, and the implementation of our Government's policies concerning security and cooperation in East Asia. So long as I remain a Member of Congress and the House Government Operations and Foreign Affairs Committees, I will do my utmost, whatever I can, to see that this oversight is conducted vigorously.

Let me add a final and more personal note, Mr. Speaker. This legislation, as it originally passed the House, and in final form today, is substantially stronger than what the administration initially proposed. The executive branch says it can live with this bill. I trust that will prove to be the case and that the President signs it willingly and enforces it aggressively. But at the same time, I hope this legislation is seen by the President and his advisers as a forthright and compelling response by the Congress to his

ill-advised, single-handed recognition of Red China without first arriving at an equitable solution to questions surrounding the future of Taiwan and without consulting meaningfully ahead of time with the Congress.

Under our Constitution, the President is Chief Executive officer, and speaks and acts in various ways on behalf of our country in international affairs. However, Congress too has its vital and important constitutional role to play in foreign affairs. Regrettably, that role has too often, under many recent Presidents, been slighted, undermined, or overlooked altogether.

Hopefully, the Taiwan Relations Act will serve notice on this and future administrations, and encourage future Congresses, that the national legislature should not sit idly by and allow its prerogatives and place in international policy-making to be undercut or ill-served. This legislation not only helps insure the safe and secure future of Taiwan, but hopefully also aids in establishing concrete legislative precedents for stronger future congressional involvement in foreign affairs. That important message is not set forth word for word in the text of this bill, but I hope it is, and will be seen, and heeded, nevertheless.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting to adopt this conference report—as the best possible way left for us to salvage the diplomatic relations we maintained for so many years with the Republic of China, prior to untimely, unwise and premature action by the President last December, when he formally recognized the People's Republic of China, and broke diplomatic relations with the Republic of China.

I might add that this legislation is approved and requested by our friends, the Government of Taiwan, the only free China. Like the Congress under the laws of our land, they really have no other alternative. But again it is a meaningful alternative—much better than I ever anticipated and I am satisfied much better than the Republic of China (Taiwan) ever expected. A vote for this legislation is not, and should not be construed as support for the action taken by the President.

□ 1610

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend and former co-ambassador to the United Nations.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Thank you very much.

I wish to associate myself with the very fine remarks made by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN). I think that Mr. FOUNTAIN has really given a very excellent analysis of this bill. If I draw one conclusion of the work we have done here we have demonstrated our concern for those people who live on the island of Taiwan. I just wish to compliment you on a very fine statement.

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

□ 1615

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote against the conference report.

Taiwan is important to the western Pacific defenses of the United States. The conference report surrenders these defenses.

The platitudes in the conference report are a sham which attempt to conceal the surrender of Taiwan to the Communists. We, by adopting this conference report, are simply implementing the surrender of Taiwan which was accomplished by the administration. That is all that is being done by this conference report; we are simply implementing what the President has done.

This does not in any way change the proposition that the President has surrendered the sovereignty of Taiwan to the Communist government in Peking. There is no government on Taiwan by the action of adopting this conference report; otherwise we would send an ambassador to our friend of 30 years. We send no ambassador because by this action we recognize no government on Taiwan. There is no government there because we have sold it out to the Communist regime in Peking, and we do that by adopting this conference report.

The supporters will ultimately argue that the Taiwan question is an internal affair of the PRC and thus attempt to deceive the public.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote against the conference report.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLODY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the conferees on the development of the conference report presented to us today concerning our Nation's continuing relationship with the people of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, while I voted against the measure which was passed by this House a few weeks ago, I am reassured by language in the conference report with which the Members of this House and of the other body have agreed. It is my hope and expectation that the cultural, social, and economic relations between the peoples of our two nations may be continued—even extended in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am also satisfied that the conference report contains assurances that we will help provide defense supplies to our friends in Taiwan—and we are pledging ourselves to support Taiwan if it is subjected to any military or economic attack.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that we have—under very adverse circumstances—provided the maximum of support and friendship in the language of this conference report and I intend to vote for its adoption.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD), for yielding this time to me.

Although I can understand why my good friend, the chairman of the committee, wants to move this along as expeditiously as possible. A sinking feeling must come over the proponents, a little bit like having a bone in your throat or a lump in your heart. It is something you want to forget about quickly and bury it, hoping that all your pious platitudes really have some truthful ring in the future.

It is bad enough to insult a sovereign people—and that is what we are doing—but the Republic of China is a sovereign nation, not an entity, the Taiwanese or the people on Taiwan. I have been on this floor during the entire debate and watched how careful the sponsors of this legislation were not to refer to a "sovereign people" or a "sovereign country" or the Republic of China.

That is a little bit insulting to them, but it is worse to find Members of this Congress, Members of the House of Representatives, afraid to call long-time friends a sovereign nation. It is bad enough that we refer to them as "Taiwanese" or "the people on Taiwan." You who advocate this travesty have been careful not to refer to them as a nation, but how much worse it is when we are doing this to a country that has been a lifelong friend, a friend extending back as far as any of us in this Chamber can go back and remember, and our minds run not to the contrary.

Not so with the people on the mainland, not so with the People's Republic of China. The Communists repressive and inhumane rule makes them no friend. Why carry water for them.

It is also bad enough that the President would usurp the authority of the Congress—and indeed I believe he did, and I hope a lawsuit will prove that—but it is worse that the Congress rolls over and ratifies this action.

How many times have I heard in the last 10 years, particularly during the Vietnam war and after the Tonkin resolution, that the Congress ought to stand up to the President? Maybe we do not stand up to this President, but at any rate this was a good time to do it, and the Congress failed to do so.

It is bad enough that we are accepting this act in the way we are, but it is worse that I keep hearing people say that it is for the Taiwanese, that it is to help them, and that we are for them. I hear time and time again that they have agreed to this shameful ploy.

That is a little bit like the man who sits down in the electric chair and allows himself to be electrocuted. We might say that because the man sits down in the chair and allows himself to be strapped in, he goes along with it. Of course, that assumes the guards standing there did not make any difference. But the sponsors say the Taiwanese people have accepted this, they want this, they urgently request this, that is why it must be done. Foolishness, sheer foolishness we know what we are doing, whatever you

might call it or however you might try to rationalize it.

□ 1620

I just want to register that on this day in March 1979, I am one who believes the majority in Congress is going to do an unconscionable thing. They are going to turn their backs on their friends; worse, because it was a demand, a price extracted by an enemy. Yes, I think the Government of the People's Republic of China is an enemy. You can call their friends all you want, but they are the unrepentant murderers of millions of people on their own mainland. They have never repented. The only way they repent is to die. Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai never repented. They had to die. I think a lot died today, including the dignity and the word of this country.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, merely to advise my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK), for whom I have a high regard and esteem, that I do not have a lump in my throat and I am not swallowing hard or in any way remorseful or concerned about this conference report. Let me advise the gentleman that I have had an opportunity to speak to some of the people who were formerly represented here, who are interested in the Republic of China, and they are pleased with this legislation and with this report, and only the PRC is unhappy with this report. I submit—and I might be in error—that those who are voting in opposition to the report will really be making the PRC happy that they have at least that number of Members who they will interpret are looking out for their interest.

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

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the sterile record of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will not show future generations what I would like to record.

My good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI), had to grope, had to pause to find a way to refer to our former friends of the Republic of China, and that in itself shows that there must be some small lump in the throat of my good friend.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, I was not groping. I was speaking slowly for emphasis.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 339, nays 50, answered "present" 5, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—339

Abdnor	Fary	Martin
Addabbo	Fascell	Mathis
Akaka	Fazio	Matsui
Albosta	Fenwick	Mattox
Alexander	Ferraro	Mavroules
Ambro	Fish	Mazzoli
Anderson,	Flithian	Mica
Calif.	Flippo	Mikulski
Andrews, N.C.	Foley	Miller, Calif.
Andrews,	Ford, Mich.	Mineta
N. Dak.	Ford, Tenn.	Minish
Annunzio	Fountain	Mitchell, Md.
Anthony	Fowler	Mitchell, N.Y.
Archer	Frost	Moakley
Ashley	Fuqua	Moffett
Aspin	Garcia	Mollohan
Atkinson	Gephardt	Montgomery
AuCoin	Glaimo	Moore
Bafalis	Gingrich	Moorhead, Pa.
Baldus	Motti	Ginn
Barnard	Glickman	Murphy, Ill.
Barnes	Gonzalez	Murphy, N.Y.
Beard, R.I.	Goodling	Murphy, Pa.
Bedell	Gore	Murtha
Bellenson	Gradison	Myers, Ind.
Benjamin	Gramm	Myers, Pa.
Bennett	Grassley	Natcher
Bereuter	Gray	Neal
Bethune	Green	Nedzi
Bevill	Grisham	Nelson
Blaggi	Gudger	Nichols
Bingham	Guyer	Nolan
Blanchard	Hagedorn	Nowak
Boggs	Hall, Ohio	O'Brien
Boland	Hall, Tex.	Oakar
Bolling	Hamilton	Oberstar
Boner	Hammer-	Obeys
Bonior	schmidt	Oettinger
Bonker	Hance	Panetta
Bouquard	Hanley	Pashayan
Bowen	Harkin	Patten
Brademas	Harris	Patterson
Breaux	Harsha	Pease
Brinkley	Heckler	Perkins
Brodhead	Hefner	Peyser
Broomfield	Heftel	Pickle
Brown, Calif.	Hightower	Preyer
Brown, Ohio	Hillis	Price
Buchanan	Hinson	Pritchard
Burison	Holland	Pursell
Butler	Hollenbeck	Quayle
Byron	Holt	Quillen
Campbell	Holtzman	Rahall
Carr	Hopkins	Rallsback
Cavanaugh	Horton	Rangel
Chappell	Howard	Ratchford
Cheney	Hubbard	Regula
Chisholm	Huckaby	Reuss
Clausen	Hughes	Rhodes
Clay	Hutto	Richmond
Cleveland	Hyde	Rinaldo
Clinger	Ichord	Ritter
Coelho	Ireland	Roberts
Coleman	Jacobs	Rodino
Collins, Ill.	Jeffords	Roe
Conte	Jenkins	Rose
Corcoran	Jenrette	Rosenthal
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Cotter	Johnson, Colo.	Roth
Coughlin	Jones, N.C.	Russo
Courter	Jones, Tenn.	Sabo
D'Amours	Kastenmeier	Santini
Danielson	Kazen	Sawyer
Daschle	Kemp	Scheuer
Davis, Mich.	Kildee	Schroeder
Davis, S.C.	Kogovsek	Schulze
Deckard	Kostmayer	Sebelius
Derrick	LaFalce	Seiberling
Derwinski	Leach, Iowa	Sensenbrenner
Dicks	Leland	Shannon
Dingell	Lent	Sharp
Dixon	Levitas	Shuster
Dodd	Lloyd	Simon
Donnelly	Long, La.	Skelton
Dougherty	Long, Md.	Slack
Downey	Lott	Smith, Iowa
Drinan	Lowry	Smith, Nebr.
Duncan, Oreg.	Lujan	Snowe
Duncan, Tenn.	Luken	Snyder
Early	Lundine	Solarz
Eckhardt	McClory	Spellman
Edwards, Ala.	McCormack	Spence
Edwards, Calif.	McDade	St Germain
Emery	McEwen	Stack
English	McHugh	Stangeland
Erdahl	McKinney	Stanton
Erlenborn	Madigan	Stark
Ertel	Maguire	Steed
Evans, Ga.	Markley	Stockman
Evans, Ind.	Marks	Stokes

Stratton	Walgren	Winn
Studds	Walker	Wirth
Swift	Wampler	Wolfe, N.Y.
Synar	Waxman	Wolpe, Mich.
Tauke	White	Wright
Taylor	Whitehurst	Wydler
Thomas	Whitley	Wylie
Thompson	Whittaker	Yates
Traxler	Whitten	Yatron
Treen	Williams, Mont.	Young, Alaska
Udall	Williams, Ohio	Young, Fla.
Van Deerin	Wilson, Bob	Young, Mo.
Vento	Wilson, C. H.	Zablocki
Volkmer	Wilson, Tex.	Zeferetti

NAYS—50

Applegate	Gilman	Moorhead,
Ashbrook	Goldwater	Calif.
Badham	Hansen	Paul
Bailey	Jeffries	Robinson
Bauman	Kelly	Rousselot
Burgener	Kramer	Roybal
Carney	Lagomarsino	Rudd
Collins, Tex.	Latta	Satterfield
Crane, Daniel	Leach, La.	Shelby
Crane, Philip	Leath, Tex.	Shumway
Daniel, Dan	Lewis	Solomon
Daniel, R. W.	Livingston	Stenholm
Dannemeyer	Loeffler	Stump
Devine	Lungren	Symms
Dickinson	McDonald	Tribble
Dornan	Marriott	Watkins
Edwards, Okla.	Miller, Ohio	Wyatt

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Burton, John	Dellums	Weiss
Burton, Phillip	Kindness	

NOT VOTING—38

Anderson, Ill.	Flood	McKay
Beard, Tenn.	Florio	Marlenee
Brooks	Forsythe	Michel
Broyhill	Frenzel	Mikva
Carter	Gaydos	Pepper
Conable	Gibbons	Runnels
Conyers	Guarini	Staggers
de la Garza	Hawkins	Stewart
Diggs	Jones, Okla.	Ullman
Edgar	Lederer	Vander Jagt
Evans, Del.	Lee	Vanik
Findley	Lehman	Weaver
Fisher	McCloskey	

□ 1635

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Guarini with Mr. Forsythe.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Marlenee.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Runnels.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Lederer with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Lehman with Mr. Broyhill.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Florio with Mr. Evans of Delaware.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Beard of Tennessee.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Edgar.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Lee.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Jones of Oklahoma.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Frenzel.

Mr. WEISS changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A motion to reconsider was laid on by Mr. Sparrow, one of its Clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence

of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3091. An act to extend for one year the provisions of law relating to the business expenses of State legislators.

□ 1640

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Rules could tell us the topic of the report?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it would be a resolution dealing with the debt limit.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it is the information of the gentleman from Maryland that the need for this legislation was described as an emergency situation. The notice I received was that our Rules Committee meeting was to be held in 15 minutes but that the rule and the bill would not be called up until Monday. If it is not to be called up until Monday why would the request be made that the report be filed tonight?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has information I do not have. I was informed it would come up tomorrow, but I could be in error.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland does not wish to stand in the way of progress as seen by the gentleman from Missouri, but I do think it might be better to await the determination of the Committee on Rules.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1787, NASA 1979 SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 177 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 177

Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1787) to authorize a supplemental appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this

resolution it shall be in order to move, section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1787) to authorize a supplemental appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Frost) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Lott), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 177 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1787 authorizing supplemental appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1979 in the amount of \$185 million for research and development.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. The resolution also waives points of order against the bill for failure to comply with section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. Section 402(a) prohibits the Congress from considering legislation which authorizes new budget authority for a fiscal year unless the bill was reported on or before May 15 preceding the beginning of that fiscal year. The Committee on Science and Technology requested the waiver subject to section 402(b) of the Congressional Budget Act which allows the Rules Committee to grant an emergency waiver of section 402(a). The waiver, of course, is necessary since this authorization was reported after May 15, 1978 and authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 1979.

This supplemental appropriation is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to allow NASA to continue the Space Shuttle program without delays that could substantially increase the costs of the program. During the 95th Congress, NASA was authorized an appropriation of \$1,443,300,000 for the Space Shuttle design, development, test, and evaluation program and the Shuttle production program for a four-Orbiter fleet, with \$4 million of these funds to be used for a fifth Orbiter option. The request for the additional \$185 million for fiscal year 1979 is the first supplemental request in the 7 years the Shuttle program has been under development. The request is a result of technical problems encountered in the development, manu-

facturing and testing of the Shuttle systems, and delay in appropriating these additional funds would cause a major disruption in schedules at Space Shuttle prime contractor, subcontractor and vendor plants throughout the country leading to layoffs of half the projected work force, about 20,000 out of 42,000 jobs.

Delay in appropriating these funds would also result in a delay of several months for the first orbiter flight and a 6- to 12-month delay in the delivery of the second, third, and fourth Orbiters at an estimated increased cost of between \$400 to \$600 million.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the important role the Space Shuttle will play in the development of outer space for commercial, scientific, and defense needs, I urge by colleagues to adopt House Resolution 177.

□ 1645

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a 1-hour, open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1787, which authorizes a supplemental appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development. Section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act is waived, since the legislation authorizes funds for fiscal year 1979 and, accordingly, should have been reported from committee prior to May 15, 1978. The first reading of the bill is to be dispensed with.

H.R. 1787 is a supplemental authorization for fiscal year 1979 in the amount of \$185 million to be used by NASA in connection with the Space Shuttle program. When added to the \$1.44 billion authorized last year for research and development at NASA, the total fiscal year 1979 authorization will be approximately \$1.63 billion.

It is my understanding that the authorizing committee has investigated the supplemental request and has determined that the need for the additional funds has resulted from technical problems encountered in the development, manufacturing, and testing of the Space Shuttle systems. The committee report suggests that the effect of the potential delay in the Space Shuttle program if this money is not authorized is estimated at \$400 to \$600 million.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with this rule. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1650

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and

extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1786, NASA FISCAL YEAR 1980 AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 176 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 176

Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1786) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1786) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI, are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Frost) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Lott), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 176 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1786 authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management and for other purposes.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate with the time equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. The resolution also makes in order consideration of an amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule. Upon conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, a motion to recommit with or without instructions would be in order.

The resolution waives points of order against the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI, which prohibits appropriations in a legislative bill. This waiver is necessary because in several instances the committee substitute technically makes appropriations for NASA activities. In addition, the resolution contains a waiver against points of order for failure of the bill, as introduced, to comply with the provisions of section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act which prohibits the Congress from considering legislation which authorizes new budget authority for a fiscal year unless the bill was reported on or before May 15 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1786 would authorize appropriations of \$4,762 million for NASA in fiscal year 1980. This authorization level is \$37 million higher than the President's budget request for fiscal year 1980 and 9.5 percent above the current fiscal year 1979 appropriation (\$4.35 billion, excluding a pending supplemental appropriation request of \$185 million).

The increases made by the committee adjusted four line items all within the research and development category. Principally, the committee retained the option in fiscal year 1979 appropriations for a fifth Space Shuttle Orbiter and increased the line item for the Space Shuttle research and development program by \$27 million. The committee authorized a total of \$1,393,000,000 for Shuttle research and development and \$27,750,000 for construction of facilities for the Space Shuttle, which is schedule to make its first flight on November 9 of this year.

H.R. 1786 also amends the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to raise from \$5,000 to \$25,000 the amount for which NASA may settle or adjust damage claims on behalf of the U.S. Government for actions resulting from the conduct of NASA functions. The act is further amended by adding a new subsection authorizing the Administrator to provide, at his discretion and at the terms he deems appropriate, liability insurance to private users of space vehicles—including the Space Shuttle—to compensate for claims by third parties.

Mr. Speaker, the NASA program is of vital importance to our country and has provided jobs and rapidly accelerated technology development in the past 20 years. I would urge my colleagues to adopt House Resolution 176 so that we may proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1786, the NASA authorization bill.

□ 1655

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a 1-hour, open rule permitting consideration of H.R. 1786, which authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1980. Section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act is waived against the bill, since language in certain subsections provides authorizations for fiscal year 1979 and should have been reported before May 15, 1978. It will be in order under the rule to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill for purposes of amendment. Clause 5 of rule XXI, which prohibits appropriations in legislation, is waived against the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The reason for this waiver is because the substitute contains language which can be interpreted as reappropriations.

The purpose of H.R. 1786 is to authorize a total of \$4.76 billion to NASA for fiscal year 1980. Of this figure \$3.6 billion is for research and development, \$157.6 million is for construction of facilities, and \$965 million is for research and program management. The total authorization represents a \$37 million increase over the President's budget request for fiscal year 1980. This increase consists of \$27 million in additional authorizations for maintaining the option to purchase the fifth Space Shuttle Orbiter, \$1 million for program studies for a large deployable antenna demonstration, \$2 million for initiating development of a multispectral resource sampler, \$4 million for initiating development of a national oceanic satellite system, and \$8 million for augmentation of the variable cycle engine component program. There is a corresponding \$5 million decrease in other items.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation, along with the NASA supplemental authorization for fiscal year 1979, will continue a balanced space program in our country. Although I would much prefer to know that H.R. 1786 was in line with the President's request, I have no objection to the passage of this rule and intend to support the legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 1787, on which the rule has just been granted.

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

There was no objection.

NASA 1979 SUPPLEMENTAL
AUTHORIZATION

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1787) to authorize a supplemental appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA). The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1787, with Mr. BEILENSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In considering the bill before us, H.R. 1787, we need to place the development of the Space Shuttle in accurate perspective. First, it needs to be recognized that in terms of 1971 dollars the Space Shuttle development program is within 10 percent of its originally estimated costs. This is a significant achievement in a program of complex technology. NASA is to be applauded for the excellence of management which has achieved this with tight budget restrictions and a demanding technical challenge.

In retrospect, the annual budget restrictions have required pushing testing to late in the program and consequently difficult technical problems have been encountered and are being overcome later in the development cycle. Thus the need for the additional funds results from technical problems encountered in development, manufacturing, and testing of Space Shuttle systems; the need for design changes and weight reductions; and the requirements of prime contractors and subcontractors for increased engineering and manufacturing effort to fabricate hardware and conduct test activities.

Intensive development and testing activity is proceeding in fiscal year 1979 with the first orbital flight targeted for late 1979. Funding is being applied to design, development, test, and evaluation activities at a rate which supports this plan; orbiter production activities are proceeding on a constrained basis; and the fiscal year 1979 supplemental authorization is being requested to restore funding for production activities. If the requested supplemental appropriation is not approved, it will be necessary to rebalance the program plan by adjusting the fiscal year 1979 devel-

opment and test activities with a resultant delay of several months in first orbital flight and by delaying production activities with a resultant 6- to 12-month delay in delivery of the second, third, and fourth orbiter vehicles.

The administration has submitted, as anticipated, a request for supplemental appropriations for NASA for fiscal year 1979 in the amount of \$185 million. The bill, H.R. 1787, before us is to authorize that appropriation.

The bill before us today is straightforward in its intent. It is to provide sufficient funds for the NASA Space Shuttle program to continue in an orderly and economic manner.

The Committee on Science and Technology and the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications have maintained a detailed and intensive oversight of the Space Shuttle program. The full committee has reviewed the program annually since its inception in 1971. The Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications has reviewed Shuttle cost, performance and schedule at least twice annually during the same period. During this last year, the subcommittee has examined the program on three separate occasions resulting in published hearings and a report. As a result of this activity, I can report that the Space Shuttle is a well managed and well balanced high technology program.

The benefits of a low cost, reusable Earth-to-orbit transportation system are well known to the Members of this body. I will not attempt to review the significant increase in the utility of space gained when the Space Shuttle becomes operational. Rather, it is important to point out that this technically complex program has already surmounted difficult problems. Even with these problems, as I mentioned earlier, the program is still within 10 percent—in 1971 dollars—of its original estimate made in 1971. The supplemental request of \$185 million being made today will still maintain that estimate within 10 percent of the original. In that context, it is important to examine the effect of failing to provide the supplemental funds.

The funds are to be used for the research, development, test and evaluation of the Space Shuttle. Hearings in September 1978, before our Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, made it clear that such a supplemental appropriation would be essential if cost control were to be maintained in the program and substantial total program cost increases were to be avoided. In testimony before the subcommittee, NASA indicated that failing to receive a timely supplemental appropriation would result in severe schedule penalties and Space Shuttle program cost penalties. Without the supplemental it has been estimated that the first manned orbital flight would be delayed 4 to 6 months with an increase in total development costs of from \$300 to \$400 million, and that the follow-on orbiter deliveries would be delayed from 6 to 12 months at cost penalties of \$100 to \$200 million.

In addition to this \$400 to \$600 million

effect in direct program funding, the Shuttle schedule delays would result in other budget and programmatic effects particularly to payload users. Currently planned Space Transportation System missions on the Shuttle will have to be rescheduled, where possible, to expendable launch vehicles. This would necessitate the purchase of additional expendable launch vehicles at an additional cost. Adjustments in the tracking network operations resulting from the delayed launch of the tracking and data relay satellite are estimated to require substantial additional funds.

Another major area of impact, more difficult to define, would involve the effects on payload benefits lost to Space Transportation System users. Those payloads that are not compatible with expendable launch vehicles would have to be deferred. Payloads would continue to be designed to be compatible on both the Space Shuttle and expendable launch vehicles, thus resulting in payload cost penalties and postponing the economic benefits to be realized from the planned Space Shuttle operational use. When the approximate cost effect of all these payload related factors is added to the direct Shuttle cost, the overall total cost of not obtaining a supplemental appropriation is estimated by NASA to exceed \$1 billion plus the effects of future inflation.

As I pointed out earlier, the Space Shuttle development program is within 10 percent of the original 1971 program estimate, and will remain so with the supplemental. The provision for supplemental funds at this point in the program is crucial since peak fabrication and, therefore, peak expenditure rates have been reached. Changes in program pace at this time will quickly lead to large cost increases which can be eliminated by the supplemental funds.

Having considered in detail all of those factors and having held hearings in Washington and at the key contractor facilities, the committee by a unanimous vote of those present voted to recommend this supplemental appropriations.

I urge my colleagues in the interest of maintaining cost discipline and schedule control in the Space Shuttle program to vote in favor of H.R. 1787.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as ranking minority member on the Space Science and Applications Subcommittee, I rise in support of this legislation, H.R. 1787. The chairman, Mr. FUQUA, and I have spent many hours in hearings both here in Washington and the field, attempting to understand and justify this supplemental funding request. It has not been an easy task. As a fiscally conservative businessman, it is always very difficult to rationalize the need for an additional funding request. However, I freely and enthusiastically can state to you and my colleagues that this request is justified and is in the best interest of the Nation.

To arrive at this conclusion, I had to answer three very basic questions. I would like to share with my colleagues my

thoughts on those questions. Hopefully, each of you will then arrive at the same conclusion I have.

The first question I considered was: "Is the Space Shuttle program still a sufficiently worthy program to warrant the expenditure of these funds?" Several very important facts must be considered in regard to this question. First, this Nation has made a substantial commitment to the utilization of space for both civilian and military programs. Everyday we reap these benefits when we pick up our telephone or look at the weather forecast. A significant portion of our environmental monitoring comes from satellites in Earth orbit. More importantly, we are becoming more dependent upon space for our national security and defense. In fact, the President has been very explicit about the significance of satellites for SALT verification.

Therefore, if we can accept the significance of space for our future, then we must accept the worthiness of the Space Shuttle program, because it is the only space transportation system that is available. The military and civilian space programs have already begun phasing out the conventional expendable launch vehicles. Production lines have been stopped. In the event the Shuttle were delayed, it would seriously impair the integrity of both programs and ultimately result in much higher expenditures.

Based upon these considerations, I have concluded, beyond a doubt, that this program is worthy of continued expenditure of funds. If you accept this important role that space will play in our national security and well-being, then the Space Shuttle is a worthy program.

The second question I considered was whether there was any mismanagement in the program that was placing unjust financial burden on the taxpayer. This was the simplest question for me to resolve because of my very long involvement with the program.

The Space Shuttle program is a high technology program that is stretching the very bounds of the state-of-the-art. Never before has a throttling engine been designed that produces this level of thrust, nor has there ever been a reusable rocket engine of this size. This engine is designed for as many as 55 reuses. The list of technological advances manifested within this program is quite long. The important point, though, is that the very nature of this program has the potential of many serious impairments and setbacks. In spite of this huge potential however, this program is within 6 to 12 months of the original 1971 schedule and 10 percent of the original cost. I submit to you that there cannot be any mismanagement when a program of this magnitude and complexity is as close as it is to the original plan.

The third and final question I considered was what would be the impact if this supplemental were not approved. I am very concerned about the problems of a balanced Federal budget and the need for reducing Federal spending. It would be very easy to subscribe to a philosophy of not voting for any type

of supplemental request. However, I would feel responsible for what the impact of such a philosophy would be. Therefore, I was provoked into looking at some of those impacts. The first thing that I found was that nearly half of the 42,000 contractor personnel would be laid off.

In addition, the direct and indirect cost impacts are estimated in excess of \$1 billion. The direct cost to the shuttle alone is \$400 to \$600 million. My conscience will not allow me to induce this type of impact for the sake of a politically expedient philosophy. It is not prudent judgment to risk in excess of \$1 billion in future costs for \$285 million today.

I admit that this decision is not an easy one. But few worthwhile decisions are. I think that it is imperative that each of you consider the same three questions that I have just mentioned. I feel confident that you will arrive at the same conclusion that I have, we cannot afford not to approve this measure. I strongly encourage you to vote yes on H.R. 1787.

□ 1705

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. NELSON), a member of the subcommittee, who has provided very valuable help to the subcommittee and to the full committee and who also serves on the Committee on the Budget. We are most appreciative of his fine service to the people whom he represents.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1787 to authorize supplemental funding in fiscal year 1979 to assure the continuity and the cost discipline of the Space Shuttle program.

As a member of the Science and Technology Committee, I am aware of the need for this funding to help defray costs in the development of this, the most sophisticated vehicle ever constructed. These additional costs are as a result of difficulties which occurred at the very threshold of our knowledge. From a program standpoint, to delay the Shuttle would probably force NASA to commit expendable launch vehicles to missions already scheduled—at markedly increased costs. It may well necessitate delays in the launch of several missions, over one-half of which are non-NASA flights for which the Agency is reimbursed by other Federal agencies, domestic enterprises, and international agencies. It should be remembered that the fundamental value of the Shuttle program is cost effectiveness—to dramatically lower the per mission cost through the utilization of a reusable vehicle. To delay its completion serves only to delay the savings.

Further, as a member of the Budget Committee, I am painfully aware of the need to microscopically review our spending priorities. I urge you to approve the fiscal merits of this supplemental in addition to the valid technical justification. Were this \$185 million request to be refused, we would be faced with an additional \$400 to \$600 million outlay.

Please consider that we are not discussing a cost overrun as the result of mismanagement on the part of NASA. In fact, even including the \$185 million supplemental, the Shuttle program will be within 10 percent of the 1971 estimated cost—a remarkable achievement by Federal Government standards.

□ 1710

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER).

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1979 supplemental authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I would like to point out that the majority and minority have worked very closely on this legislation and are in basic agreement regarding its importance. This bipartisan support was reflected in the unanimous vote of the committee to report H.R. 1787.

The Space Shuttle is a national asset because of its unique capability. This system will provide for relatively low cost transportation to low Earth orbit, thereby opening the frontiers of space for American industry and even the world. The military significance of the Space Shuttle cannot be overlooked. A fully operational Space Shuttle will give the United States a space transportation system which no other nation on Earth can presently come close to matching. This supplemental authorization is needed to insure completion of the full system.

This high technology program, which provides in excess of 40,000 jobs in the private sector, is within 10 percent of the original cost estimates which were made in 1971. Considering the tremendous rate of inflation over the past decade, NASA and their contractors have done a reasonable job in containing program cost. NASA has applied shrewd engineering and managerial skill in getting the maximum out of the tax dollars invested. The original estimate for the program was \$5.15 billion. Today, 8 years later, that estimate has grown by less than 10 percent to \$5.654 billion. This is not a small accomplishment when you consider the complex technology and magnitude of the Space Shuttle program.

I am an avid supporter of the political philosophy of reducing Federal spending and balancing the budget. However, close analysis reveals that failure to pass this supplemental will result in substantial layoffs in the aerospace industry and an actual increase in Federal expenditures to cover losses.

I will vote "yes" on H.R. 1787, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FLIPPO), a very valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1787 which would authorize supplemental appropriations to NASA for fiscal year 1979. Approval of this supplemental authorization is requisite to the maintenance of a first orbital

flight in 1979 and continued cost discipline in the program. The committee has considered the need for this supplemental very thoroughly during September 1979 program review hearings and again in February during our authorization hearings.

Failure to approve the requested fiscal year 1979 supplemental authorization of \$185 million to meet Space Shuttle program requirements would cause major program impacts increasing the total cost of development and production currently projected for the Space Shuttle program, increasing costs in related NASA program activities and increasing costs among users of NASA launch services. These costs are estimated to exceed \$1 billion.

The Space Shuttle development program is now entering its seventh year. In the early years, fiscal year funds were constrained by the Office of Management and Budget which resulted in schedule changes and deferral of work to later years. More recently, technical problems have resulted in both schedule changes and cost growth; however, these changes are still well within reasonable engineering estimating error to be expected for high technology program forecasting.

The Space Shuttle development program should be maintained within 10 percent of the original estimates if NASA can maintain a launch date of not later than December 1979. NASA is currently working toward a success-oriented launch date of November 1979, and is operating on a funding plan based on obtaining the supplemental.

Analysis of the likely impact requires taking into account the labor intensity of the Shuttle program—85 percent of Shuttle funding is for people—and the significance of the fixed and variable components of the work force in major technological developments.

At this stage of the Shuttle development program, the fixed effort is proceeding at a relatively high level compared to the variable effort which is associated primarily with processing of flight hardware. If the supplemental is not approved, the Shuttle program will incur a significant loss of critical engineering skills needed to support ongoing development activities through flight testing and to provide program continuity into production and operations. Current industry manpower shortages will greatly impact subsequent restart and build-up contractor/subcontractor efforts in terms of skills recovery and training which will further increase program costs and delay schedules.

I think NASA has done an outstanding job in bringing the Shuttle program to the current state of development and in maintaining cost discipline for this technically challenging and highly complex development program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that NASA can complete the Shuttle development program and keep this Nation in the forefront of space research as well as providing increased benefits and practical applications.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN).

Mr. DORNAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1787, and I can personally attest to the significance of providing this additional fiscal year 1979 funding. I am thoroughly convinced that this program is imperative, not only for the great peaceful pursuits for which it will be utilized but also for our national security. I am equally sure that this program is being managed as well as humanly possible. It would be a grave mistake for us to construe this request as a sign of failure. The total program runout cost is still within 10 percent of the original projection, and I respectfully challenge my colleagues to find any program of this magnitude or complexity that is as close to its original cost and schedule as is our space shuttle.

Total success for the development of the space program system is within our grasp. We will, all of us, be thrilled when we see that beautiful "Columbia" on the launch pad at Kennedy Space Center ready to journey into space, hopefully on schedule because of overwhelming support of this supplemental. Total success for the development of this space transportation system is within our grasp. We would be more than foolish to throw this opportunity away now. Not only would we incur hundreds of millions of dollars in additional costs due to failure to approve this measure, we would also threaten the integrity and prestige of this nation.

The Space Shuttle represents a milestone in the conquest of the frontiers of space. This transportation system will open the horizons of space to the entire world. American industry, the Department of Defense, and many international participants have made commitments to this excellent system. We cannot afford to sacrifice that cooperation and those commitments.

We face difficult economic decisions, but please let us not be pennywise and pound foolish. Failure to approve this measure will provoke profound short- and long-term problems which we cannot afford.

I might add that I have been given an analysis from our CIA and our Defense Intelligence Agency within the past few months to inform me if there is a single Soviet space program that does not have a total military application, and the answer from both agencies is that every Soviet space program is totally geared toward military use and power projection. The only space programs proceeding right now that have any peaceful applications are our U.S. Programs, particularly our Space Shuttle program, hence, the enthusiastic joining of our European friends to our efforts. I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on H.R. 1787.

□ 1715

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GRISHAM).

Mr. GRISHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the pending legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Space Shuttle system is vitally important to our Nation. It is the first reusable launch system designed for routine, economical access to the Earth's orbit. The requested supplemental authorization of \$185 million is crucial to the efficiency and continued success of the Space Shuttle program. The need for additional funding has arisen from many complex and technical problems encountered in the development, manufacturing, and testing of Space Shuttle systems.

Fiscal year 1979 is critical in the development program leading to the first launch which will take place later this year.

Disapproval of the requested supplemental authorization would have a severe and adverse impact on the Space Shuttle program, related NASA programs, and would extend to all users of Shuttle launch services. When taken together, the total cost increase would exceed \$1 billion.

A lack of supplemental funding would require immediate layoffs affecting approximately 20,000 of 42,000 jobs nationwide.

In addition, major uncertainties would be injected into the Shuttle program if we fail to take positive action today. First, we cannot predict the amount of time that would be required for a revised program. Second, the impact of any delay on the economic environment of the many plants involved in the shuttle program cannot as yet be accurately gaged. Finally, the ability of contractors and subcontractors to rehire the technical workforce after dislodging them from the program is open to serious question.

Without this supplemental authorization, the first orbital test flight would be delayed 6 months, at an additional cost to the taxpayers of \$300 million to \$400 million.

It is important to note that future orbiters are dependent on a reasonable flow of activity following the initial test flight. Any delay in the program would cause inefficiencies in production flow and orbiter deliveries would be delayed between 6 months and 1 year. A \$100 to \$200 million increase in the total cost of these orbiters will be the result.

Mr. Chairman, in 1971, the total cost estimate for the Space Shuttle program was \$5.15 billion. Today, the estimate, in 1971 dollars, is \$5.654 billion—an increase of less than 10 percent. This is certainly an outstanding track record.

To delay the program now—with full knowledge of the additional costs inherent in such a delay—would be both unnecessary and irresponsible.

I shall vote for the passage of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON).

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, it has been my distinct privilege and pleasure to join the distinguished ranking

minority member of this subcommittee and the distinguished chairman of the committee in a tour of the NASA facilities at New Orleans. I can attest, having made various trips to that facility and having studied the details of its operation, that the program being discussed on the floor is an outstanding one, one that will provide benefits to this Nation for many years to come.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse it, and I urge the Members of this body to accept and to ratify this request.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS).

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Florida for yielding this time to me. I hope that he will think it is in ill grace for me to oppose the particular legislation that he has brought before us.

Mr. Chairman, as I listen to all the justifications as to why this additional \$185 million ought to be approved and adopted without any question or any qualm at all, I think back to only yesterday when this House turned down an opportunity to prevent \$24 million from being rescinded for nurses training.

I think back to the effort of the administration and the current budget to cut back feeding programs for children, breakfast and lunch programs, by 10 percent.

I think back to the statement that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford) made earlier today on this floor when he pointed out that the administration in an effort to save some \$120 million this year is undercutting the commitments that were made to students in the middle-income students assistance program.

I think back to the efforts being made to cut back social security, to cut back the funding for older Americans programs. Every social welfare program, every domestic program, every educational program that this Congress has to deal with has been and is in the process of being or will be cut back and will be cut back with the enthusiastic support of most of those, at least on the other side of the aisle who today have been telling us that we cannot afford not to approve this \$185 million.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to really take a very hard look at what it is that we propose to do. We ought to take a look at the conditions people in this country find themselves in, look at the proposals of the lean and austere budget which has been preached to us and to see where our order of priorities is and ought to be.

If we take that kind of hard look, I am convinced we will conclude that we ought not to approve this additional \$185 million, that we ought not to throw the budget further out of kilter by that \$185 million and rather use that \$185 million for programs that are desperately needed to allow our neediest of American citizens to survive in this age of rampant inflation.

□ 1720

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we will have an occasion to have a recorded vote on this measure. As on all other measures which will tend to highlight where the Members of this body really have their commitments. It seems to me that it is fine to talk about balancing the budget in order to cut inflation when we are talking about programs to help people. It is another matter apparently when the effort is to add to the budget and throw the budget further out of kilter when we are talking about exotic gimmickry.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that many of the Members of this body take a very good and hard look at what we are about to do when it comes to a final vote on this measure and will vote no.

Mr. WYDLER. Would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WEISS. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman if it is satisfactory to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology.

Mr. WYDLER. It is your decision.

Mr. WEISS. He gave me the time.

I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman has raised a good point. All of us here in the House are going to have to make some very hard decisions in the months ahead on budget priorities and what we think is important and what we do not think is important. For example, we all know that the President has committed our country to sums that I hear are up to \$5 billion or \$10 billion to countries in the Middle East so they can enter into a peace agreement. We will be called upon in this House and on this floor to vote yes or no on that.

Mr. WEISS. I would like to take back the balance of my brief and limited period of time. I have but 5 minutes in total.

That point is extremely well taken. That is exactly the kind of order of priorities that we ought to be looking at. That is a priority that is in the best interest of this Nation and I think it is necessary for the best interests of this Nation. However, to talk about \$185 million as a supplemental authorization as if it were peanuts, so to speak, which is the way this discussion has been going on, I think is forgetting where we are and what we are about.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER).

Mr. WYDLER. I would like to pursue it with the gentleman because I do not think it is quite as simple as he tries to make it sound.

The fact of the matter is that it is a difficult vote for many Members of this House for many reasons. It is an important expenditure. Nobody would deny that. Yet people are going to have to weigh factors such as the following: The \$185 million essentially goes to America, to American working men and women, it goes to an important national product

which will benefit our country and the world. The other money goes to foreign countries, foreign governments and foreign people. Should we not give them a nickel of money until every dollar of social welfare programs are restored to our budget? Is that the standard we are to use in this House of Representatives? We are going to be called on to use some wisdom and some judgment on these matters.

I would only ask the gentleman try to think of that, not try to make it sound like anyone who tries to support this very important technological program for our country is ignoring the needs of the poor people or the people that are receiving benefits under social welfare programs.

The gentleman, too, is going to be called upon at times to vote for programs that do not even go to people in this country at the same time that some of these domestic programs cannot be fulfilled, every need met and so on. That is an unfortunate problem he faces and that I face and that every Member of this body faces. I do not think it really adds to the sum total of our knowledge here to try to make it seem that the people who are supporting those important plans and programs for a strong America in the future are ignoring the needs of the people that have very important needs at the present time.

□ 1725

Mr. Chairman it is not enough for the gentleman to point out what cuts were made in various programs he supports. I think the gentleman should point out how much was spent on those programs, how much was spent last year, and how much those programs might have been increased from year to year, in order to try to get some balance in what the Congress is doing and not put the Members of the House in the position of somehow being against poor people, which I do not think is the case.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1787, the supplemental authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN) have so ably stated, the authorization contained in this bill essential in order to prevent delays in the Space Shuttle program. The program is now in midstride, with both development and production proceeding simultaneously, and the delay, if incurred, will cost an estimated \$400 to \$600 million.

As the committee points out in its report, the total cost of the Space Shuttle development program has been kept within 10 percent of its original estimate in 1971 dollars. However, maintenance of this admirable cost record is contingent upon a December 1979 launch date. The launch, in turn, is contingent upon the supplemental funding authorized by this bill.

I think it is noteworthy that this authorization was unanimously approved

by the committee on a voice vote, and has also been approved by the Office of Management and Budget. It is also worth remembering that NASA expenditures are labor intensive, with approximately 85 percent going directly for jobs and the remainder for materials.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, this authorization is needed now in order to save taxpayers \$400 million down the road. It is a wise course of action, and I urge my colleagues to approve it.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Mr. MOORHEAD of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1787 and identify myself with the remarks of my colleagues who are supporting the authorization of the supplemental appropriation of \$185 million for the Space Shuttle program.

The reality of the situation is that it would be far more costly in the long-run if we do not provide the additional funds now when they are needed to maintain the momentum of the project. The estimated 20,000 job lay-offs that could result throughout the country without H.R. 1787 would possibly result in many of these people drawing unemployment benefits from the Treasury to sit idly for a few months until the next fiscal appropriation became available in October 1979. The estimate that failure to approve the \$185 million now could result in up to \$600 million in excess cost for the remainder of the program emphasizes the wisdom in approving this authorization at this time.

An unnecessary delay in launching the Space Shuttle would also have an adverse impact on the projected 10-year plan for launching future satellites and phasing out existing ones. Scheduling adjustments could be made but they are always costly.

The history of the management of the entire NASA space program, which has had only two other supplemental appropriation requests since 1958, gives me confidence that this request is not a result of careless or extravagant decisionmaking by the program planners.

This is the only supplemental funding request that has been made for the Space Shuttle program and it is rather amazing to observe how close to original projections the program has stayed considering its magnitude. Since 1971 the project would have had less than a 10-percent increase over the original estimate of \$5.150 billion—measured in 1971 dollars—even including the \$185 million we are considering today.

The major reasons for this funding request stem from problems incurred in the development of the Shuttle. The technological problems that must be solved in this kind of project are ones that have never been faced before and solutions must be invented. It is almost impossible to accurately estimate such costs, but it appears that the program planners have been able to come very close. It is not really necessary for me to reiterate the numerous technological benefits we have realized from spinoffs of

advanced scientific research that resulted from our earlier space programs. If we contemplate for a moment the development of computers, satellites, and cardiac pacemakers, we can envision the numerous benefits that have come with this project.

The detailed explanation offered by the Committee on Science and Technology of the expense that would result from a major delay of the program, makes H.R. 1787 a cost effective measure. I would like to urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1787.

□ 1730

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

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1787, authorizing supplemental appropriations for the Space Shuttle program in fiscal year 1979.

The Space Shuttle is the key element of a versatile, economical space transportation system that will provide a wide variety of national and international users with round-trip access to space. There is only a short time before its planned maiden flight.

So that the program can continue along its current schedule and sustain this country's leadership in space, I favor the approval of the request for supplemental funds of \$185 million.

The overall results of approving this request will far outweigh any near term economics that would result from non-approval.

The net cost increase eventually—if we do not approve this request—has been estimated to be more than \$1 billion. The program will be sidetracked seriously, major delays will result and confidence in the program will suffer. Substantial numbers of employees in many States will have to be laid off both at the major contractors and smaller subcontractors.

NASA examined various alternatives in order to avoid making this request such as reprogramming the funds from other programs in the agency, delaying the development even further, reallocating the funds from production and reducing program content. All of these alternatives were studied in great detail.

The \$185 million is too large for reprogramming from within NASA. Delaying development and production results in major cost penalties; and reductions in program content were not possible as previous reductions in content had been made in 1974, 1975 and 1976.

The supplemental is considered the only viable alternative at this stage of the program. I agree with and favor the supplemental's approval.

I urge passage of this legislation. ●

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, as ranking majority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, I rise in full support for this supplemental authorization bill, H.R. 1787. The Space Shuttle program is presently going through an extremely intense period of testing and demands our full support. What ever research and development problems uncovered during this crucial testing will

be overcome. I would like to put the emphasis on development, because that is where we are, we are developing the final product to be utilized for years to come. Mr. Chairman, through my years on the committee, I have learned the meaning of the words research and development. You must take your time, you must be thorough in your technical investigations, you must test and retest to assure the quality of the product. I support this supplemental authorization bill which allows NASA to continue with a balanced schedule and program and provides the confidence so sorely needed in the tough hours before you have the finished product.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for this bill has been explained by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, the Honorable DON FUQUA of Florida, so I will not dwell on them at this time but instead, lend my voice in approval of their bill and ask my colleagues to support it. Let us not tire, let us not be indecisive at a time when we are in this final phase of developing a program which will once again proclaim America's rightful status as No. 1 in space. Thank you Mr. Chairman for your consideration and I ask my colleagues to vote for passage of this bill. ●

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just like to point out again that 85 percent of the funds being requested in this supplemental for the Space Shuttle program, is for people. I would further like to point out that failure to pass this would necessitate some additional cost of some \$300 to \$400 million in follow-on orbiter deliveries being delayed for from 6 to 12 months. Furthermore, there would be a lay-off of people. The planned Space Shuttle transportation system and the payloads that have been committed to these payloads would further be delayed. It would mean the retooling of the tracking networks, the purchase of expendable launch vehicles, where the production lines have been shut down, and inordinate delay throughout the program.

This is the most efficient thing that we can do in order to proceed in an economical and prudent time frame. I urge the adoption of the bill.

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

H.R. 1787

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of subsection 1(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1979 (Public Law 95-401), is amended by striking out "\$1,443,300,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,628,300,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BELLESON, 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. 1787) to authorize a supplemental appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, pursuant to House Resolution 177, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 39, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—354

Abdnor	Carr	Foley
Addabbo	Chappell	Ford, Mich.
Akaka	Cheney	Forsythe
Albosta	Chisholm	Fountain
Alexander	Clausen	Fowler
Ambro	Cleveland	Frost
Anderson, Calif.	Clinger	Fuqua
Andrews, N.C.	Coelho	Garcia
Andrews, N. Dak.	Coleman	Glaimo
Annunzio	Collins, Ill.	Gilman
Anthony	Collins, Tex.	Gingrich
Applegate	Conte	Ginn
Archer	Corcoran	Glickman
Ashbrook	Corman	Goldwater
Ashley	Cotter	Gonzalez
Aspin	Coughlin	Gore
Atkinson	Courter	Gradison
AuCoin	Crane, Daniel	Grassley
Badham	Crane, Philip	Gray
Bafalis	D'Amours	Green
Balley	Daniel, Dan	Grisham
Baldus	Daniel, R. W.	Gudger
Barnard	Danielson	Guyer
Barnes	Dannemeyer	Hagedorn
Bauman	Davis, Mich.	Hall, Ohio
Beard, R.I.	Davis, S.C.	Hall, Tex.
Bellenson	de la Garza	Hamilton
Benjamin	Deckard	Hammer-
Bennett	Derrick	schmidt
Bereuter	Derwinski	Hance
Bevill	Devine	Hanley
Biaggi	Dickinson	Hansen
Bingham	Dicks	Harkin
Blanchard	Dingell	Harris
Boggs	Dixon	Harsha
Boland	Dornan	Heckler
Bolling	Dougherty	Hefner
Boner	Downey	Heftel
Bonior	Drinan	Hightower
Bonker	Duncan, Oreg.	Hillis
Bouquard	Duncan, Tenn.	Hinson
Bowen	Eckhardt	Holland
Brademas	Edwards, Ala.	Hollenbeck
Breaux	Edwards, Calif.	Holt
Brinkley	Edwards, Okla.	Hopkins
Broomfield	Emery	Horton
Brown, Calif.	English	Howard
Brown, Ohio	Erlenborn	Hubbard
Buchanan	Ertel	Huckaby
Burgener	Evans, Ga.	Eutto
Burleson	Fary	Hyde
Burton, Phillip	Fascell	Ichord
Butler	Fazio	Ireland
Byron	Ferraro	Jeffords
Campbell	Fish	Jeffries
Carney	Fithian	Jenkins
	Flippo	Jenrette
	Florio	Johnson, Calif.

Johnson, Colo.	Murphy, Ill.	Shuster
Jones, N.C.	Murphy, N.Y.	Simon
Jones, Tenn.	Murphy, Pa.	Skelton
Kazen	Murtha	Slack
Kelly	Myers, Ind.	Smith, Iowa
Kemp	Myers, Pa.	Smith, Nebr.
Kildee	Natcher	Snowe
Klindness	Neal	Snyder
Kramer	Nedzi	Solarz
Lagomarsino	Nelson	Solomon
Latta	Nichols	Spellman
Leach, Iowa	Nowak	Spence
Leach, La.	O'Brien	St Germain
Leath, Tex.	Oakar	Stangeland
Lee	Oberstar	Stanton
Leland	Ottinger	Steed
Lent	Pashayan	Stenholm
Levitas	Patten	Stockman
Lewis	Patterson	Stokes
Livingston	Paul	Stratton
Lloyd	Pease	Stump
Loeffler	Perkins	Swift
Long, La.	Peyser	Symms
Long, Md.	Pickle	Synar
Lott	Preyer	Tauke
Lowry	Price	Taylor
Lujan	Pritchard	Thomas
Luken	Pursell	Thompson
Lundine	Quayle	Traxler
Lungren	Quillen	Treen
McClary	Rahall	Trible
McCormack	Railsback	Udall
McDade	Rangel	Van Deerin
McDonald	Ratchford	Volkmer
McEwen	Regula	Walgren
McHugh	Rhodes	Walker
McKinney	Richmond	Wampler
Madigan	Rinaldo	Watkins
Markey	Ritter	Waxman
Marks	Roberts	White
Marlenee	Robinson	Whitehurst
Marriott	Rodino	Whitley
Martin	Roe	Whittaker
Mathis	Rose	Whitten
Matsui	Rostenkowski	Williams, Mont.
Mattox	Roth	Williams, Ohio
Mavroules	Rousselot	Wilson, C. H.
Mazzoli	Roybal	Winn
Mica	Rudd	Wirth
Mikulski	Sabo	Wolff, N.Y.
Miller, Calif.	Santini	Wolpe, Mich.
Mineta	Satterfield	Wright
Minish	Sawyer	Wyatt
Mitchell, N.Y.	Scheuer	Wydler
Moakley	Schroeder	Wylie
Moffett	Schulze	Yatron
Mollohan	Sebelius	Young, Alaska
Montgomery	Sensenbrenner	Young, Fla.
Moore	Shannon	Zablocki
Moorhead, Calif.	Sharp	Zeferetti
Moorhead, Pa.	Shelby	
	Shumway	

NAYS—39

Bedell	Ford, Tenn.	Nolan
Brodhead	Gephardt	Obey
Broyhill	Goodling	Panetta
Burton, John	Gramm	Reuss
Cavanaugh	Holtzman	Rosenthal
Clay	Hughes	Russo
Daschle	Jacobs	Seiberling
Dellums	Kastenmeier	Stack
Donnelly	Kostmayer	Stark
Early	Maguire	Studds
Erdahl	Miller, Ohio	Vento
Evans, Ind.	Mitchell, Md.	Weiss
Fenwick	Mottl	Yates

NOT VOTING—39

Anderson, Ill.	Flood	Michel
Beard, Tenn.	Frenzel	Mikva
Bethune	Gaydos	Pepper
Brooks	Gibbons	Runnels
Carter	Guarini	Staggers
Conable	Hawkins	Stewart
Conyers	Jones, Okla.	Ullman
Diggs	Kogovsek	Vander Jagt
Dodd	LaFalce	Vanik
Edgar	Lederer	Weaver
Evans, Del.	Lehman	Wilson, Bob
Findley	McCloskey	Wilson, Tex.
Fisher	McKay	Young, Mo.

□ 1750

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Beard of Tennessee.
Mr. Guarini with Mr. Frenzel.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Vander Jagt.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Flood with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Bethune.
Mr. Lederer with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Lehman with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Young of Missouri with Mr. Evans of Delaware.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Findley.
Mr. LaFalce with Mr. Kogovsek.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Vanik.
Mr. Stewart with Mr. Runnels.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. McKay.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Edgar.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Jones of Oklahoma.
Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Mikva.

Mr. STACK and Mrs. FENWICK changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRAISE FOR PRESIDENT CARTER FROM CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous achievement of our President in negotiating the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt has won the praises of leaders and governments throughout the world.

Today I have received from the Right Honorable John G. Diefenbaker, former Prime Minister of Canada, an excerpt from the debates of the Canadian House of Commons on March 7 in which a resolution of commendation of President Carter was considered and approved unanimously.

To the great relief of the world community the President's initiative at that perilous hour succeeded, and a peace treaty has now been signed here in Washington. The support and good will of Canada in this effort was and is an encouragement to President Carter and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, without objection I shall insert the excerpt from the House of Commons debates in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
March 7, 1979.

The House met at 2 p.m.

(1405)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ROLE OF PRESIDENT CARTER IN PEACE TALKS BETWEEN EGYPT AND ISRAEL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have already discussed this matter with the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and I hope the House will give its unanimous approval. I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43.

With Canadians being dedicated to the achievement of international peace, I move:

That this House commends United States President Carter for his courageous initiative in going personally to Egypt and Israel in his continuing endeavour to bring about peace between these two countries, and supporting his objectives, expresses the hope that through his unusual and statesmanlike endeavours a just and lasting peace will have been achieved.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In order for this motion to be presented at this time pursuant to Standing Order 43 the unanimous consent of the House would be required. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion by Mr. Diefenbaker, seconded by Mr. Jamieson. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION CONCURRING IN SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2534, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-75), on the resolution (H. Res. 183) concurring in Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 2534) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed.

NASA FISCAL YEAR 1980 AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1786) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1786), with Mr. BEILSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Fuqua) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Winn) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the past year has been of major significance in our civilian space program. The NASA Landsat sys-

tems, whose repetitive observation of Earth resources is producing large-scale direct benefits, underwent a major change in 1978 with the retirement of an older satellite and the launch of a much-improved replacement.

The original Landsat 1, which had been orbiting since 1972, was turned off on January 6. Two months later—on March 5—NASA successfully launched Landsat 3, which has substantially greater data-collecting capability than its predecessors. The system now consists of two active satellites, Landsat 3 and the 4-year-old Landsat 2. Together they cover virtually every spot on Earth every 9 days, relaying to Earth data which is converted to photolike images that offer great potential for improved management of Earth's resources.

A similar type of ocean-monitoring satellite, the Seasat 1, was launched June 26. An ocean survey satellite, Seasat was designed to explore the potential of a future operational system for such uses as ship routing, storm and iceberg avoidance, guiding fishing fleets to most productive waters, and warning of threatening coastal disasters. Seasat was only partially successful. After 99 days of operation, it suddenly stopped transmitting. The data sent during the active period was sufficient to meet most of the scientific objectives of the mission and provided for a limited evaluation of an operational system's potential.

An important step in NASA's planetary research program was the dual launch of Pioneer Venus spacecraft which are making an extensive reconnaissance of the neighbor planet.

NASA teams were also actively monitoring the progress of earlier launched interplanetary spacecraft. Voyagers 1 and 2, launched in the late summer of 1977, were en route to close encounters with the superplanet Jupiter. Voyager 1 has made its closest approach with spectacular results and Voyager 2 will rendezvous with Jupiter in July. Pioneer 11, which left Earth in 1973, will begin a closeup investigation of Saturn in September 1979.

Among NASA's other major launches in 1978 were these:

January 26: The International Ultraviolet Explorer, a joint NASA/European Space Agency/United Kingdom satellite.

August 12: ISEE-3, third of the International Sun-Earth Explorers.

October 13: Tiros N, a polar-orbiting experimental weather satellite for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

October 24: Nimbus 7, a research satellite designed to test sensors for oceanographic and meteorological monitoring.

November 13: HEAO-2, second of the High Energy Astronomy Observatories, which are mapping celestial X-ray sources.

NASA's 1978 plan called for launches of 25 spacecraft, 9 more than in the previous year. As was the case in 1977, most of the launches were "reimbursables" whose launch costs were paid back to NASA by payload sponsors. NASA's "customers" in 1978 included the European

Space Agency, the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, Comsat Corporation, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the U.S. Navy, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

The Space Shuttle headed the list of major systems in development status during 1978. The Space Shuttle main engine, the primary pacing factor in maintaining the development schedule, was successfully test fired as a single unit a number of times; full duration testing of the complete three-engine propulsion system was planned for early 1979. Three successful ground firings of the Shuttle's solid rocket boosters were accomplished. All elements of the Shuttle—the two solid boosters, the Shuttle Orbiter and its external main tanks—were mated together for the first time and put through a series of vibration tests to verify that the Shuttle's structure will perform as predicted.

Other major NASA programs in development status included:

Galileo, a dual unit spacecraft consisting of an orbiter and a planetary probe, to be launched in 1982 for an extensive survey of Jupiter.

Landsat D, the fourth and most advanced of the Landsat Earth resources monitoring satellites, to be launched in 1981.

Space Telescope, an advanced astronomical system which will permit observations far deeper into space than has ever before been possible.

Spacelab, a habitable space laboratory for human-directed experiments in orbit, which fits into the cargo bay of the Shuttle Orbiter. First Spacelab flight is targeted for 1980. The laboratory is being developed by European Space Agency.

This outstanding performance is not without its problems. No new programs are included in the NASA budget as proposed by the administration. The accomplishment of the logical follow-on program in space science and space applications will thus be delayed. Coupled with this a steady decline in the buying power of the dollar has drastically reduced ability to capitalize on our space expertise for practical benefits. I am including a table in the RECORD which demonstrates that in constant 1968 dollars the NASA budget in 1979 represented less than 50 percent of its buying power less than a decade ago.

NASA funds to industry* calendar years 1968-79

	[Millions of dollars]
1968	\$3,938
1969	3,177
1970	2,688
1971	2,361
1972	2,154
1973	1,869
1974	1,798
1975	1,770
1976	1,736
1977	1,679
1978	1,641
1979	1,653

*Source: AIA Report, 19788.

Constant dollars (1968=100).

It is significant that NASA continues to make important contributions to our quality of life and economic well-being under these circumstances.

In 1979, 11 of the 16 launches on NASA's schedule for 1979 are reimbursables, satellites launched by NASA for other agencies or corporations.

As was the case in 1978, most of the 1979 launches will emphasize the use of space for the direct benefit of people on Earth—communications and environmental and meteorological information. During 1978, the agency logged 20 launches—11 of them reimbursables for paying customers.

The paying customers for 1979 launches include the Department of Defense, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), The United Kingdom, Western Union Corp., Comsat Corp., and RCA.

The first orbital flight of the Space Shuttle, NASA's reusable space transportation vehicle, is scheduled at the earliest for November 1979. Astronauts John Young and Robert Crippen have been named as crew members on the first flight which will be launched from Kennedy Space Center, Fla., and land about 53 hours later at the NASA Dryden

Flight Research Center, Edwards, Calif.

Transition to the Space Shuttle will begin in 1980. There are substantial opportunities for our Nation in space beyond the content of this budget. It is my belief that this body will want to support a number of new initiatives in space in the years ahead. The fiscal year 1981 budget will test our resolve next year in maintaining a strong national space program.

In developing the bill before us today, I want to recognize the dedicated efforts of the members of the Committee on Science and Technology and in particular the members of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications. Each member of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle has made a significant contribution. As always, we can depend on the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for his knowledge and personal insight into the complex programs. His diligent effort continues to be of immeasurable help in establishing a sound bill and strong NASA program.

Again, I would like to commend all members of the committee who have so diligently worked on bringing this bill to the floor.

My remarks will be directed primarily to the actions taken by your Committee on Science and Technology as a result of the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation, and Communications, will cover those areas of aviation contained within H.R. 1786.

Mr. Chairman, I am including in the Record a table which summarizes the budget actions taken by the Committee on Science and Technology on the fiscal year 1980 NASA authorization request. I would like to point out that the NASA fiscal year 1980 request for the Space Shuttle program is \$1,366,000,000 and not the \$1,336,000,000 which appears in the original bill (H.R. 1786). The amount was incorrectly printed in the bill.

NASA BUDGET (H.R. 1786)

[In thousands of dollars]

Line item	Fiscal year 1979 House authori- zation	Fiscal year 1980 NASA request	Committee action	Line item	Fiscal year 1979 House authori- zation	Fiscal year 1980 NASA request	Committee action
1(a)(1) Space Shuttle.....	\$1,443,300	\$1,366,000	\$1,393,000	1(a)(10) Space research and technology.....	111,300	116,400	116,400
1(a)(2) Space flight operations.....	308,900	467,300	463,300	1(a)(11) Energy technology applications.....	6,000	3,000	3,000
1(a)(3) Expendable launch vehicles.....	71,500	70,700	70,700	1(a)(12) Tracking and data acquisition.....	304,400	332,800	323,800
1(a)(4) Physics and astronomy.....	285,500	337,500	337,500	Subtotal, Research and development.....	3,353,800	3,602,500	3,639,500
1(a)(5) Lunar and planetary exploration.....	187,100	220,200	220,200	Subtotal, construction of facilities.....	147,500	157,600	157,600
1(a)(6) Life sciences.....	40,600	43,900	43,900	Subtotal, research and program management.....	914,000	964,900	964,900
1(a)(7) Space applications.....	288,300	332,300	338,300	Total.....	4,415,300	4,725,000	4,762,000
1(a)(8) Technology utilization.....	14,600	12,100	12,100				
1(a)(9) Aero. research and development.....	292,300	300,300	308,300				

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications held a total of three hearings in September 1978, and 15 hearings in January, February, and March 1979, to review the NASA fiscal year 1978-79 budget performance, the fiscal year 1979 supplemental budget request, and the fiscal year 1980 authorization request. Testimony was taken from representatives of NASA, the U.S. Air Force, the European Space Agency, and members of the industrial and scientific community on NASA related programs. In addition, the full committee heard testimony in a hearing on the current NASA programs and a hearing on the President's civilian space policy. The aeronautical programs of NASA have been covered separately by the Subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation and Communications and will be reported on separately by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN).

The bill before us today, H.R. 1786, is to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1980. This bill was reported out by the committee on March 14, 1979, by unanimous roll call vote of those present. The committee report contains 17 views adopted by the full committee and one additional view.

For the benefit of the Members, I will summarize the bill and the actions taken.

NASA requested a new authorization of \$4,725,000,000 for fiscal year 1980. This amount is \$309,700,000 or 7 percent more than authorized by the House in fiscal year 1979. The actions recommended by the committee on the fiscal year 1980 budget would yield a net increase of \$37.0 million from the requested budget.

The committee recommends changes to seven line items. The total net dollar change to the NASA request is \$37.0 million which is comprised of \$42.0 million in increases and \$5.0 million in decreases as follows:

First. Space Shuttle. \$27 million increase for maintaining the option to purchase a 5th Space Shuttle Orbiter;

Second. Space flight operations. \$5 million decrease in subline items other than advanced programs; \$1.0 million increase in advanced programs for studies for a large deployable antenna demonstration.

Third. Space applications. \$2 million increase for initiating development of a multispectral resource sampler; \$4.0 million increase for initiating development of a National Oceanic Satellite System.

Fourth. Aeronautical research and

technology. \$8 million increase for augmentation of the variable cycle engine component program.

In addition, two new subsections 1b(6) and 1b(14) were added to the bill, removing maintenance projects from subsections 1b(16) (A) and (C) of the original bill with appropriate redesignation of subsections. This language change properly identifies maintenance project at the Kennedy Space Center and Michoud assembly facility.

The administration requested and the committee endorses two additional changes in existing law in sections 6 (a) and (b) of the bill. Sections 6(a) increases from \$5,000 to \$25,000 the amount of claims which the Administrator of NASA may settle on behalf of the Government. Section 6(b) provides for insurance and indemnification required in the Space Shuttle era for multiple payload users.

The committee has also included in the report accompanying the bill certain oversight findings and recommendations relating to international space activities.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am including in the Record a table which summarizes the budget actions of the committee for fiscal year 1980.

FISCAL YEAR 1980 NASA AUTHORIZATION BILL—H.R. 1785 COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Subline	Line Item	Fiscal year 1979 House authorization	Fiscal year 1980 NASA request	Committee action	Remarks
1(a)(1).....	Space Shuttle.....	1,443,300	1,366,000	1,393,000	+\$27M—Maintains option for 5th Orbiter. —\$5M—Reduction.
1(a)(2).....	Space flight operations.....	308,900	467,300	463,300	+\$1M—Advanced programs (large deployable antenna demonstration studies).
1(a)(3).....	Expendable launch vehicles.....	71,500	70,700	70,700	No change.
1(a)(4).....	Physics and astronomy.....	285,500	337,500	337,500	Do.
1(a)(5).....	Planetary exploration.....	187,100	220,200	220,200	Do.
1(a)(6).....	Life sciences.....	40,600	43,900	43,900	Do.
1(a)(7).....	Space applications.....	288,300	332,300	338,300	+\$2M—Multispectral resources sampler. +\$4M—National Oceanic satellite system.
1(a)(8).....	Technology utilization.....	14,600	12,100	12,100	Do.
1(a)(9).....	Aeronautical research and technology.....	292,300	300,300	308,300	+\$8M—Variable cycle engine component pro- gram.
1(a)(10).....	Space research and technology.....	111,300	116,400	116,400	No change.
1(a)(11).....	Energy technology applications.....	6,000	3,000	3,000	Do.
1(a)(12).....	Tracking and data acquisition.....	304,400	332,800	332,800	Do.
Subtotal, research and devel- opment.....		3,353,800	3,602,500	3,639,500	+\$37M—R&D.
1(b)(1).....	Ames Research Center, modification of static test facility.....		2,900	2,900	No change.
1(b)(2).....	Hugh L. Dryden Flight Research Center, construction of large aircraft maintenance.....		1,500	1,500	Do.
1(b)(3).....	Johnson Space Flight Center, Ellington Air Force Base, re- habilitation and modification of flight operations facilities.....		1,760	1,760	Do.
1(b)(4).....	Kennedy Space Center, modifications to central instrumenta- tion facility.....		1,260	1,260	Do.
1(b)(5).....	Kennedy Space Center, modifications to operations and check- out building.....		950	950	Do.
1(b)(6).....	Kennedy Space Center, roof rehabilitation, launch control complex.....			600	+\$0.6M—Transferred from Space Shuttle facil- ities launch complex 39, 1(b)(18).
1(b)(7).....	Langley Research Center, modifications of model support system 8-foot high temperature structures tunnel.....		1,410	1,410	No change.
1(b)(8).....	Langley Research Center, modifications to 8-foot transonic pressure tunnel.....		2,000	2,000	Do.
1(b)(9).....	Langley Research Center, modification of transonic dynamics tunnel.....		970	970	Do.
1(b)(10).....	Langley Research Center, rehabilitation and modification of gas dynamics laboratory.....		3,600	3,600	Do.
1(b)(11).....	Lewis Research Center, modifications to central air system, various buildings.....		5,720	5,720	Do.
1(b)(12).....	Marshall Space Flight Center, modifications to various buildings.....		2,640	2,640	Do.
1(b)(13).....	Marshall Space Flight Center, rehabilitation of roofs, various buildings.....		900	900	Do.
1(b)(14).....	Michoud assembly facility, rehabilitation of roof, phase I, building 103.....			3,100	+\$3.1M—Transferred from Space Shuttle facilities, 1(b)(18) Michoud assembly facility.
1(b)(15).....	Wallops Flight Center, construction of facilities operations shop building.....		1,100	1,100	No change.
1(b)(16).....	Langley Research Center, large aeronautical facility; construc- tion of national transonic facility.....		12,000	12,000	Do.
1(b)(17).....	Ames Research Center, large aeronautical facility; modifica- tion of 40 by 80 foot subsonic wind tunnel.....		33,900	33,900	Do.
1(b)(18).....	Space Shuttle facilities at various locations as follows: a. Modifications to launch complex 39, John F. Kennedy Space Center.....		17,700	17,100	—\$0.6M—Transferred to separate line item.
	b. Modifications to crawler transporter maintenance facility, John F. Kennedy Space Center.....		1,250	1,250	No change.
	c. Modification of manufacturing and final assembly facilities for external tanks, Michoud assembly facility.....		10,000	6,900	—\$3.1M—Transferred to separate line item.
	d. Minor Shuttle—Unique projects various locations.....		2,500	2,500	No Change.
1(b)(19).....	Space Shuttle payload facilities at various locations as follows: a. Rehabilitation and modification for payload ground support operations, John F. Kennedy Space Center.....		2,610	2,610	Do.
	b. Modification and addition to materials sciences lab- oratory, Ames Research Center.....		1,640	1,640	Do.
1(b)(20).....	Repair of facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$500,000 per project.....		12,000	12,000	Do.
1(b)(21).....	Rehabilitation and modification of facilities at various loca- tions, not in excess of \$500,000 per project.....		19,790	19,790	Do.
1(b)(22).....	Minor construction of new facilities at various location, not in excess of \$250,000 per project.....		3,500	3,500	Do.
1(b)(23).....	Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for.....		14,000	14,000	Do.
Subtotal, construction of facilities.....		147,500	157,600	157,600	No dollar changes.—Redistribution changes only.
1(c)(1), subtotal, research and program management.....		2,914,000	964,900	964,900	No change.
SUMMARY					
Research and development.....		3,353,800	3,602,500	3,639,500	+\$37M.
Construction of facilities.....		147,500	157,600	157,600	No dollar changes—Redistribution changes only.
Research and program management.....		2,914,000	964,900	964,900	No change.
Total.....		6,415,300	4,725,000	4,762,000	+\$37M.

¹ Does not include 1979 Supplemental Request of \$185,000,000. Requested in separate legisla-
tion, H.R. 1787.

² Does not include supplemental for pay raise.

³ Does not include fiscal year 1979 supplemental request of \$185,000,000 requested in separate
legislation H.R. 1787.

⁴ Does not include supplemental for pay raise.

At the appropriate time, I plan to offer a technical amendment to section 6 of H.R. 1786 which would make section 6 effective on October 1, 1979, and will bring the bill in conformance with the provisions of section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

I urge adoption of the bill as recommended by your Committee.

For use of the Members, a budget

analysis for the NASA programs is included in the RECORD.

NASA BUDGET ANALYSIS

BUDGET OVERVIEW

Fiscal year 1979 operation plan (See Chart I)

1. The primary difference which exists between the final appropriation for the current year (Fiscal Year 1979) and the Operating Plan result from the proposed fiscal year 1979 supplemental budget request of

\$185,000,000 for the Space Shuttle and the proposed 1979 supplemental of \$30,969,000 for the October 1978 pay increase.

2. Small decreases from the authorized amounts in Research and Development programs including Space Flight Operations, Expendable Launch Vehicles, Space Science, Space and Terrestrial Applications, Aeronautics and Space Technology and Tracking and Data Acquisition have been made to adjust to a \$45.4 million decrease from the amount authorized to the amount appropriated for Research and Development.

CHART I—NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, FISCAL YEAR 1979 OPERATING PLAN SUMMARY OF NEW OPERATIONAL AUTHORITY

(In millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1979 budget request	Authorization	Appropriation	Current operating plan		Fiscal year 1979 budget request	Authorization	Appropriation	Current operating plan
Research and development					Research and development				
Space transportation systems.....	1,827.7	1,833.2		2,009.5	Aeronautics and space technology.....	375.4	391.4		376.4
Space shuttle.....	1,439.3	1,443.3		¹ 1,628.3	Aeronautical research and technology.....	264.1	275.1		264.1
Space flight operations.....	311.9	315.9		309.7	Space research and technology.....	108.3	111.3		107.3
Expendable launch vehicles.....	76.5	74.0		71.5	Energy technology.....	3.0	5.0		5.0
Space science.....	513.2	515.2		505.4	Tracking and data acquisition.....	305.4	305.4		302.0
Physics and astronomy.....	285.5	285.5		282.9	Research and development total.....	3,305.1	3,337.6	3,292.2	3,477.2
Planetary exploration.....	187.1	187.1		182.4	Construction of facilities.....	152.5	150.0	147.5	147.5
Life sciences.....	40.6	42.6		40.1	Research and program management.....	914.0	914.0	910.5	² 941.5
Space and terrestrial applications.....	283.4	292.4		283.9	Total NASA.....	4,371.6	4,401.6	4,350.2	4,566.2
Space applications.....	274.3	280.3		274.8					
Technology utilization.....	9.1	12.1		9.1					

¹ Includes proposed supplemental of \$185,000,000 for the Space Shuttle.

² Includes proposed supplemental of \$30,969,000 for October 1978, pay increase.

Reduction in NASA budget by Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

The following tabulation (Chart II) shows the fiscal year 1980 NASA request to OMB, the Budget requests to Congress, and a comparison with the fiscal year 1979 Operating Plan (Chart I). The remarks column defines reductions made by OMB. Of particular note are the following reductions.

1. Reduction of Advanced Programs and planning for potential future space transportation capabilities.

2. Deletion of funding for initial procurement of four standard spacecraft.

3. Deletion of funds to initiate a Gamma Ray Observatory—a proposed mission to conduct a whole sky survey in the electromagnetic spectrum.

4. Deletion of funds for initiation of the Venus Orbiting Imaging Radar—a proposed mission to determine surface characteristics of Venus globally and to make atmospheric and plasma physics measurements.

5. Reduction in space science supporting research and technology including Sounding rockets, Airborne research, balloon research and planetary exploration research and analysis activities.

6. Deletion of funds to initiate development of advanced remote sensor instrument using multilinear array technology.

7. Deletion of funds for initiation of proposed development of satellite system for ocean observations—the National Ocean Satellite System.

8. Reduction in Space Applications supporting research and technology activities

including resource observation and environmental observation research and data analysis, upper atmosphere research, materials processing research and data analysis, and advanced communications research.

9. Deletion of funding of some Space Research and Technology activities including Efficient Sensor Technology, Space Structures Technology and reduction of funds for Space Technology Flight Experiments.

10. No funds requested or included for Solar Power Satellite space related technology.

11. Deletion of funding for proposed improvement of data processing capabilities to meet future Spacelab mission requirements.

12. Deletion of funding for a number of Construction of Facility projects.

CHART II

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION REDUCTIONS TO NASA REQUEST, FISCAL YEAR 1980 BUDGET

(In millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1979 operating plan	Fiscal year 1980 budget request OMB	Reductions	Fiscal year 1980 budget request to Congress	Remarks
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT					
Space Shuttle.....	1,628.3	1,366.0		1,366.0	
Design, development, test and evaluation.....	¹ 1,170.3	610.5		610.5	Provides for effort toward 1st orbital flight in 1979 and development test flights during 1980.
Production.....	458.0	755.5		755.5	Provides for effort toward a national fleet of operational orbiters.
Space flight operations.....	308.7	473.3	-6.0	467.3	
Advanced programs.....	7.0	18.0	-5.0	13.0	Reduction in proposed advanced planning for potential future space transportation capabilities.
Space Shuttle thrust augmentation.....		16.0	-1.0	15.0	Adjustment to estimate. Emphasis on fiscal year 1980 to be on definition and verification activities.
Other space flight operations activities.....	302.7	439.3		439.3	
Expendable launch vehicles.....	71.5	70.7		70.7	
Standard spacecraft and equipment.....		13.8	-13.8		Deletion of funding for initial procurement of 4 standard spacecraft.
Physics and astronomy.....	282.9	375.1	-37.6	337.5	Deletion of funds to initiate proposed mission to conduct a whole-sky survey in the highest energy region of the electromagnetic spectrum.
Gamma ray observatory.....		15.4	-15.4		Reduction in fiscal year 1980 funding for development multiuser instruments for use on future Spacelab missions.
Spacelab payload development.....	² 34.9	44.2	-2.9	41.3	Deletion of funds proposed for initiation of research effort using existing facilities to search for indications of extra-terrestrial intelligence.
Search for extra-terrestrial intelligence.....		2.8	-2.8		Reductions to hold program within constrained funding level.
Sounding rockets.....	22.2	25.4	-3.7	21.7	
Airborne research.....	4.6	5.7	-1.7	4.0	Do.
Balloon research.....	² 2.5	2.4	-1.2	1.2	Do.
Supporting research and technology.....	19.3	27.4	-5.9	21.5	Do.
Other research and data analysis.....	² 25.1	16.8	-4.0	12.8	Do.
Other physics and astronomy projects.....	174.3	235.0		235.0	

	Fiscal year 1979 operat- ing plan	Fiscal year 1980 budget request OMB	Reductions	Fiscal year 1980 budget request to Congress	Remarks
Planetary exploration.....	182.4	238.0	-17.8	220.2	
Venus orbiting imaging radar.....		10.0	-10.0		Deletion of funds for initiation of proposed mission to determine surface characteristics of Venus globally and to make atmospheric and physics measurements.
Research and analysis.....	44.4	52.9	-7.8	45.1	Reduction in proposed funding in the areas of planetary materials, geochemistry, astronomy, geology and mission planning within constrain funding level.
Other planetary exploration projects.....	138.0	175.1		175.1	
Life sciences.....	40.1	48.5	-4.6	4.39	Reduction in proposed funding for life science flight experiments and advanced mission planning.
Applications.....	274.8	367.7	-35.4	332.2	
Agricultural research.....		7.5	-4.1	3.4	Inclusion of top priority crop forecasting and early warning activities, but deletion of funding for related activities in forestry, pollution monitoring, and land use.
Multispectral resources sampler.....		2.2	-2.2		Deletion of funds to initiate proposed development of advanced remote sensor instrument using multilinear array technology.
Resources observations research and data analysis.....	22.1	32.0	-1.6	30.4	Reduction of proposed enhancement of research and data analysis within overall funding constraint.
National oceanic satellite system.....		15.0	-15.0		Deletion of funds for initiation of proposed development of satellite system for ocean observations as part of a joint effort with NOAA and DOD.
Environmental observations Spacelab payloads.....	7.7	8.9	-1.5	7.4	Reduction in proposed funding for development of experimental remote sensing instruments to be tested on Spacelab missions.
Environmental observations research and data analysis.....	33.9	53.6	-3.7	49.9	Reduction in proposed effort to remain within funding constraints.
Upper atmosphere research.....	(*)	18.1	-2.9	15.2	Do.
Technology transfer.....	11.0	11.3	-1.0	10.3	Do.
Materials processing research and data analysis.....	4.4	8.7	-1.8	6.9	Do.
Advanced communications research.....		5.0	-1.6	3.4	Reduction in proposed research, design and experimental test of technology for future satellite communications.
Other applications projects.....	195.7	205.4		205.4	
Technology utilization.....	19.1	14.1	-2.0	12.1	Deletion of funding for proposed enhancement of bioengineering technology efforts.
Aeronautical research and technology.....	264.1	326.5	-26.2	300.3	
Research and technology base.....	109.2	129.5	-12.0	117.5	Deletion of funds for proposed increase in far term oriented aeronautical research effort.
Advanced rotorcraft systems technology.....		11.2	-11.2		Deletion of funding proposed for focused research and technology to provide a basis for significant improvements in future rotorcraft designs.
Advanced propeller research.....		3.0	-3.0		Deletion of funds for proposed development and demonstration of advanced propeller technology for future turboprop aircraft.
Other aeronautics projects.....	154.9	182.8		182.8	
Space research and technology.....	107.3	137.2	-20.8	116.4	Deletion of funding proposed for increased long-term research activities in key areas of space technology.
Research and technology base.....	71.8	81.1	-4.0	77.1	
Advanced communications research.....		3.0	-4.4	2.6	
Efficient sensor technology.....		4.7	-4.7		Deletion of funding for proposed development and demonstration of technology for detectors and sensors with greater sensitivity, longer life and lower cost.
Space structures technology.....	2.3	7.5	-3.0	4.5	Reduction of proposed funding for development and ground testing of advanced space structure concepts.
Composites for advanced transportation systems.....	1.5	2.3	-1.6	.7	Reduction in funding proposed for system technology effort on use of composite materials in space structures.
Space technology flight experiments.....	16.6	25.2	-7.1	18.1	Reduction in proposed funding development of space technology flight experiments.
Other space research and technology projects.....	15.1	13.4		13.4	
Energy technology.....	5.0	5.0	-2.0	3.0	Reduction in proposed funding for identification and verification of technology applicable to energy needs.
Tracking and data acquisition.....	302.0	344.5	-11.7	332.8	
GSFC computer replacement.....		1.6	-1.6		Deferral of procurement of replacement computers.
Additional staffing for laser site operations.....		1.8	-1.8		Deletion of proposed funding to provide additional shifts for operation of laser tracking facilities.
Spacelab data processing capability—GSFC.....		7.2	-7.2		Deletion of funding for proposed improvement of data processing capabilities to meet future Spacelab missions requirements.
Support for Venus orbiting imaging radar mission.....		1.1	-1.1		Deletion of support consistent with deletion of proposed mission.
Other tracking and data projects.....	302.0	332.8		332.8	
Total research and development.....	3,477.2	3,780.4	-177.9	3,602.5	

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

Modification of High Energy Fuels Laboratory—LeRC.....	1.0	-1.0			Deletion of funding for modification of laboratory for testing of materials for high temperature aircraft engine turbine blades.
Spacelab Data Processing Facility—GSFC.....	4.9	-4.9			Deferral of facility to house data processing equipment required for support of future Spacelab missions.
Energy conservation projects at 6 centers.....	7.9	-7.9			Deletion of funding for energy conservation modifications.
Planning for numerical aerodynamic simulation facility.....	4.2	-2.2		2.0	Reduction of funding proposed for study and design effort on an advanced aerodynamic simulation facility.

¹ Includes proposed supplemental appropriation of \$185,000,000.

² Fiscal year 1979 amounts for upper atmospheric research activities which are transferred to applications in the fiscal year 1980 budget: Spacelab payloads \$1,000,000; balloon research \$1,000,000; other research and analysis \$12,500,000; total \$14,500,000.

MAJOR PROGRAMS COST TO COMPLETION

The estimated "run-out" or cost to completion for major NASA programs is

provided in chart III. With the exception of the Space Shuttle development no major cost increases have occurred.

Other increases are generally associated with changes in program scope and with inflation.

CHART III.—ESTIMATED PROJECT TOTAL COST

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Original development estimate			Current estimate range	Original development estimate			Current estimate range
Date	Range			Date	Range		
Space Shuttle D.D.T. & E.....	March 1972	\$5,150	\$5,654	Galileo (formerly JOP) development.....	August 1978	275-295	275-295
High Energy Astronomy Observatory (HEAO).....	October 1974	200-220	230-250	Galileo Mission operations and data analysis.....	August 1978	150-170	150-170
Solar Maximum Mission (SMM).....	April 1977	75-90	75-90	Tiros-N.....	February 1974	40-50	45-50
Space Telescope (ST).....	February 1978	435-470	485-520	Nimbus-7.....	July 1975	65-85	75-80
International Solar Polar Mission (ISPM) development.....	(*)	190-230	190-30	Landsat-D.....	January 1979	330-350	330-350
ISPM Mission operations and data analysis.....	(*)	40-50	40-50	Seasat.....	July 1975	65-75	75-80
Voyager (MJS 1977).....	May 1974	280-320	325-350	Search and Rescue.....	(*)	20-24	20-24
Pioneer Venus.....	December 1974	150-190	160-19	Earth radiation budget experiment (ERBE).....	(*)	70-85	70-85
				Halogen occultation experiment (HALOE).....	(*)	20-26	20-26

¹ In 1971 dollars.

² Increase in range attributable to unanticipated inflation is estimated at \$3,030,000 to \$5,000,000.

³ In fiscal year 1980 budget dollars; \$435,000,000 to \$470,000,000 in fiscal year 1978 budget dollars. Difference is attributable to inflation adjustment.

⁴ Planning estimate; development estimate not yet available.

⁵ Planning estimate; development estimate will be established after completion of contractual negotiations and Memorandum of Understanding with France and Canada.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

The unobligated balances for the budget line items (chart IV) as of Sep-

tember 30, 1979, at the end of the fiscal year 1978, were within amounts con-

sidered normal for carryover to the current fiscal year.

CHART IV.—NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1978 and prior unob- ligated balance Sept. 30, 1978	Fiscal year 1979 and prior unob- ligated balance as of Dec. 31, 1978	Estimated unobligated balance Sept. 30, 1979		Fiscal year 1978 and prior unob- ligated balance Sept. 30, 1978	Fiscal year 1979 and prior unob- ligated balance as of Dec. 31, 1978	Estimated unobligated balance Sept. 30, 1979
Research and development:				Energy technology applications.....	.5	4.4	
Space Shuttle.....	3.7	971.2		Tracking and data acquisition.....	21.5	214.6	
Space flight operations.....	23.5	242.9		Standards and practices.....	2.6	10.6	
Expendable launch vehicles.....	33.9	94.7		Total research and development.....	240.4	2,507.7	
Physics and astronomy.....	35.4	235.0		Construction of facilities.....	93.4	189.7	73.6
Lunar and planetary.....	30.9	162.5		Research and program management.....		670.0	
Life sciences.....	12.2	45.0		Total NASA.....	333.8	3,367.4	73.6
Space applications.....	26.3	212.7					
Technology utilization.....	3.3	10.6					
Aeronautics research and technology.....	37.3	227.3					
Space research and technology.....	9.3	76.2					

Note: All research and development and research and program management funds are planned for obligation by the end of fiscal year 1979. Historically, however, there remains a relatively small amount of R. & D. funds in the procurement pipeline which is technically unobligated at the end of the fiscal year. This amount, statistically equivalent to a few weeks of procurement activity is obligated in the next fiscal year. These amounts in the procurement pipeline have no impact

on the following fiscal year requirements. For construction of facilities, it is estimated that \$110,700,000 of the fiscal year 1979 appropriation of \$147,500,000 will be obligated in fiscal year 1979, leaving a planned unobligated balance of \$36,800,000. In addition, \$36,800,000 of prior appropriations are estimated to be unobligated at the end of the year.

INFLATION EFFECT ON NASA BUDGET

The effect of inflation on the buying power of the NASA dollar is shown in chart V. Note that the \$4.725 billion

budget request in fiscal year 1980 represents \$3.441 billion in terms of 1976 dollars. These figures indicate that the

increase in actual funding levels over the past several years have not fully offset the effect of inflation on NASA activities.

CHART V.—EFFECT OF INFLATION ON TOTAL NASA BUDGET PURCHASING POWER (ASSUMES FLEXIBLE ADHERENCE TO ADMINISTRATION WAGE AND PRICE GUIDELINES)

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	Fiscal year—					4-yr		Fiscal year—					4-yr
	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	change		1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	change
Actual budget authority.....	\$3.552	\$3.846	\$4.064	\$4.566	\$4.725	-----	Inflation Factors (percent).....	10.0	7.7	7.9	7.4	+37.3	
Budget Authority in terms of constant fiscal year 1976 dollars, based on NASA Index.....	3.552	3.496	3.430	3.570	3.441	-----	Real change in actual NASA purchasing power (percent).....	-1.6	-1.9	+4.1	-3.6	-3.1	

NASA has also provided the following discussion of their inflation forecast:

Our inflation forecast through FY 1980 is based on a continuing survey of cost data relevant to the goods and services purchased with the NASA budget. Since our purchases are highly labor intensive, we use the aerospace industry wage salary and benefit cost projections supplemented by econometrics (Data Resources Inc.) forecasts for items such as utilities, materials, test equipment, facilities and overhead "other" costs. Our calculations are adjusted to reflect the Administration's Price and Wage Guidelines policies. Since it is too early to predict how closely they will be observed, we have developed a range of NASA inflation projections from fairly rigid to more flexible adherence to those guidelines.

Our current forecasts for the effects of inflation on NASA purchases are shown below:

[In percent]

	FY 1979	FY 1980
Total NASA budget.....	7.4-7.9	7.1-7.4
R&D budgets (such as Shuttle).....	7.8-8.5	7.5-7.9

Indexes such as the GNP deflator and CPI are not adequate measures of NASA inflation because they measure the cost changes of goods and services traded on the economy that typically have the benefit of highly capitalized mass production and other economies of scale to help offset labor compensation increases. The bulk of NASA activities involve labor intensive research and development efforts and the cost of these

activities directly reflects the increase in average labor compensation.

While aerospace, as well as national compensation exceed GNP deflator and CPI growth over the long pull, there are periods when compensation growth is lower or not much higher.

The effect of inflation on the Space Shuttle program using the lower of the above rates is displayed below:

[In millions of dollars]

Original development estimate in 1971 dollars.....	5,150
Increases in development estimate resulting from budget, program and schedule changes.....	504
Revised estimate in 1971 dollars.....	5,654
Inflation adjustment to FY 1980 budget dollars.....	2,088
Estimate in FY 1980 budget dollars.....	7,742
Additional inflation adjustment through completion assuming a future annual rate of 7%.....	13
Total estimate in real year dollars.....	7,755

Your committee reviewed the bill section by section. One language amendment is proposed of a technical nature to identify two construction of facility projects as separate line items.

In addition to the budget changes noted, your committee is recommending a number of views. These views encompass significant issues of emphasis and policy that your committee adopted and incorporated in the legislative report accompanying the bill.

The remainder of my comments provide in somewhat more detail recommended committee actions and recommended committee views.

Also included are findings and recommendations which are excerpted from a November 1978 Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications Report on International Space Activities and are included as oversight findings and recommendations of the full committee in the fiscal year 1980 NASA authorization report pursuant to clause 2(1)(3)(A), rule XI, and under the authority of rule X, clause 2(b)(1) and clause (3)(f), of the rules of the House of Representatives.

COMMITTEE ACTIONS

FIFTH SPACE SHUTTLE ORBITER

NASA requested \$1,366,000,000 for the Space Shuttle program in fiscal year 1980. Within this line item NASA requested \$755,500,000 to support production of a four orbiter fleet. The committee has continued to monitor very closely the development of the space transportation system mission model. We are encouraged with the apparent success with which the traffic model is being filled and have serious doubts that a total of four orbiters will be adequate. Theoretically, four would be adequate, however, it would not allow for sufficient schedule flexibility in the event of requirements for orbiter modifications or repairs. Therefore, to retain the option for the fifth Space Shuttle Orbiter, the committee increases the Space Shuttle line item

by \$27,000,000 for a total of \$1,393,000,000 in fiscal year 1980.

SPACE FLIGHT OPERATIONS

NASA requested \$467,300,000 for space flight operations programs in fiscal year 1980. Within this line item the committee made a reduction of \$5,000,000 to be taken in space transportation systems operations capability development; development, test and mission support; and space transportation system operations. The committee increased advanced programs by \$1,000,000 resulting in a total recommended authorization of \$463,300,000 for space flight operations programs in fiscal year 1980. The committee directs NASA to use the increased advanced programs funds for definition studies of a large deployable space antenna. Because of the diversity of potential uses for such a large antenna, the study should include necessary planning to assure multiagency participation. The committee further urges that NASA seek additional funding support from other agencies which can benefit most from the demonstration of a large antenna.

SPACE APPLICATIONS

NASA requested \$332,300,000 for space applications programs in fiscal year 1980. Within this line item, the committee increased resource observation programs by \$2,000,000 and environmental observation programs by \$4,000,000 resulting in a total recommended authorization of \$338,300,000 for space applications program in fiscal year 1980.

Resource observations. NASA requested \$141,400,000 for Resource Observation programs in fiscal year 1980. Within this subline item, the Office of Management and Budget reduced NASA's request for a multi-spectral-resources sampler by \$2,200,000. The committee believes there is a need for the development of an advanced remote sensor instrument using multilinear array technology which would have improved resolution and higher reliability. Therefore, the committee recommends an addition of \$2,000,000 to initiate development of a multi-spectral-resources sampler resulting in a total recommended authorization of \$143,400,000 for resource observation programs in fiscal year 1980.

Environmental observations. NASA requested \$117,200,000 for Environmental Observation programs in fiscal year 1980. Within this subline item, the Office of Management and Budget reduced NASA's request for a national oceanic satellite system by \$15,000,000 which is a follow-on to the SEASAT program. In an October 1977 report, the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications recommended a follow-on SEASAT in fiscal year 1979. In the fiscal year 1979 authorization report, the committee recommended a follow-on SEASAT program in fiscal year 1980. With the recent failure of SEASAT it is ever more important to initiate a follow-on SEASAT program. Therefore, the committee recommends an addition of \$4,000,000 to initiate development of a national oceanic satellite system resulting in a total recommended authorization of \$121,200,000 for environmental observations in fiscal year

1980. Additionally, the committee recommends that the instrument package for the national oceanic satellite system be reviewed to assess the requirements for a synthetic aperture radar and the benefits that would result from the inclusion of the synthetic aperture radar.

LANGUAGE AMENDMENT

SECTION 1(b)

Two new subsections 1b(6) and 1b(14), were added to identify projects necessary for the proper maintenance of facilities at the Kennedy Space Center and Michoud Assembly Facility, respectively. These projects were removed from subsections 1b(18) (A) and (C) which do not pertain to maintenance of facilities. Subsections of section 1(b) were redesignated accordingly.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

SPACE POLICY

The committee notes that the administration in the past year has enunciated a space policy and commends that action. To the extent that such a policy clarifies roles and encourages broad participation in space activities such policy statements can facilitate a full utilization of the space potential. However, the committee wishes to express concern that aspects of the stated policy may be interpreted as limiting or even preventing an orderly evolution of space program technology goals and objectives. Recognizing the significant contribution of our space program to our quality of life and economic well-being, the committee urges the administrator of NASA to consult with the Office of Science and Technology Policy to further clarify and assure that the national space policy as it is defined today does not lead to a further stagnation and decline in our civilian space program. Further, the committee urges that priority be given to assuring that meritorious new programs which have been totally eliminated from the fiscal year 1980 budget be included in fiscal year 1981.

SPACE SHUTTLE DEVELOPMENT

The Space Shuttle is reaching the final stage of development prior to a first orbital flight of the vehicle. The committee notes that complex programs such as the Space Shuttle cannot proceed without some degree of risk. The rigorous assessment of such risk cannot be totally defined. Knowing the subjective nature of such risk, NASA in Space Shuttle and past programs has included a highly disciplined test program to evaluate the capability of components and complete systems. It is the view of the committee that NASA has achieved a good balance in minimizing risk and in establishing the depth and extent of testing the various subsystems of the Space Shuttle. Recognizing that NASA will not knowingly compromise personnel safety, the committee encourages NASA at this juncture to resist the potential for overemphasizing component level testing at this time while maintaining a balanced approach to minimizing risk.

SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONAL PROGRAM ECONOMIES

One of the major congressional commitments made by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration at the

outset of the Space Shuttle development program was to provide a system capable of an "out of pocket" cost of \$10,500,000 (1971 dollars) per flight at flight rates of 60 missions per year. Fiscal year 1980 will be a critical time as NASA will complete the orbital flight tests of the Space Shuttle and should begin operational flights. Establishment of operational program goals and a Shuttle pricing policy have materially improved the precision of NASA management control and direction of Space Shuttle operational program planning. Achievement of the desired operational economies and cost per flight targets will require intensive management attention to reduce institutional costs and promote operational efficiencies for the transportation system. The committee encourages NASA to redouble efforts to achieve these goals.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

The committee is encouraged by the modest increase in the budget request for advanced programs studies. However, there continues to be reductions by the Office of Management and Budget in this budget category. The advanced program concept studies including the 25 KW power module, orbital transfer vehicles, large space structure construction, and advanced transportation systems are being significantly inhibited by continuing cutbacks in advanced programs.

The committee continues to see a need to conduct studies to define systems for future missions which will exploit Space Shuttle. The committee requests that creased emphasis is needed to provide for satellite retrieval, maintenance and repair—key areas for cost savings afforded by the Shuttle.

The committee urges increased emphasis in advanced programs planning with sufficient funding to allow for a logical systematic evolution of space initiatives to capitalize on the Space Shuttle. The committee requests that NASA submit a report which outlines strategies for future space programs to avoid NASA projected budget decreases and to avoid reductions in the institutional base at the NASA field centers.

The space transportation system is a national asset which will lead to expanded future space activities. In planning the advanced programs it is the position of the committee that the needs of all agencies be considered and that multi-agency participation be encouraged for major programs.

The committee specifically recommends initiation of the development of a 25 KW power module to extend the orbit stay-time and operational capabilities of the Space Shuttle and initiation of the development of a multi-use large deployable antenna system in fiscal year 1981.

SOLAR ELECTRIC PROPULSION SYSTEM

The committee supports the definition studies on a solar electric propulsion system (SEPS) in fiscal year 1980 in order to assure the availability of the system to support the combined Hally/Tempel 2 comet mission. The comet mission must be initiated in fiscal year 1982

in order to encounter Halley's comet which will not return for 76 years and provide the opportunity to explore what are believed to be the most primitive bodies available for studying solar system evolution. The solar electric propulsion system concept has been under evolutionary study for as long as NASA has been in existence. The committee urges NASA to take necessary action for a fiscal year 1981 new start to assure solar electric propulsion system availability for a Halley/Tempel 2 comet mission as well as for other high energy missions.

SPACE SCIENCE PROGRAMS

The committee is concerned by the lack of new starts in the physics and astronomy program and planetary exploration program for fiscal year 1980. The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 mandate for the expansion of human knowledge of phenomena in the atmosphere and space dictates a commitment to program continuity. Without new and challenging initiatives, the currently healthy character of NASA's space science activities cannot be sustained.

Physics and astronomy—The gamma ray observatory (GRO) has had extensive study by NASA to provide necessary follow-on to high energy physics investigations. The committee recognizes that the Office of Management and Budget refused NASA the gamma ray observatory start in fiscal year 1980. The committee strongly supports initiation of the gamma ray observatory no later than fiscal year 1981, consistent with the priorities established by NASA for high energy physics objectives. The committee expects that these objectives will be achieved in order to prevent an extended gap in the high energy program orbital operations and recognizes that in support of these objectives, over \$1 million in research and development is provided for fiscal year 1980 advanced technology development for the gamma ray observatory.

Planetary exploration—The Venus orbiting imaging radar (VOIR) mission is the next step in planetary exploration and provides necessary continuity in developing our understanding of the comparative planetology of Earth, Mars, and Venus. The committee also recognizes that NASA's request for the Venus orbiting imaging radar new start in fiscal year 1980 was refused by the Office of Management and Budget. The committee strongly supports initiation of this program no later than in fiscal year 1981, since failure to do so would preclude the mission from being flown with present technology within the current decade due to unfavorable planetary alignments. The committee recognizes that over \$4 million in research and development is provided for advanced technology development for the Venus orbiting imaging radar in fiscal year 1980 budget, and expects NASA to advance those technologies which support a fiscal year 1981 Venus orbiting imaging radar initiative.

EARTH SCIENCE

The committee is aware of a number of issues which appear to be inhibiting

basic research activities in the Earth sciences. These issues involve the difficulty of carrying out basic research in the global and interdisciplinary areas of the Earth sciences utilizing remote sensing from space, conflicting jurisdictional disputes among Government agencies whose interests are relatively narrowly focused, and the need for a lead agency for fundamental investigations in the Earth sciences. Therefore, the committee requests that NASA advise the committee by September 1979 of steps which need to be taken to resolve these jurisdictional issues.

SPACE COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

The committee notes that NASA has announced its intention to reenter the field of advanced space communications research and technology to assist in maintaining our National capability and to enhance our ability to be a major supplier of communications satellites and related equipment in the world marketplace.

Space communications research and technology makes a positive contribution to our Nation's balance of payments and should continue to do so as the world market grows. Therefore, the committee urges NASA's continued attention to this important technology and a continuing evaluation of its role relative to the private sector to assure that high risk technologies in the communications satellite area, including navigation systems, are adequately served.

SPACE APPLICATIONS USER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

In the fiscal year 1979 authorization report the committee noted a reduction in the funds to support technology transfer and demonstration projects and an increased emphasis on the scientific content of the applications programs. The committee recommended that NASA evaluate what strategies and programs are necessary to strengthen user oriented programs at all levels and advise the committee prior to the fiscal year 1980 annual authorization what steps need to be taken to meet this objective. NASA has yet to communicate with the committee in this regard. Further, the committee recommends that NASA review the space applications user development activities and make recommendations with regard to program balance and strategies for strengthening user oriented programs.

SPACE APPLICATIONS SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

The committee applauds the modest increases in space applications supporting research and technology programs. In this area, the committee perceives a need to review the balance of in-house versus university activities and the rationale and procedures for review of both in-house and university proposals to assure the most effective utilization of these funds. The committee understands that the Space and Terrestrial Applications Steering Committee is currently reviewing the supporting research and technology proposal evaluation procedures. The committee requests that

NASA report the results of this review to the committee by September 30, 1979.

TECHNOLOGY UTILIZATION

The technology utilization program has evolved over many years into an effective mechanism for the dissemination of technology information, as well as the secondary applications of this technology to uses outside of NASA for economic and societal benefit. To provide for the transfer of new knowledge and innovative ideas to industry, medicine, and important public areas such as transportation, environment, urban development, and public safety, NASA has developed a variety of mechanisms under the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

As part of its statutory responsibility to "provide for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination" of NASA-developed technology, NASA has made wide distribution to industry and the public, scientific, and technical publications and other materials. The committee believes that if NASA finds it necessary to charge the public for these materials, the prices should be low enough so that they do not hinder the flow of information. NASA should not attempt, for example, to recover full costs of publications and dissemination if to do so in NASA's judgment would not serve the broader purposes of the technology utilization program.

The committee further urges NASA to increase the efforts of the Industrial Application Centers in promoting awareness and involvement of local communities in the potentials of NASA technology in enhancing to the extent practicable, less developed and less populated regions of the country.

The reorganization of the technology utilization program from the Office of External Affairs to the Office of Space and Terrestrial Applications (OSTA) may provide more direct access by OSTA programs to user development techniques and processes which have served the needs of technology utilization. The committee urges NASA to make every effort to assure that transfer of available technology from across program offices continues unencumbered by specific mainline program requirements.

ADVANCED CHEMICAL PROPULSION TECHNOLOGY BASE

The committee views with concern the declining industrial base for advanced chemical propulsion technology. In recent years the liquid rocket industry sales have become increasingly dominated by one engine development program because of limited new programs in the field. If our Nation is to be in a position to embark on future space initiatives, the government must make a deliberate determination as to the level and composition of a sustained industrial propulsion capability. To determine what national propulsion industry capability should be maintained, NASA should propose to the Congress a plan for advanced propulsion technology base activities and assess what portion of the industrial base will be maintained by their action.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The committee notes that the reimbursable energy technology responsibilities assigned to NASA by the Department of Energy is increasing. The committee believes that the funds being devoted to energy technology identification and verification are being used effectively and continue to be necessary to assure that the capabilities of NASA are focused on energy problems in support of the Department of Energy (DOE). The committee applauds NASA's continued work with DOE to expand this activity. However, in the face of manpower reductions NASA should strive to maintain a proper balance between reimbursable activities and mainline NASA programs to assure that NASA's research and development mission is not threatened.

With regard to the solar power satellite program, the committee continues to be concerned over the lack of funds for necessary space related technology verification activities. Therefore, the Committee again urges that the NASA Administrator and responsible energy authorities within the executive branch encourage the use of NASA expertise and facilities by:

Allocating sufficient funds to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for verification of the technology essential to solar power satellite demonstration; and,

Reviewing the existing National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities and equipments complement to assure that these national assets are employed in solution of our energy problems.

TRACKING AND DATA RELAY SATELLITE SYSTEM

The tracking and data relay satellite system (TDRSS) will provide services to NASA satellites into the 1990's. The cost of leasing these services is greatly influenced by the cost of financing which is estimated to add over 40 percent to the lease. Whereas, the Federal Financing Bank (FFB) is providing the financing during the TDRSS development phase, alternative arrangements may prove more desirable during the operations phase.

Therefore, the committee requests NASA to reevaluate TDRSS financing and to report their findings to the committee by December 1979.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

The committee in authorizing \$1,760,000 for construction work at Ellington AFB, wishes to express its strong support for NASA's right to continue using their present facilities at Ellington.

The committee wishes to emphasize that the facilities at Ellington are vital to the Space Shuttle mission and any forced relocation to a more remote area, either at this time or in the foreseeable future, would have a detrimental effect on the mission in terms of schedule and cost.

The committee requests that NASA diligently pursue and participate in all negotiations with or conducted by the General Services Administration. It is also requested that NASA keep the committee completely and currently in-

formed of every significant event concerning NASA's occupancy rights at Ellington to assure continued availability and use by NASA's Johnson Space Center.

R. & D. PROGRAM SUPPORT (DTMS AND IMS)

Contained within the research and development budget is a category known as Program Support. It consists of multi-program technical support functions required to carry out NASA's approved missions. These functions benefit various programs, but because of their multi-program nature are more effectively managed, accounted for and controlled as specific technical support functions rather than as elements of individual programs.

Program support is budgeted in two ways. Program support for the projects of the Office of Space Transportation Systems is contained within the Development, Test and Mission support (DTMS) line item. Program support for all other NASA offices is contained within a fund source called Institutional Management Support (IMS). This can be viewed as a tax on the research and development programs to pay for multi-program services. It does not appear as a separate line item as DTMS does. Rather it is contained within the budget estimates for each program.

The committee recognizes that in a research and development institution, a mechanism is needed to pay the costs associated with operation and maintenance of the common laboratories and other facilities that comprise the institutions research capability. Furthermore, the committee understands the relative merits of both the DTMS and IMS approaches to this requirement. Nevertheless the Committee is concerned about the need for a strict constructionist approach in the booking of charges to either the Program Support category or directly to one of the research and development programs.

Therefore, the committee requests NASA to develop a plan to govern future actions, that will: (1) assure adequate support of the research and development institution, (2) provide sufficient visibility of program support costs, (3) assure that all feasibly identifiable costs are charged to benefiting programs. The plan should specifically address the period during which Shuttle operations are beginning and Shuttle development is completed. The Administrator of NASA is further requested to transmit this plan to the committee by August 30, 1979.

AERONAUTICS: FUTURE TRENDS

The committee notes with considerable alarm, the budget projections that show an actual decline in spending for aeronautical R. & T. in fiscal year 1981 and 1982. Slow but steady budgetary progress in recent years has resulted from a begrudging acceptance by the administration of the inescapable relationship between investments in R. & D. and the benefits that come from American preeminence in the civil aviation market.

It is extremely unfortunate that this painful lesson is being forgotten again at a time when foreign challenges to our leadership are enjoying unprece-

dented success. In 1974, the United States delivered 93 percent of the jet transports in the free world. By 1977 the figure had dropped to 69 percent.

The committee believes the time is ripe for a bold new initiative in aeronautics, along the lines of the highly successful ACEE program. As the level of activity in that program begins to tail off, the manpower, financial and facility resources which are thereby freed should be refocused on a new and imaginative program. This effort should be directed at advanced technology that responds to the clear national need for increased productivity in air transportation. Furthermore, a central feature of the new program should be that it will lead to exportable products and thereby reduce our balance-of-payments deficit.

To assist in the definition of such a new program, the committee requests that NASA prepare a white paper detailing potential program options along with cost and schedule information. The committee further requests that the paper be transmitted by July 30, 1979.

Include the following:

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

[Excerpted from pages 1-3, International Space Activities, Report prepared by the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications of the Committee on Science and Technology, Serial VV, November 1978]

(1) *Sovereignty over the geostationary orbit.*—Action should be initiated and vigorously pursued to establish an international codicil to the 1967 Outer Space Treaty which specifically forbids any individual nation's claiming sovereignty over the geostationary orbit. Further, the development of multipurpose space platforms should be encouraged and supported, since such platforms have the potential for reducing the demand on geostationary orbit locations and frequencies which constitute the cause of the problem.

(2) *Utilization of space by the developing nations.*—Two specific actions can be taken to increase the developing nations' participation in space activities and to increase the benefits they derive from space technology:

(a) Define and implement an equitable pricing policy for communications, Earth observations, and launch services which recognizes the need for varying combinations of incremental pricing ranging from full-cost pro-rata cost sharing through different scales of reduced charges for amortization of the initial system investment, depending on the customers' needs and fiscal resources. The implications of reduced-charge subsidies require careful consideration and evaluation.

(b) Establish a workable policy and methodology for equitable nondiscriminatory dissemination of data and information generated by civil Earth-observation space systems. One possible approach to assure such appropriate access would be a Global Resources Information Center.

(3) *Cost reduction of international space activities.*—Rising costs appear to be inhibiting both the scope and number of experiments users can afford (Spacelab is of particular concern here). Cost reductions should be actively sought. Specific suggestions are:

(a) Investigate the use of pallets and general-purpose free-flying spacecraft instead of Spacelab modules wherever possible.

(b) Support evolutionary pallet and spacecraft designs to improve load factor and load function.

(c) Relax programmatic requirements to permit more extensive sharing of shuttle flights; e.g., by extending the "getaway special" principle.

(d) Support evolutionary space technology

programs which offer promise of increased payload capability, improved shuttle load factors, and lower-cost systems or procedures.

(e) Evaluate the cost-reduction benefits of private-industry management of space transportation system operations, including the aggregation of the diffuse commercial and international market for space transportation services.

(f) Permit NASA (or whatever entity operates the space transportation system) the flexibility to adjust incremental pricing for add-on payload users (particularly those from developing nations) and for innovative new space applications missions.

(4) *Satellite communications.*—Two special issues were identified: public service satellites and the role of government in research and development. Specific recommendations were as follows:

(a) Federal cost sharing policies and procedures should be established to reduce financial and institutional barriers faced by commercial organizations in developing public service systems, which can offer social (including international) benefit but which have not yet attracted substantial private capital.

(b) The federal government should restate a policy of performing research and development in advanced satellite communications technology, both to reduce the commercial risk of public service communications systems and to enhance the U.S. position relative to those overseas nations which have subsidized major advances in satellite communications technology.

(5) *Cooperation in space science.*—Continued improvements in international space science program cooperation can be achieved by reducing the uncertainties caused by year-to-year vagaries in budgetary support of these necessarily long-term efforts. A specific recommendation which would help in achieving this end would be to reinforce the scope and frequency of NASA's interaction with Congress prior to submission of actual budget requests, to increase congressional understanding of long-range space science goals and programs. Formal institutionalization cooperative agreement procedures rather than the present case-by-case treatment, however, would be counterproductive because it would reduce all-important flexibility.

(6) *Development of institutional infrastructures.*—Three specific concerns highlighted in this area were the prospective impact of multi-purpose space platforms, the implications of not proceeding with an operational Landsat, and the maximization of user involvement and initiative in space applications systems. Recommendations are as follows:

(a) A model for a multipurpose regional space platform might serve as the framework for a wide range of institutionalization procedures, and should be actively studied. Specific legislative actions could include supporting the development of large space structures, creation of a regional coordinating entity, and initiating an institutional framework for domestic and international use of multipurpose space platforms.

(b) Although lack of assurance of Landsat data-collection continuity (because the present program is experimental rather than operational) is often cited as the major barrier to promoting the use of Landsat data, the Panel identified education of the user community as the real problem. Enhancement of user education activities is therefore recommended as the top-priority concern, as specified in (c) below.

(c) Because early and intensive user involvement and user perception of need are essential to stimulating transition of space

technology applications from the experimental to the operational phase, as was clearly demonstrated in the case of satellite communications, a substantial effort should be initiated to establish an infrastructure aimed at the development of a highly-motivated user community, particularly in the case of such disaggregated markets as those for Earth observations data.

(7) *Export of space technology and technology transfer.*—Because the present procedures inhibit the effectiveness of U.S. industry in competing for international procurements, the panel recommended that the State Department's Munitions Board list of spacecraft and related technologies be reviewed to streamline and simplify the control process for space-related exports.

(8) *United Nations Conference on Outer Space.*—The conclusion of the UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space that a Conference is desirable is strongly endorsed, but the panel recommends that the Conference be limited to technical matters, especially in the areas of system capabilities and user applications. This limitation would permit the free discussion of many potential developments in space, whereas a political debate would almost certainly inhibit the proper exposition of significant and potentially valuable space developments.

In addition to these specific issues, five items relative to international space activities were identified which were not considered to require decision-making action, but which were nevertheless of some importance in providing background for international space activities issues. These items are as follows:

(1) Involvement with international partners in space activities should always be as early as possible, commensurate with the specific type of program under consideration.

(2) Because of its great success, INTEL-SAT should be used as an institutional model for other international space activities to whatever extent possible.

(3) European and U.S. remote sensing satellites are both competitive and compatible, and the coexistence of both should not be of concern.

(4) Early cooperative planning of international scientific and applications satellites and their financing on a program-by-program basis is preferable to setting up a formal organization to do so.

(5) Current international agreements on responsibility for objects launched into space are as effective as is practical, and are being complied with. Problems concerning space debris should be dealt with in the context of these existing agreements on a case-by-case basis as they occur.

I urge passage of H.R. 1786 as recommended by your committee.

□ 1800

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1786, the fiscal year 1980 authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This legislation is one of the few agency budgets that is consistent with the policy of fiscal restraint. Unfortunately, NASA is also one of the few agencies that could justifiably have an increasing budget. If the fiscal year 1979 supplemental is considered this legislation represents an increase of less than 4 percent. There are no new programs and the manpower ceiling has been reduced by 674. The net effect, when inflation is considered, is a decrease in overall capability.

This apparent decrease in capability

represents the most prominent area of concern. As an independent businessman, I learned the importance of making small investments in the future. These investments do not necessarily contribute immediately to the solution of fiscal problems; in fact, they may initially aggravate the problem. However, these investments invariably represent the long-term integrity of the business. I view the NASA budget as a small investment in the future of the Nation.

There is no doubt that the investment is small; it is less than 1 percent of the Federal budget. Nor is there any doubt that there is a significant return on that investment. I have seen studies that show that within 10 years for every dollar spent in research and development, \$7 to \$14 is returned to the economy.

We cannot ignore the immediate fiscal problems that our Nation is facing. However, it would be very unwise for us to also ignore the long-term consequences. It is in the best interest of the Nation to maintain a healthy and growing technological base. This base will drastically affect the economic integrity of our Nation.

I have tempered my enthusiasm for an aggressive space program because of the current fiscal restraints which need to be applied. Nevertheless, my concern has not changed. The committee has taken what in my view are the minimal actions required to prevent irreparable damage to the NASA programs. The committee has increased the President's request by a total of \$37 million. As is reflected in the additional views of the report, I was in favor of adding an additional \$3 million for the advanced turboprop program.

The major portion of the increase, \$27 million, is for procurement of the fifth Space Shuttle orbiter. The committee position, which I strongly support, is in opposition to the President's seemingly arbitrary conclusion that only four orbiters are required. We have received testimony from both the Department of Defense and NASA, stating that they continue to feel a five-orbiter fleet is required.

The other increases are in the areas of space applications and aeronautics—increases which will contribute to the solution of many of our energy problems.

In conclusion I would say that the NASA budget is a shining example of a fiscally austere budget. I am willing to accept this austerity; not without concern, but I will support it. I encourage my colleagues to do the same. Vote "yes" on H.R. 1786.

□ 1805

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

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

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I commend the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN) and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA), for the fine job they have done, as usual, in bringing the NASA authorization bill to the floor

in an improved state from that proposed by the administration. I support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, as ranking minority member of the Science and Technology Committee, I rise in support of this legislation, H.R. 1786. The total authorization of \$4.762 billion is less than 8 percent above the fiscal year 1979 level. In addition to holding the budget down, the manpower ceilings have also been reduced by 674 positions.

Technology continues to be one of the most important facets of our world economy. Every day I see more and more areas where technology is contributing to the solution of our problems—solutions that vary from monitoring natural resources, to worldwide communications, to solving our energy problems. NASA is a national asset that has and will continue to contribute to the strength and stability of our technological base.

We cannot afford to turn our backs on this vast technological capability. We cannot afford to dampen the innovative, creative thoughts of our engineers and scientists.

Today we are being challenged. Our technical ingenuity is being challenged by the problems we face. Our prestige as a world leader of technology is being challenged by other nations. We must face these challenges squarely. Unless we encourage the creative capabilities of our engineers and scientists, not just those at NASA but across the entire front of science and technology, we are going to fuel the fires of inflation; increase the balance of payment deficits; and expand the unemployment roles.

Some changes to the President's request have been made by the committee. These changes represent items which the committee feels cannot be eliminated without inducing long-term consequences; \$27 million of the \$37 million added is for the procurement of the fifth Space Shuttle orbiter. This decision is in opposition to the President's position, but the committee continues to feel it is important to retain the option on the fifth orbiter fleet.

I was somewhat surprised to see that the NASA funding for energy technology was reduced substantially for fiscal year 1980. However, the Administrator assured me that the reimbursable funding for energy programs from the Department of Energy was increasing. The level of reimbursable funds from DOE has grown from \$123 million in fiscal year 1978 to \$160 million in fiscal year 1979.

In conclusion, I would say that the fiscal year 1980 budget is somewhat a plateau for NASA. We must not sacrifice our future for the sake of short-term problems.

I ask your support of H.R. 1786.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FLIPPO).

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of H.R. 1786 and the recommendations of the Committee on Science and Technology. I would like to congratulate Mr. FUQUA, chairman of

the full committee and Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications; Mr. WYDLER, the ranking minority member of the full committee; and Mr. WINN, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for their leadership and fine work in bringing this legislation to the floor.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that this authorization represents a most austere budget. NASA requested no new starts in fiscal year 1980. Additionally, although NASA is already below 1977 manpower levels, the agency is incurring additional manpower reductions to compensate for the needs of other agencies in meeting a Government-wide goal.

Although the NASA budget has been increasing in recent years in terms of actual dollars, the increases have not fully offset the effects of inflation.

Since fiscal year 1973—the year the shuttle was initiated—NASA's budget has increased from \$3.4 billion to \$4.7 billion, but this increase has not fully offset the effects of inflation. NASA's research and development effort has declined in terms of real purchasing power and as a percent of the gross national product.

In comparison to the 1973 level, the 1980 budget, despite an increase of 39 percent in actual dollars, will have decreased by about 20 percent in purchasing power. In the same time period the R. & D. budget exclusive of shuttle funding will have decreased about 46 percent in buying power. These decreases reflect the fact that in terms of research and development effort, a dollar in 1980 will be worth about 55 cents compared to the 1973 dollar. NASA research and development, like other labor intensive activities, has been subject to a somewhat greater rate of inflation than would be indicated by either the GNP deflator or the Consumer Price Index.

NASA's plans presently call for the first manned orbital flight of the Space Shuttle in the early part of fiscal year 1980. The Space Shuttle is the key element of a versatile, economical space transportation system that will provide a wide variety of national and international users with round trip access to space. The Shuttle will be the first reusable space vehicle and will be configured to carry many different types of payloads to and from low Earth orbit. Since the Space Shuttle will serve commercial, NASA and defense payloads, it is critical that this Nation have an adequate number of orbiters to assure the necessary flexibility to serve the diverse requirements of these communities.

The Space Shuttle is truly a national program. Nearly every State in the Union is performing work to support its development and production. This involves tens of thousands of skilled workers. Due to restricted budgets for the Space Shuttle, employment has been optimized at a comparatively low level. We must assure that the essential core of workers and contractors are maintained throughout the 1980's to provide the Space Shuttle hardware needed to ex-

ploit the opportunities which we are now planning. This can best be done by starting the fifth orbiter in fiscal year 1980 and allowing for a reasonable production cycle to fit in with the current development, testing and production.

The current orbiter production program provides four orbiters plus certain long lead items which can support initiation of a fifth orbiter. To delay the start of the fifth orbiter risks the loss of efficiently planned production of an item I am convinced we will need. A number of thorough fleet size analyses have evaluated our flight rate capabilities and requirements. To provide this capability and satisfy what will be our operational requirements from NASA, other civilian agencies and the Department of Defense, it is clear that we must maintain the Space Shuttle industrial establishment so that Orbiter No. 5 can be produced when needed in the middle of the next decade.

Decisions made now on the STS will set the ceiling on the Nation's future space capability for many years. The issues and alternatives are complex and the stakes are high—scientific and technological leadership, national security and international prestige. Moving forward now with an adequate orbiter fleet will provide a means for taking full advantage of all opportunities in the future exploitation of space.

Therefore, the committee has added funds to maintain an option for a fifth Shuttle orbiter. These funds will be used to procure long-lead items which would be used for spare equipment in the event that we do not fabricate the fifth orbiter. In recent testimony before the subcommittee, a representative of the Air Force stated strong support for maintaining the option for the fifth orbiter. Indeed there is growing Air Force interest in using the Space Shuttle which led the NASA Administrator to recently state that NASA probably will need a fifth Shuttle orbiter and maybe more. Therefore, I believe that it is indeed prudent that the Congress provide the necessary funds to maintain this option.

The launch of the high energy astronomy observatory C (HEAO-C) in September 1979, will bring to a close one of NASA's most productive scientific programs. It is also the last approved space flight mission in high energy astrophysics. The absence of new follow-on high energy missions will end the explosive advance in astronomical knowledge created by the HEAO Program.

HEAO-1 was launched in August 1977. It was planned for a 6-month mission life, but it continued to operate successfully, and return valuable scientific data for 17 months until January 9, 1979, when control gas was depleted and the mission was terminated. HEAO-1 returned an impressive list of discoveries and observations in X-ray astronomy. One of its major contributions was to map the X-ray sky at a level of sensitivity not attainable by previous spacecraft. The HEAO-1 X-ray source map, presently in preparation, will increase over four times the number of known X-ray

sources. It will serve as an authoritative X-ray star finder for many years to come. HEAO-1 also detected the presence of a hot interstellar gas, which gives off radiation only as X-rays and, therefore, could be detected only by an X-ray astronomy spacecraft. This gas potentially contains much of the mass in the universe, and it is of great interest to cosmologists. This discovery is being followed up by an intensive observation program on HEAO-2.

HEAO-2 was launched in November 1978, and following in-orbit checkout, it became an operating observatory on January 6, 1979. Early results confirm the belief that HEAO-2 has opened a new era in X-ray astronomy. During its early observing program, HEAO-2 was focused on the X-ray source, Cygnus X-3. Cygnus X-3 was a known X-ray emitter, whose emission was believed to originate from a binary star pair in which one of the stars is a neutron star. A neutron star is an old star in which the nuclear fuel has burned, and the material in the star has collapsed to very high density matter. HEAO-2 observed the Cygnus X-3 binary star system, and found in addition to the binary star system, four very hot, X-ray emitting young stars. The association of a relatively old neutron star with hot young stars is a major discovery which cannot be readily explained. Such an observation was not possible prior to HEAO-2, since no previous X-ray spacecraft had adequate resolution to separate the binary stars from the nearby young stars.

HEAO-2 has made a major contribution to the understanding of the physics of galaxies, as well as to the understanding of our own galaxy, the Milky Way, by observing our neighbor the Andromeda Galaxy. Because of our location deep in an arm of our galaxy, we cannot observe the opposite side of our galaxy from the Earth. The Andromeda is very similar to our galaxy, and it can be observed from Earth. Prior to HEAO-2, the Andromeda was known to emit X-ray, but the resolution of previous instruments was not adequate to separate more than the strongest, most isolated individual sources. HEAO-2 first pointed its moderate resolution imaging proportional counter at the Andromeda, and immediately resolved 10 individual X-ray emitters, and a large blob of X-rays at the center of the galaxy. The imaging proportional counter could not determine if the central region was made up of one large cloud of X-ray or of many individual X-ray sources. The HEAO-2 high resolution imaging instrument was pointed to the bright central region, and immediately 14 X-ray sources became visible. This supports the theory that the cores of galaxies are made up of many individual X-ray emitters rather than one enormous cloud of very hot, X-ray emitting gas. Further analysis has identified over 60 X-ray sources in the Andromeda.

HEAO-2 is conducting a broad program of observations, which is contributing to many fields of astrophysics. In support of the HEAO-1 hot gas observations, HEAO-2 scientists are investigating the question of matter in our universe by searching for very, very weak X-ray

sources in what appears to be black regions of space. HEAO-2 spectrometers have observed for the first time, spectral lines from objects such as supernovae remnants and dwarf novae. These spectral lines and features give information on the temperature in the source region, and the chemical composition of the object. In less than 6 months since launch, nearly 200 proposals for guest investigation using HEAO-2, have been received from interested scientists. Special presentations of the results from HEAO-2 have been scheduled by the American Physical Society and the American Astronomical Society, and there is every indication that HEAO-2 results will continue to attract major interest throughout the entire scientific world.

In fiscal year 1980, NASA is continuing the development of the space telescope. The space telescope will be a national observatory in orbit around the Earth for 10 to 15 years. It will be placed in orbit, using the Space Shuttle, in 1983. The space telescope, by being outside the Earth's atmosphere, will enable astronomers to see images that are 10 times smaller than with ground-based telescopes. Additionally, the color range over which we can "see" or photograph the universe will be increased by a factor of more than a thousand.

The space telescope will create more opportunities for individual investigators than does an agglomeration of many small projects. NASA expects a minimum of 100 astronomers per year to use the space telescope and that over its lifetime of 10 to 15 years a major fraction of the world's astronomers will use the space telescope.

Finally, history has shown astronomy as a science that is at the cutting edge of new technology. The space telescope will certainly tell us much about the early stages of our universe and the formation of the galaxies. One powerful hint which we have already is the existence of quasars. Quasars are the most distant and most energetic objects known in the universe. No one knows for sure how quasars manage to produce such great amounts of energy. It is conceivable that an understanding of the way quasars produce energy could lead to improved laws of physics or even some practical applications. As an historical example, we recall that the inspiration for this country's controlled thermonuclear fusion program came from the realization, by astronomers and physicists working in pure research, that the Sun shines on the basis of hydrogen fusion.

An additional potential application of the space telescope is a better understanding of weather and climate. This will be the first telescope that will be able to study the meteorology and the atmosphere of other planets. Just as if somehow, sometimes it is easier to understand your own children if you can look at how your friend's children are behaving; then it may also be easier to understand the Earth's weather if we have a chance to look frequently at the weather of other planets.

I would like to address the importance of advanced program activities. The activity under this line item is extremely

important to insure that the vital new concepts of bringing the benefits of space to mankind continue to be explored; to insure that NASA has adequate "seed corn" resources to explore these new ideas and concepts; and to insure that Congress has timely information to make the proper decisions relative to the growth and continuation of our marvelous space achievements.

It is this budget activity that spawned dramatic and valuable space achievements for which we are all so proud. From early studies in this area came the Gemini, the Apollo, the Skylab, the Apollo-Soyuz and the Space Shuttle. For the future, similar new concepts will emerge that will guarantee this Nation's leadership on this new frontier of space.

Our hearings this year have given us new insights on the potentials for growth in space. Space offers unusual possibilities for developing inexhaustible sources of energy; for creating new means of providing services to the man in the street such as electronic mail, personal navigation schemes and similar public service satellites; for new information systems for monitoring natural resources and the environment; and for means of exploiting the space environment for the benefit of all.

The potential of creating new industries in space for manufacturing, for erecting large structures, for building power stations, and numerous other objectives all emerge from studies and experimentation within the NASA advanced programs efforts.

One very important activity is ongoing studies of the 25kW power module. The missions currently planned for the Space Shuttle orbiter and the orbiter-bay-housed spacelab are constrained by the power currently available from the Shuttle and by mission duration. As the planned missions are better defined, it is becoming apparent that increased power and longer duration on-orbit Shuttle orbiter capability would be economically and scientifically beneficial.

NASA is considering a 25kW free flying power module to augment the orbiter and spacelab operations. The power module would be delivered to orbit by the Shuttle and would remain there for a period of up to 5 years followed by refurbishment and relaunch. During orbital operations the orbiter would dock with the module. The power module solar arrays/batteries can provide 25kW of additional power with the capability of up to 250kW of power through modular growth. Between flights/operations the power module would remain on-station in readiness for the next orbital operations.

With this increased capability, the orbiter/spacelab will be able to support more experiments at a higher power level. Mission duration could be increased from 7 days up to 90 days. The power module could also be used for mission support to free-flying payloads between orbiter missions. The power module will be the first long life program to develop large amounts of solar power in space and will be a significant step into the future in this area of technology.

The use of the Shuttle to launch, as-

semble, and deploy large structures in orbit is one of the most dramatic new capabilities provided by the NASA Space Transportation System.

The committee has identified this area of research to be a critical item in the process of learning how to use the Shuttle. Because of urgent priorities for Shuttle support systems such as the power module, NASA to date has been unable to devote adequate resources to the newer systems. We believe that adding \$1 million to the NASA advanced programs budget this year will significantly accelerate this research and provide economies both near term and long term by establishing an early technical base of planning.

NASA has testified that one of the most significant demonstrations of the design and use of large structures will be the large deployable antenna. It is essential this research be done in flight as the size and light-weight construction precludes deployment and testing on the ground. It can only be accomplished in the weightless environment of space.

Such antennas show promise for wide use in NASA research, DOD operations, and commercial ventures. They are needed for Earth observing systems such as radiometers, for radars and for advanced communications. For this reason it is envisioned that the program would be jointly funded by both agencies.

Early solution of the large structures deployment technological problem plus the associated propulsion, remote manipulator techniques, and operations experiments will greatly reduce the future development risk and provide the confidence needed to move out in NASA systems research and commercial ventures in space applications.

The committee is convinced that this special effort undertaken at this critical time is one of the most valuable early steps in capitalizing on our Shuttle investment. The deployable antenna is an essential element in the promise of United States' space leadership in the 1980's.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1786 authorizing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1980.

In fiscal year 1980 NASA plans to obligate \$7 million R. & D. funds in support of General Aviation. While several factors cause this to be about \$3 million less than the fiscal year 1979 budget, the primary reason is the completion in fiscal year 1979 of the Quiet, Clean General Aviation Turbofan Engine (QCGAT) program. This program is successfully demonstrating the applicability of large commercial transport engine noise and emission reduction principles and technology to much smaller engines, in the 1,500- to 4,000-pound thrust range, and is paving the way for quieter and cleaner next generation engines in this class.

The fiscal year 1980 program will con-

tinue and extend the major elements of the fiscal year 1979 program. Objectives include increased safety, energy efficiency and utility, with continued attention to reducing environmental impact (primarily noise) of propeller powered aircraft. The need for improvement in each area is indicated by several factors. General aviation continues to exhibit the highest growth rate of all transportation modes (nearly 18,000 new aircraft in 1978). Increasing congestion of our airways due to all types of aircraft operations, plus the increased number of general aviation fliers, and the increasingly extensive and important role of general aviation within the total transportation system all underscore the need for even better safety, simple and dependable operation, and reduced environmental impact. These factors, together with increased fuel costs and decreased fuel availability accentuate the vital importance of increased fuel efficiency.

The program will extend past notable accomplishments toward increased safety through improved stall/spin resistance and through the evolution of superior crash energy absorbing/load limiting structural design principles. Reduced propulsive thrust requirements and fuel consumption are the objectives of low drag airfoil and aircraft configuration research. In addition, efficiency improvements to both internal combustion and gas turbine powerplants are being sought. Propeller research includes both reduced noise and increased efficiency. Research to increase utility is being continued in the area of integrated avionics systems, and in the specific area of improved agricultural aerial applications technology.

Continued NASA sponsored research in each of these areas is essential to the earliest achievement of the needed improvements and the resulting benefits to all who benefit from general aviation: Users, industry, the overall economy and the general public.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BOUQUARD) a member of our subcommittee.

Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1786, which would authorize funds for NASA in fiscal year 1980 for continuation of the space program. Programs within this authorization provide for continued research and development in space flight, space science, space applications, aeronautical and space research and technology, and necessary supporting construction and administrative effort.

This is an austere budget with no new starts in the NASA request. Additionally, NASA is being asked to make cutbacks in manpower, to compensate for other agencies, when NASA is already below 1977 employment levels.

I would like to point out to my colleagues the very important work being carried on by NASA in support of the Department of Energy. NASA participation in energy research development and demonstration, encompasses a wide range of activities that capitalize on unique NASA capabilities in management and facilities resources developed

in our aeronautics and space programs. NASA continues to make major, important contributions toward the resolution of many of the Nation's energy problems. Interest at NASA centers in energy programs is at a high level, and innovative ideas with the potential to resolve these problems are continually surfacing. It is believed that NASA capabilities developed in the past with such care to address a different set of problems can be capitalized upon in this new challenge.

The major reimbursable programs that we are presently conducting for DOE and other agencies include:

- Photovoltaic conversion.
- Wind turbo generators.
- Solar heating and cooling.
- Advanced automotive propulsion.
- Electric and hybrid vehicles.
- Industrial gas turbines.
- Fuel cell systems.
- Solar power satellites.

In the past year, DOE has continued to expand NASA participation in its programs, and it is anticipated additional responsibilities will be assigned in the coming year for both the DOE and other Federal agencies with energy problems.

In fiscal year 1979, NASA anticipates receiving over \$160 million in reimbursable funding, up from the \$123 million transferred to us in fiscal year 1978. In fiscal year 1980, preliminary estimates indicate that NASA will be responsible for over \$200 million in reimbursable energy programs.

Another area I would like to discuss involves NASA's support to our Nation's universities. It is basic NASA policy to encourage colleges and universities to participate in the Nation's space and aeronautics program to the maximum extent practicable and it is NASA's intention to continue to have a strong academic involvement in the agency's R. & D. program. Not only is this involvement essential to the progress of current agency efforts, but it contributes directly to continued productivity of academic scientists and engineers, the training of successive new generations of researchers, and the dissemination of results—all of which are required to maintain both national and NASA programs in the years to come. Academic scientists are given the opportunity to help advance the frontiers of science and technology in all disciplines of interest to the Nation in aeronautics and space.

NASA's university policies are designed to encourage heavy academic involvement in basic research; promote a growing independent academic research program; and to achieve broad cooperation between university and NASA in-house research groups. Thus, NASA encourages centers of excellence in universities and works with educational institutions to strengthen them, as required, in research and education in aerospace science, engineering, and management. The methods used include the selection of university proposals for experiments on their merits, work-study programs, graduate degree programs and seeking the advice of the academic community in planning new programs.

NASA field centers and certain head-quarter program offices provide funds for those R. & D. activities in universities which contribute to the responsibility of that particular NASA element. The sum total of these obligations is collectively referred to as NASA's university program. The effort funded each year is substantial. Thus, \$135.3 million was obligated for university efforts in fiscal year 1978, an increase of \$10.7 million over fiscal year 1977. About 75 percent of the fiscal year 1978 funding was provided by NASA field installations throughout the country. Estimated obligations for fiscal years 1979 and 1980 are \$146 and \$151 million, respectively.

Research of interest to NASA has been performed in some 469 institutions with close to 2,900 individual projects active at any one time. All types of institutions across the country are represented—public and private, large and small—and in addition, NASA makes a special effort to involve minority schools and researchers in the early stages of their careers. Topics cover a wide range with major emphasis in the physical and environmental sciences, followed by engineering and the life sciences. Basic research has contributed significantly to NASA's fiscal year 1978 funding to universities. Results of this extensive research has contributed significantly to the success of the national aerospace effort, while at the same time allowing universities to pursue their educational goals.

In overview, NASA's policies and practices for university relations are aimed at achieving a stronger and more creative NASA research program in the decades ahead and have the concomitant result of contributing to a combined stronger in-house and academic research establishment.

Again, I would encourage my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

□ 1810

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN).

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, it gives me pleasure to rise in support of this legislation, the fiscal year 1980 authorization request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I would like to share some of my thoughts regarding the importance of technology and innovation and its impact on our military strength.

As policymakers, one of our most important constitutional trusts is to provide for the defense of our Republic. Not only defense in the sense of the number and quality of arms but also defense in the sense of economic security of our Nation; defense in the sense of protecting the integrity and prestige of this Nation as a world leader in science and technology.

Technological discoveries and decisions are being made every single day which will affect life on our planet for centuries to come. I am afraid that when many of those decisions are opposed some colleagues are not keeping in mind

the rudimentary principles of defense of the Republic.

This fear is very dramatically displayed when I see budgets like the NASA budget presented before this body. This is probably the best mechanism that the Nation has for applying these defensive principles to which I have referred. At a time when we are being threatened economically and militarily, we should be building our defenses. Instead I see a critical reduction in NASA buying power. We cannot allow this lack of vision to erode our national destiny involving space exploration. The U.S.S.R. and other nations of the world are making rapid strides in the development of space and aeronautical technology. American industry is being called upon to face those challenges and the Federal Government is not providing sufficient support.

Many of our programs are still being scoffed at because they are too visionary. Keep in mind that the Wright brothers were also considered too visionary and far out for their time. I do not have to remind my colleagues what impact visionary leadership in aviation has had on our national security.

The space visionaries of today are equally as important to our future security. We cannot afford to ignore the challenges of space. Some of the most farsighted men of our time are preoccupied with this challenge and we cannot afford to turn our backs on them. The only way we can support their efforts is to provide them a realistically healthy budget.

I know that to some minds it sounds too romantic, but I believe it is the providential destiny of this Nation to lead the conquest of space. Unfortunately, I sometimes fear we have lost the spirit of adventure, vision, and sense of mission that motivated the late President John F. Kennedy.

Maybe this is not the time in history to make the massive commitment that President Kennedy made. But neither is it the time to shortchange the talent, imagination, technical abilities, and great managerial skills which are available to us in our great aerospace industry.

I would like to express my enthusiastic support and confidence in the entire technological enterprise of this Nation. And I implore this body to support that enterprise so as to meet the challenges that are facing this Nation.

H.R. 1786, the 1980 NASA authorization is a firm step forward in support of one of the greatest adventures of all history—reaching for the stars.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS).

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend my appreciation to the distinguished chairman for his graciousness in yielding time to me.

I would like to point out that, as we go into the amendment process on this bill, I will be offering an amendment which will once again allow all in this body, especially those who are very,

very concerned about balancing the budget this year and perhaps over the course of the next 3 years, to take one small step towards that by being able to vote for an amendment to cut almost \$23 million from this particular authorization measure.

Mr. Chairman, going back over the course of the last 8 years or so, we have seen this body dealt with in a questionable fashion. In 1971 after the expenditure of approximately a billion dollars on the so-called supersonic transport, and a great deal of effort on both sides of the aisle that boondoggle was brought to a halt. Slowly but surely, however, through the research and development process we have had snuck in through the back door the very same program for the development and ultimate production of a supersonic transport.

It seems to me that now is the time to bring it to a halt, because over the course of the last 8 years we will have appropriated over \$100 million if this year's appropriation goes through. This phase will then have been concluded. The next phase—and I will expand on it later on—will require an expenditure of \$561 million for validation of the research and development programs. After that—and the reports clearly spell it out—it will require in excess of a billion and a half dollars to prepare us for technological readiness of an SST. I do not think this body ought to wait until we are faced with that kind of expenditure to bring this boondoggle to a halt. The House did it after 10 years of effort in 1971. The beast should remain buried, and this body, knowing what the facts are, ought in fact to bury it now rather than after all those extravagant expenditures.

We keep on hearing about how there is no money in this authorization for a prototype development. That is true. The private sector, the free enterprise people in the aeronautics industry, very generously tell us that after the Federal Government expends over \$2 billion in research and has it all ready, they will then take that 2 billion dollars' worth of Federal expenditures and they will reap the profits and build their own prototype. That is not the kind of bargain that we ought to be accepting.

Mr. Chairman, I am today offering an amendment that would restore integrity to the congressional legislative process in regard to the NASA authorization.

As many of my colleagues will recall, Congress voted in 1971 to terminate the civilian supersonic transport aircraft program which had by then cost some \$1 billion in Federal funds. The House and Senate determined at that time that commercial SST's were not economically feasible and represented a significant environmental hazard.

Congress has not reversed this position in the succeeding 8 years, nor have the proponents of a commercial U.S. SST convincingly countered the economic and environmental objections raised against the aircraft. Indeed, the experience of the British-French

Concorde indicates conclusively that commercial SST's are still not financially viable.

Despite this unambiguous action by Congress, we find that at least \$54 million has been appropriated since the alleged death of the program in 1971 for commercial SST research and development by NASA. An additional \$65.8 million has been authorized during this period for the same purposes. And now the fiscal 1980 NASA authorization legislation contains an authorization for and additional \$22.7 million for commercial SST's.

Congress cannot be blamed for failing to prevent these unnecessary, inflationary and misplaced authorizations and appropriations. If you look in H.R. 1786, you will not find any direct reference to the SST. Instead, you will find a \$9.7 million authorization for an "SCR" program and another \$13.0 million for a "VCE" program.

SCR stands for supersonic cruise research program, the purpose of which according to the Office of Management and Budget is to "assess key technical unknowns and problem areas confronting the design of a viable supersonic transport."

VCE means variable cycle engine. This is a research and development program which, again according to OMB, will "examine new propulsion concepts with potential application to a future supersonic transport."

In short, these two programs are intended to provide research and development for a commercial supersonic transport plane.

This House can be forgiven if it has failed over the years to realize that it has been authorizing and appropriating millions of dollars for a program that was supposedly terminated 8 years ago. There is no reference to the commercial SST as such in H.R. 1786, nor has there been any such reference to the best of my knowledge in previous NASA authorization measures.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 1786 would end this backdoor approach to funding a program that is properly the responsibility of the private sector.

If the economic and environmental problems associated with commercial SST's have in fact been alleviated over the past 8 years, then I am confident that our free enterprise system can and will devise a way of developing and producing an acceptable SST. I fail to see the Federal role in such an undertaking. Are we to continue this open-ended funding for a program of very dubious merit at a time when the American people are rightfully worried about inflationary spending by the Federal Government?

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the Office of Technology Assessment has been requested to conduct a thorough study of the current status of SST research and development feasibility. The report from OTA is due in April 1980. At the very least, this House should await the results of that important and definitive study

before agreeing to additional outlays for the program which is under review.

If we authorize \$22.7 million for commercial SST research and development before we even know what the OTA study has found, then Congress can indeed be held to task for putting a budgetary cart before the horse. Why bother commissioning a study on SST feasibility if we decide in advance to commit millions to the program? Let us at least pause and consider the findings of the OTA study.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it would not behoove this House to authorize another \$22.7 million for a program that is inherently inflationary. This program produces nothing in the way of goods and services that can be put back into our economy. It is a dead-end capital commitment with a comparatively low degree of labor intensity.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support my amendment and get the Federal Government out of this private sector area once and for all.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN).

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation, and Communications conducted numerous field inspections and held extensive hearings here in Washington on the aeronautical part of the fiscal year 1980 NASA authorization. Testimony was taken from a variety of witnesses both inside and outside of NASA.

Members of the subcommittee worked long and hard in carefully reviewing the NASA aeronautical program and the 1980 budget request. We found that although the dollar amount for aeronautical R. & D. is small—\$308 million this year—the pay-off is very large. This is true because NASA emphasizes the high-risk, long-term research and technology that industry is financially unable or unwilling to undertake. Such efforts provide the foundation for future aircraft and engines which return many times their initial investment to our economy.

Because of this the Committee on Science and Technology has repeatedly urged the administration and the Congress to increase the resources devoted to aeronautical R. & D. We have often pointed to the many long-term benefits of investment in this area, which are reflected in billions of dollars in sales of U.S. aircraft both here and abroad, and in millions of jobs for Americans. It is unfortunate indeed that the administration has not seen fit to put forward a single new start for the coming year.

The fiscal year 1980 program in aeronautics represents a continuation of NASA's efforts to advance technology across the board. Specifically, NASA is working in virtually all areas of aircraft technology including materials, structures, propulsion, aerodynamics and avionics. Of special note this year is a substantial amount for developing the technology needed for a new generation of fuel-efficient subsonic aircraft. This program, which was carefully worked out

with the close involvement of industry, holds great promise for our continued worldwide leadership in aviation.

Finally, let me turn briefly to an issue about which many Members are properly concerned. That issue relates to the committee's action in approving NASA's request for supersonic cruise research and our action on the variable cycle engine components program. Notice that I said research. I cannot emphasize this too strongly. We are specifically not authorizing the construction of a prototype aircraft or any other flyable hardware. We are directing NASA to continue their experiments on potential solutions to the well known side-effects of supersonic flight. We are talking only about research.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the fiscal year 1980 NASA authorization bill.

□ 1815

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER), the ranking minority member on the full committee.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WYDLER was allowed to speak out of order.)

THE NUCLEAR PLANT INCIDENT TODAY NEAR HARRISBURG, PA.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, as most Members know, a nuclear plant incident occurred this morning at Three Mile Island in the Susquehanna River near Harrisburg, Pa.

To the surprise of many people, no explosion occurred, no one was injured, and the world did not come to an end. Unlike a recent movie script, the matter was handled in a completely open fashion by plant officials and by State and Federal authorities with satisfactory results so far. Apparently the emergency core cooling system which came on-line to dissipate the reactor heat has been working well. As a result of this and the precautions taken by operators and authorities, it appears that there has been no undue exposure to plant personnel and we have assurances that there presently is no threat to the general populace.

Mr. Chairman, the lesson we have learned is that, although small, there is some probability that nuclear plant accidents will occur. More importantly, we have also learned that such incidents can be handled in a safe and decisive manner.

As of late this afternoon, the radiation levels within the containment vessel, although remaining high, are decreasing in such a way that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission concludes the reactor is cooling down satisfactorily. The radiation levels one-third of a mile from the plant site are low, and at a level just about that which a plant operator would normally be exposed to.

□ 1820

As I said, this was the situation as of late this afternoon. The Department of Energy at the request of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has dispatched two radiological surveillance teams to the plantsite by helicopter. These teams

are taking samples and measuring radiation levels on and around the site. Some of these measurements will serve as a check on measurements made by the State earlier today. The latest report was that the emergency cooling system has stabilized the heat release. The pressure in the containment vessel, which reached a maximum of a little less than one-tenth of design pressure, is decreasing.

The complete details of the accident, its specific cause, and other questions cannot yet be answered, but I feel that the country has learned a lesson at Three Mile Island. It is simply this: an improbable nuclear accident or event does not lead to the catastrophic disaster which the doomsayers have predicted. It would be healthy for the country if we subjected other technologies to the same scrutiny that the technologists have applied to the nuclear power development.

I have the feeling it would make a difference in terms of national policy for electrical power generation if we behaved more rationally toward the nuclear option.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the gentleman's calling the attention of the House to the developments today at Three Mile Island. It seems to me that some of us might perhaps draw somewhat different conclusions from the set of circumstances which the gentleman described.

Mr. WYDLER. If the gentleman from New York would ask a question, I would be glad to answer it.

Mr. WEISS. I will put it in the form of a question. Would it not appear that in the light of what happened today that perhaps the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which came in for a great deal of criticism in the course of the last 2 weeks for ordering five other nuclear powerplants to shut down because of the weakness of certain pipes and other equipment, was in fact right in exercising that kind of extreme caution and safety?

Mr. WYDLER. No. I think that would be a self-serving conclusion that a person would reach when there is no connection between the two events whatsoever. I cannot see how a rational person would draw those kinds of conclusions. The plants which were closed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, as the gentleman should know, were closed because of the potential danger that might occur if an earthquake took place. There was no earthquake in the Three Mile area where the plant is located, so there is absolutely no connection between the accident that took place this morning in the Three Mile area and the closing down of five plants by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I think that kind of muddling of things together is the type of thing that draws into the public mind a confusion which does not let people act rationally toward these types of projects. The fact of the matter is we found

out that we can have a nuclear accident at a plant and that it can be safely handled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I support the National Aeronautics and Space Administration bill H.R. 1786. I am very fortunate, Mr. Chairman, to not only be ranking majority member on the Committee on Science and Technology, but also to have the privilege to chair the Subcommittee on Economic Development within the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. These positions afford me the opportunity to view our Nation's space program from a different perspective.

Let me say to this great body that our Nation's space program has had revolutionary effects on how we perceive the world around us and has opened up new understanding of natural phenomena which will undoubtedly have profound effects on our earthly future. We must continue to encourage NASA's explorations and applications activities which recognize our dependence on a rather fragile place within the surrounding cosmos.

The inflation effect on the NASA budget is a very interesting one, Mr. Chairman, for although the NASA budget has been increasing in recent years in terms of actual dollars, the increases have not fully offset the effects of inflation.

Since 1973, the year the Shuttle was initiated, NASA's budget has increased from \$3.4 to \$4.7 billion, but this increase has not fully offset the effects of inflation. NASA's research and development effort has declined in terms of real purchasing power and as a percent of the gross national product.

In comparison to the 1973 level, Mr. Chairman, the 1980 authorization despite an increase of approximately 39 percent in actual dollars, will have decreased by about 20 percent in purchasing power. In the same time period, the NASA R. & D. budget, exclusive of Space Shuttle funding, will have decreased about 46 percent in buying power. These decreases reflect the fact that in terms of research and development effort, a dollar in 1980 will be worth about 55 cents compared to the 1973 dollar. It should also be noted that NASA research and development, like other labor intensive activities, has been subject to a somewhat greater rate of inflation than would be indicated by either the GNP deflator or the Consumer Price Index.

Mr. Chairman, these are very sobering but real facts. We must in turn deal with this robber that deprives this Nation of further research and development efforts that has the potential to improve the well-being of all our citizens of this great Nation.

I am pleased to support this bill Mr. Chairman and take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the committee, Mr. DON FRUQUA of Florida and also the ranking minority member of the Space Subcommittee Mr. LARRY WINN of Kansas. These men have provided the leadership in reviewing this bill in depth and came forth with a responsible and timely piece of legislation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the bill H.R. 1786. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, we can all be proud of NASA's accomplishments in opening up the frontiers of space. Although the NASA Authorization bill, H.R. 1786 is rather modest in light of the prospects for future aeronautical and space programs, it is well planned and balanced and deserves our full support.

In advancing our capabilities in space science, space applications and space technology, NASA has created a vast reservoir of technological knowhow. Through the technology utilization program, NASA has provided effective spin-off programs which are having real impact on the businesses and the industries of this Nation and are providing down to earth benefits to our people. Many specific examples of NASA's technology utilization program are demonstrated each year and a study last year by the Denver Research Institute concludes that the economy benefits at least \$6 for every dollar spent on the technology utilization program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that even with the accomplishments of the technology utilization program, we have only begun to tap the potential of NASA technology, and I look to the industrial application centers as playing an increasing role in advancing these transfers in the future.

Since their inception over 16 years ago, the NASA industrial applications centers (IAC's), formerly regional dissemination centers, have been at the forefront of federally sponsored information and technology delivery services. NASA has served as a forerunner and model for other agencies in the development of its own scientific and technical data base as well as in providing the means for efficient computerized access on-line to industrial users through the IAC's.

Despite the fact that thousands of users have been served by the IAC's, recent information indicates that only 5 percent of the 490,000 manufacturing firms—the largest category of potential users—in the United States have been served by the IAC's because of our inability to provide sufficient outreach. The decrease in funding for the IAC's over the last decade in real dollar terms has hampered NASA's ability to place field representatives at locations in the country other than those of very high density. This condition must be changed in order to provide access to NASA-generated technology in areas not now covered, such as the Pacific Northwest and central Midwest.

In transferring technology to the public sector of the economy, NASA has learned that it is not enough to provide technical information to be adapted and applied by user agencies. Rather, the transfer process requires that aerospace technology be demonstrated as applicable to problems of our cities and States as well as other Federal agencies.

Over the past several years, a number of significant transfers of aerospace have occurred based on these projects conducted by NASA which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

In a recent example of a spinoff resulting from IAC services, Bettcher Manufacturing Corp. in Cleveland, Ohio, adapted a thermal coating in lieu of a porcelain coating. The company is thus able to save 80 percent of the cost of coating heating elements in their panel-bloc heaters.

On January 12, 1979, NASA delivered a lightweight, portable firefighting module to the U.S. Coast Guard. The unit is designed to be set up in less than 10 minutes by two persons without special tools and deliver a full output of 2,000 gallons per minute.

In the field of bioengineering, NASA has developed an intracranial pressure monitor, a commercial version of which will be provided by Pacesetter Systems, Inc. This device provides critical measurement of brain pressure for neurosurgeons in various cases of head injuries and other conditions requiring surgery.

Aerospace electronic technology was adapted years ago for use in cardiac pacemakers. Further development has NASA now working with John Hopkins University on human tissue stimulators to relieve pain of many common disorders. These include heart block; arrhythmias; cancer pain; and back, leg and arm pain. The device, which is fully implantable and rechargeable, allows the physician to regulate the output of the tissue stimulator. First human implant of this new pain relieving device is scheduled for this spring.

In the current climate of declining innovation and reduced funding of private R. & D., the NASA technology utilization program is an effective, worthwhile effort to capitalize on the Government-sponsored R. & D. I believe that even broader segments of our society, particularly in rural areas, will benefit in the future. I am convinced that the technology utilization program will continue to add value to the Nation far in excess of its cost.●

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1786 authorizing appropriations to NASA for fiscal year 1980. I want to congratulate Chairman Fuqua and my colleagues from the other side of the aisle—Mr. WYDLER and Mr. WINN—for their leadership in bringing this legislation before us.

As we have recently viewed the pictures which have been returned from the Voyager I journey to Jupiter, we are even more aware of the contributions of our space program to a better understanding of our universe and our own planet Earth as a part of that universe. Jupiter and its systems can be viewed as a miniature solar system and offers a promise to help us better understand Earth.

One of the findings has been the observation of the first volcanic activity on a celestial body besides Earth. Initial studies of the Voyager encounter data also have provided an insight into the complex atmosphere that surrounds Jupiter, but additional work will be required for a more complete understanding of the Jovian atmosphere dynamics. The encounter of Voyager II, later this year, will add to that understanding.

Additionally, in fiscal year 1980, NASA is requesting funds to continue development of Galileo—previously called the Jupiter Orbiter Probe—which will build on the knowledge gained from the Voyager missions to conduct a comprehensive exploration of Jupiter, its atmosphere, magnetosphere and satellites by a single mission, utilizing a deep space spacecraft concept, which combines both remote sensing and direct measurements on a combined orbiting spacecraft with an atmospheric probe.

However, the Galileo mission is the only approved planetary development program. Therefore, there is a serious concern that the lack of a new planetary mission will result in the demise of a strong governmental/university/industrial base which has kept our Nation in the forefront of exploring the universe.

The NASA program is designed not only to extend our knowledge of the Earth, its environment, the solar system, and the universe, but also to expand the practical applications of space technology. I now want to focus my remarks on the practical applications of space technology for the benefit of man on all parts of the globe.

Data gathered by satellites on earth resources makes use of a rapidly expanding technology often referred to as remote sensing. In terms of global coverage, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has launched Landsat-C to continue the research and development of medium-resolution, multispectral remote sensing systems to be used from space for global data acquisition. The performance of the instrumentation is significantly improved over the sensors used on Landsat-1 and Landsat-2. These performance improvements permit more accurate assessments in a wide-range of applications in agriculture, the environment, hydrology, and mineral and energy resources. The successful launch of this satellite is providing continuing data to current users and with the increased performance, the number and kinds of users should increase significantly.

NASA is continuing the development of Landsat-D, a project which will advance the technology and techniques for earth resources remote sensing by utilizing the advanced capabilities of the second generation experimental multispectral imager, the Thematic Mapper, in concert with the flight-proven Multispectral Scanner. This project will also test a total end-to-end data acquisition, processing, dissemination, and analysis system by bringing the satellite-sensed Earth resources data to the users in a timely fashion—5 to 7 days—on a routine basis over a projected 3-year test period.

The Thematic Mapper to be flown on Landsat-D will provide a significant improvement in the quality and usefulness of remotely-sensed multispectral imagery due to its higher resolving power and additional spectral coverage. These improvements in data quality will enhance the utility of remote sensing for mineral and petroleum exploration,

expand the application of crop inventory techniques to small field agricultural areas worldwide, and significantly increase the number and precision of land and water inventory applications in the United States.

Landsat's potential for agriculture is staggering. Early studies demonstrated that the images clearly identified basic kinds of Earth surfaces. But to manage agriculture crops effectively, planners must know much more than that. They must know how many acres of each crop are growing and what harvest can be expected. Using Landsat, farmland of an entire region can be sorted crop by crop in a matter of hours in combination with high speed computers.

Landsat also offers a new tool for the geologists. Geologists were among the first to welcome Landsat's views of large areas of the Earth's crust. Satellite images are providing complete detailed views of the faults in the Earth's crust. These cracks in the surface may run hundreds of miles, but they are not easy to detect or trace. By comparing these photographs with existing geological maps, not only were known fault systems easily observed, but many unknown faults were discovered.

Landsat images of fault systems in California have given geologists a new and valuable perspective on the threat of earthquakes to the population of this region. Knowing exactly where the faults lie should help to determine safe building locations. Landsat information can be used to revise and correct the geological maps of all areas where earthquakes occur.

Geological faults are related to more than hazards like earthquakes. They are also the key to locating mineral resources. One of the challenges facing geologists today is to find scarce new mineral deposits. Since minerals often develop along fault lines, Landsat's better mapping of faults which show fractures and discolorations provides modern day prospectors with valuable clues as they explore new areas. Oil and mining industries are the largest purchasers of Landsat data, which are made available through the U.S. Department of Interior's EROS Data Center at Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Landsat cannot find these buried treasures, but it can help point the way.

An operational Earth resources remote sensing system is a logical follow-on to the Landsat program and represents the operational phase of an evolving development initiated more than 10 years ago with the Earth resources technology satellite, later renamed Landsat-1. The Landsat series has demonstrated the wide utility of remote sensing data to diverse Earth resources applications in agriculture, forestry, rangeland, land use, hydrology, and geology. In fact, a successful demonstration of the value of such data is evident in the plans of the French and the Japanese to launch remote sensing satellites of their own.

The Landsat developments have matured to the point where an operational system, building on the Landsat base, is not only feasible but necessary. Many re-

source managers are utilizing Landsat data to supplement existing data bases because of its ability to view entire regions and the repetitive nature of these surveys. The user community, however, has indicated that the principal impediment to a wider adoption of remote sensing technology is the lack of an operational commitment. The authorization and subsequent funding approval of an operational system would be the required commitment. If the United States is to effectively manage both its renewable and nonrenewable resources; to acquire data on the quality and quantity of the Earth's resources; and to serve the needs of the Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector; then it is necessary to establish an operational system which can meet these needs on a routine and continuing base.

The present Landsat program has laid the groundwork necessary to implement an operational system. We need to exploit this technology and ensure its routine use by an even wider community of users.

Understanding and predicting the daily weather requires that detailed information be available and processed on a global basis. Improvements to both the length and accuracy of forecasts are dependent on such data and the capability of global models to describe the interactions of the various atmospheric processes. Weather satellites, with their unique capability to observe the basic parameters and dynamic processes of the atmosphere, have the potential for providing the global information required. Quantitative soundings of the global atmosphere, data for advanced research of atmospheric processes, and global viewing of clouds and storm systems are being provided by current meteorological satellites.

In recent years, a number of independent studies and reviews have led to the recommendation that programs be initiated to assess and enhance our knowledge of climate and to investigate the predictability of climate change. A national climate program plan has been developed in response to the obvious need for a well-integrated program of research and analysis of the past, present, and possible future climate conditions.

Within the context of the national program, NASA has the responsibility for making measurements from space to aid in our understanding of the physical processes that control climate and climate change. Our knowledge of these complex climate processes is very rudimentary. As a consequence, improving our understanding will require a great deal of study and data acquisition over a considerable period of time.

The ocean environment has far-reaching effects on our Nation's economy and defense systems and influences in many ways the conduct of our daily lives. Its existence provides an economic medium for the transport of people and goods, a strategic and tactical base for naval forces, food for a large percentage of the world population, and a source of energy exchange for atmospheric processes creating changes in weather and climate

patterns. But it does not remain in a constant, nor for that matter easily predictable, state. It is inherently dynamic and capable of short-term changes whose magnitude can lead to devastating disasters. Understanding these changes, predicting their occurrence, and utilizing this information advantageously to capitalize on opportunity and avoid disaster would be of immense benefit to our society.

At present, our sources of information for ocean state is limited to such conventional sources as buoys and cooperative ships and some data on weather patterns from the weather satellites. Economic analyses have concluded that an operational ocean satellite system, if available in 1975, would have provided average annual benefits of \$37 to \$67 million over the 25-year period to the year 2000.

The main drivers for these benefits from improved ways of doing business were realized in the marine transportation industry through more favorable routing of ships, commercial fishing of the oceans through better location and prediction of fish habitats, arctic navigation through improved definition of ice buildup and location, and improved inputs for offshore oil and natural gas exploration, development, and protection against the elements.

Derivation of annual cost benefits through forewarning of impending disasters such as hurricanes, tidal waves, or other ocean related phenomena is difficult to accomplish, but there is no question of the contribution to be made here.

As to matters of national defense, an ocean satellite system would provide a major increase in observational data over the oceans. With this increase, it is expected that greatly improved predictions will be available which in turn will lead to improved efficiency and effectiveness of the Navy and other Armed Forces. The effectiveness of existing sensors, weapons, and platforms would significantly benefit from knowledge of the ocean environment. Operating efficiency would be improved through scheduling training activities and selection routes to capitalize on favorable ocean conditions. Reduction in loss of life and costs of materials would be realized through improved ocean condition forecasting.

NASA, in conjunction with DOD and NOAA, has proposed to implement a global sea surface observation capability based on satellite remote-sensing techniques. This project, referred to as the National Oceanic Satellite System (NOSS), would be a limited operational demonstration of a system specifically designed to meet the Nation's needs, both civilian and military, for oceanic monitoring and predictions.

The technology, both from a measurement techniques standpoint and remote sensing operations by satellites, has in large measure been proven. All of the baseline sensors have flown in the Nimbus or the Seasat program and the improvements required to meet the user needs are not expected to involve significant new developments, felt to be of major consequence.

At present, this proposal has been stricken from the executive branch's

budget submission as a part of a broader goal reducing inflation by reducing Government spending. In view of the state of the technology and the contributions to be derived from the project, I support the committee's recommendation to include funding to complete definition of the system and initiate development.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. capability to monitor and sense the Earth's resources and environmental quality with satellite technology is unparalleled throughout the world. Furthermore, these capabilities are, and will continue to rapidly improve.

This preeminent position is a source of international responsibility, as well as national pride. Since the U.S. satellite program collects data from the entire globe it is in a unique position to meet the needs of the world's developing countries with respect to resource and environmental sensing and communications.

I believe that it is not only politically desirable but also consistent with the national objective of more harmonious international relations and Third World development to assist these countries in developing a global user plan for satellite technology.

Mr. Chairman, these are only a few areas where the space technology developed by NASA is being applied to the solution of problems here on the Earth. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that NASA can continue this important work.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1786

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to become available October 1, 1979:

(a) For "Research and development", for the following programs:

- (1) Space Shuttle, \$1,393,000,000;
- (2) Space flight operations, \$463,300,000;
- (3) Expendable launch vehicles, \$70,700,000;
- (4) Physics and astronomy, \$337,500,000;
- (5) Planetary exploration, \$220,200,000;
- (6) Life sciences, \$43,900,000;
- (7) Space applications, \$338,300,000;
- (8) Technology utilization, \$12,100,000;
- (9) Aeronautical research and technology, \$308,300,000;
- (10) Space research and technology, \$116,400,000;
- (11) Energy technology, \$3,000,000; and
- (12) Tracking and data acquisition, \$332,800,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities", including land acquisition, as follows:

- (1) Modification of static test facility, Ames Research Center, \$2,900,000.

(2) Construction of large aircraft maintenance dock, Hugh L. Dryden Flight Research Center, \$1,500,000;

(3) Rehabilitation and modification of flight operations facilities, Ellington Air Force Base, \$1,760,000;

(4) Modifications to central instrumentation facility, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$1,260,000;

(5) Modifications to operations and checkout building, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$950,000;

(6) Rehabilitation of roof, launch control complex, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$600,000;

(7) Modifications of model support system 8-foot high temperature structures tunnel, Langley Research Center, \$1,410,000;

(8) Modification to 8-foot transonic pressure tunnel, Langley Research Center, \$2,000,000;

(9) Modification of transonic dynamic tunnel, Langley Research Center, \$970,000;

(10) Rehabilitation and modification of gas dynamics laboratory, Langley Research Center, \$3,600,000;

(11) Modifications to central air system, various buildings, Lewis Research Center, \$5,720,000;

(12) Modifications to various buildings, Marshall Space Flight Center, \$2,640,000;

(13) Rehabilitation of roofs, various buildings, Marshall Space Flight Center, \$900,000;

(14) Rehabilitation of roof, Phase I, building 103, Michoud Assembly Facility, \$3,100,000;

(15) Construction of facilities operations shop building, Wallops Flight Center, \$1,100,000;

(16) Large aeronautical facility: construction of national transonic facility, Langley Research Center, \$12,000,000;

(17) Large aeronautical facility: modification of 40- by 80-foot subsonic wind tunnel, Ames Research Center, \$33,900,000;

(18) Space Shuttle facilities at various locations as follows:

(A) Modifications to launch complex 39, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$17,100,000;

(B) Modifications to crawler transporter maintenance facility, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$1,250,000;

(C) Modification of manufacturing and final assembly facilities for external tanks, Michoud Assembly Facility, \$6,900,000;

(D) Minor Shuttle-unique projects, various locations, \$2,500,000;

(19) Space Shuttle payload facilities at various locations as follows:

(A) Rehabilitation and modification for payload ground support operations, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$2,610,000;

(B) Modification and addition to materials sciences laboratory, Ames Research Center, \$1,640,000;

(20) Repair of facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$500,000 per project, \$12,000,000;

(21) Rehabilitation and modification of facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$500,000 per project, \$19,790,000;

(22) Minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$250,000 per project, \$3,500,000;

(23) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, \$14,000,000.

(c) For "Research and program management," \$964,900,000, and such additional supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 1(g), appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required at locations other than installations of the Administration for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2)

for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used in accordance with this subsection for the construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified and to the extent provided in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Research and program management" appropriation for periods not in excess of 12 months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed \$25,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 1(a) and 1(c), not in excess of \$75,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and for repairs, rehabilitation, or modification of facilities: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a), not in excess of \$25,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for any of the foregoing for unforeseen programmatic needs.

SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1) through (22), inclusive, of subsection 1(b)—

(1) in the discretion of the Administrator or his designee, may be varied upward 10 per centum, or

(2) following a report by the Administrator or his designee to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the circumstances of such action, may be varied upward 25 per centum.

to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

SEC. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (23) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations

at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of 30 days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Technology or the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee, unless (A) a period of 30 days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

SEC. 6. (a) Paragraph 13 of subsection (c) of section 203 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2473(c)(13)) is amended by striking out "\$5,000" where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000".

(b) The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, is amended (1) by redesignating section 308 as section 309 thereof; and (2) by inserting the following new section:

"INSURANCE AND INDEMNIFICATION"

"Sec. 308. (a) The Administration is authorized on such terms and to the extent it may deem appropriate to provide liability insurance for any user of a space vehicle to compensate all or a portion of claims by third parties for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property resulting from activities carried on in connection with the launch, operations or recovery of the space vehicle. Appropriations available to the Administration may be used to acquire such insurance, but such appropriations shall be reimbursed to the maximum extent practicable by the users under reimbursement policies established pursuant to section 203 (c) of this Act.

"(b) Under such regulations in conformity with this section as the Administrator shall prescribe taking into account the availability, cost and terms of liability insurance, any agreement between the Administration and a user of a space vehicle may provide that the United States will indemnify the user against claims (including reasonable expenses of litigation or settlement) by third parties for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property resulting from activities carried on in connection with the launch, operations or recovery of the space vehicle, but only to the extent that such claims are not compensated by liability insurance of the user: *Provided*, That such indemnification may be limited to claims resulting from other than the actual negligence or willful misconduct of the user.

"(c) An agreement made under subsection (b) that provides indemnification must also provide for—

"(1) notice to the United States of any claim or suit against the user for the death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to the property; and

"(2) control of or assistance in the defense by the United States, at its election, of that suit or claim.

"(d) No payment may be made under subsection (b) unless the Administrator or his designee certifies that the amount is just and reasonable.

"(e) Upon the approval by the Administrator, payments under subsection (b) may be made, at the Administrator's election, either from funds available for research and development not otherwise obligated or from funds appropriated for such payments.

"(f) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'space vehicle' means an object intended for launch, launched or assembled in outer space, including the Space Shuttle and other components of a space transportation system, together with related equipment, devices, components and parts;

"(2) the term 'user' includes anyone who enters into an agreement with the Administration for use of all or a portion of a space vehicle, who owns or provides property to be flown on a space vehicle, or who employs a person to be flown on a space vehicle; and

"(3) the term 'third party' means any person who may institute a claim against a user for death, bodily injury or loss of or damage to property."

Sec. 7. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1980".

Mr. FUQUA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA: Insert at the end of section 6 a new subsection (c). "(c) this section shall be effective October 1, 1979."

□ 1825

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment just to insure compliance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974. This is technical in nature.

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

Mr. Chairman, the chairman has stated this very well. It is obviously a technical amendment and the minority is in 100 percent agreement with this amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEISS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEISS: Page 14, line 5, strike out "\$308,300,000;" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$285,600,000: *Provided*, That, no part of any funds available to the Administrator pursuant to this Act may be used for any research or development activity relating to civilian Advanced Supersonic Transports, or for any other study, analysis, or planning relating to technology for such transports;"

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, on page 6 of the committee report I find a fascinating statement. I think that perhaps the Members will find it equally fascinating. I am going to read it. It says:

NASA requested \$300,300,000 for Aeronautical Research and Technology. Although this amount represents a 13.7 percent increase over the current plan for fiscal year 1979, the Committee is disturbed to note that this increase represents nothing more than run-out of current programs with a modest allowance for inflation.

I then skip a paragraph and pick up the next sentence:

Therefore, the Committee increases the requested amount for Variable-Cycle Engine Technology by \$8,000,000 to provide for additional experimentation that is not included in the current program for a total authorization of \$308,300,000.

The reason that I find these particular two sentences fascinating, Mr. Chairman, is that here we have been for the better part of these last 3 months engaged in discussion after discussion and debate after debate about how important and essential it was, never mind not to increase the budget that was submitted to us, but how essential it was to decrease budget requests. In fact, there have been people who have gotten up, especially on the other side of the aisle, calling down upon us all the doom that would befall this country because we were not ready to balance the budget this very year, and some in more modest fashion have suggested that we must balance the budget in 3 years.

Instead of that, here is an important committee which comes along and says it is not sufficient to have a 13.7 percent increase on a particular program. We are going to add \$8 million on top of that.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that

that is standing the logic of the balanced budget on its head.

I think it calls to stark attention why the people of this country might feel somewhat cynical that there are so many who are ready to balance the budget on their backs and out of their skins but when it comes to gimmickry of the kind that this SST authorization is, then the sky is the limit.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that a billion dollars had been scheduled in this SST program over a 10-year period until distinguished leading Members of this body, including the now distinguished minority leader and some distinguished current chairmen of this House, who finally brought the monster to heel and to a halt and cut the program dead. That was after a billion dollars had been expended; but, lo and behold, the monster was not buried, it was not even dead, because we discovered in 1977 by going through one of these committee reports that from the very year after that action of the Congress in bringing the SST program to a halt, "small" amounts of money of \$8 million, or \$10 million, or \$11 million, or \$12 million or \$20 million a year had been snuck in by the back door; but you would never discover that, by reading the bills, only if you read the reports.

To this day, over the course of the last 7 or 8 years, some \$85 million had been expended in that fashion. With this \$22 million, almost \$23 million, it will become over \$100 million, for a monster that we thought had been killed; but that is not the worst of it. NASA has suggested, has said to us, that all the research and development experimentation is just about through. The next step, my colleagues, is validation of that research and development.

Do you know what that is going to cost? Five hundred and sixty-one million dollars. That is the next step.

□ 1830

Do you know what the step after that is? Technological readiness of advanced supersonic transport. Do you know what that is going to cost? Over \$1.5 billion. Talk about balancing budgets? Who is kidding who? It seems to me if we really take it all seriously, the kind of dire economic shape this country is in, we will start looking not just at social programs.

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

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

Mr. WEISS. We ought not to be looking just at the social programs that I delineated earlier, whether it be in the field of health or education or women or infant care or child care or social security. We ought to be looking at the programs that deal with hardware because there never seems to be a concern about how inflationary hardware costs are.

The time, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, to take that meaningful step is right now. When we think about hardware we have to really look clearly at the consequences of what we do. When we are treated as we were a little bit ago to an Alice in Wonderland type of exposition as to how dangerous or not danger-

ous one of the most frightening incidents this country has been confronted with, that is the emergency situation at the nuclear plant in Pennsylvania this morning, then it seems to me we ought not just to take the word of people who are in the technological or scientific field as to what is right or what is necessary or what is needed. We ought to be checking it out for ourselves.

In this instance I tell you, my colleagues, if we want to strike a blow for fighting inflation, for balancing the budget, for bringing to a halt a program which we thought that we had halted some 8 or 9 years ago, this is the time to do it and I hope that my colleagues will do so by voting for my amendment to delete \$22.7 million.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AMBRO. Those of us who live in and around Kennedy Airport fought the Concorde vociferously. An awful lot of the things that we heard about it were proved in testimony from experts. For example, before the Subcommittee on Aviation when I questioned Frank Borman, he said the Concorde was a turkey because it was terribly fuel inefficient.

We believed at one point that emissions of oxides of nitrogen would float up through the atmosphere and deplete our ozone layer and to those of us who have less than a covered pate were severely concerned because of the carcinogenic effects of ultraviolet rays beating on our brows.

The sound and decibel levels of the Concorde were of great concern to all of those who lived in and around the periphery of airports, at which the SST's would land.

Imagine this: A fuel-efficient supersonic transport which would put this Nation in the forefront of aviation once more, not competing as they now do with conventional aircraft; a supersonic transport with sound-absorbent material and the technology to eliminate those horrendous decibel levels.

Imagine this in terms of recent knowledge: Emissions of oxide of nitrogen have now been determined through a photochemical process not to deplete the ozone layer but indeed to enhance it.

□ 1835

And so here we have a variety of ingredients which can be pulled together to bring once more to this Nation one of the greatest achievements technologically in the world. This is one thing more that will restore this Nation's hegemony in the area of high technology. That is what this program is all about.

I will leave it to others to talk about the balances between the expenditures of funds for social programs as opposed to high technology. I will leave it to others to talk about the infusion of funds into this economy to create jobs for people, as opposed to what my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Weiss), says. But I do think in terms of the balance between the knowledge we had in 1971 and our misconceptions about an SST and that which we can do today

under this program, it means that we have no choice but to continue with this effort.

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

Mr. AMBRO. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for his very excellent statement and say further that there are no funds whatsoever in this bill or in any other bill that comes before this committee to commit this country to build an SST. We are only trying to study ways by which, should that decision ever be made, we would have the best technology available at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. AMBRO), and I ask for a "no" vote on the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to echo the thoughts of the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

I sit as a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation, and Communication, in which that particular question was asked: are any funds to be committed, or are any funds going to be committed for the building of any prototype or for the production of any airplane whatsoever?

The answer is an unqualified "no," both from NASA as well as industry. In fact, industry indicated that at least at this time they have no interest in pursuing a supersonic transport.

These funds give us a tremendous spin-off. This accounted for \$22.5 million for general aviation and research and development in this country, which, as the gentleman knows, points out that this is something on which we have taken the lead for many, many years.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a very, very wise decision to vote down this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Weiss) that we seem to be at odds here today, but I have the greatest respect for him, and I like him very much personally. So I do not want the gentleman to feel that the fact that we seem to be disagreeing on a very frequent basis here today is any indication of anything other than the fact that we do not see these issues the same way.

I have to disagree with what the gentleman said about this particular issue for a number of reasons. First of all, the gentleman tried to imply, as I heard him present his case, that somehow the people on this side of the aisle were budget-busters because we were considering the item for the supersonic transport. The fact of the matter is, of course, that this particular item and the bill that we are considering on the floor of the House came out of the committee with a uni-

mous vote of all the Members on the Democratic and Republican sides, and there are just about twice as many Democrats on the committee as there are Republicans.

So I think the blame, whatever it is in that case has to be shared on a fairly equal basis. That is not the important point the gentleman made, of course.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to yield.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, the important point the gentleman made regards whether this country really should stand still on technology. That is what he would have us do, and I cannot see any sensible Member of this Congress adopting that course of action.

Sure, we built an SST or tried to some years ago. It was finally voted down near the very end of the program in this very body, and I voted against it. It was a very noisy aircraft, one that could not be justified at that time in our Nation's history. That was my judgment.

But this is 10 years later. We did not mean that we were voting on that day that never again would the United States consider building a supersonic aircraft.

□ 1840

As a matter of fact, I hope to heaven that all of us here would wish that we could build a very quiet fuel-efficient and effective supersonic airplane and dominate that world market for the American economy. That should be something we are trying to do. But the gentleman would have us, because we used to have a bad airplane, never again consider entering that field of endeavor. And that is the kind of shutout thinking that really will turn this country on a downgrade in competition with the rest of the world and guarantee that we will become a second-class economic power.

As one who is vitally concerned with this—because my district is one which is right next to Kennedy Airport, which obviously has more SST's, has more now and will have more than any country, that is, from the standpoint of landing and takeoffs over there—I want our country to get ahead on this. I want our country to do the research and development, so that we can build an SST that is quiet, so that when the people in my district have to listen to one going over their heads, it will be a quiet plane and it will be an American plane. Why not? Why not the best, as somebody once said in this country not long ago?

So I hope the members of this Committee will defeat the amendment.

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

Mr. WYDLER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CAVANAUGH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that I have either misunderstood what the gentleman from New York (Mr. Weiss) has said, or others are not interpreting what he said as accurately as could be. What I understood him to say is not that he is against the technology, not that he is against the development of the technology, but who should pay for the development of the technology. And at this point in time,

when there are great constraints on the fiscal obligations of the Federal Government, how do we make the judgment as to how this fits in our priorities? And I think what the gentleman from New York is saying to the Congress, or what I understood him to say, is that the development of this technology should be left to those who will benefit directly economically from its development, and that is the airlines and aviation industry in this country.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman did listen to what the gentleman had to say, now that he asked me that question, because I remember he came to the conclusion that we were trying to put that monster back in the air, that monster I presume to be the old SST that we voted down about 10 years ago. That is what the gentleman is shooting at.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to follow through with the question that the gentleman asked: Who should pay?

This morning, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation, and Communication, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), myself and others, sat in and listened to testimony on the whole question of mass transportation systems—buses, railroads, trolley cars, automotive propulsion.

The Federal Government is putting an awful lot of dollars, millions of dollars, into how to make a better engine, how to build a better railroad, how to build better buses. We are putting research dollars into medicine, we are putting research dollars into the environment, we are putting research dollars into aeronautics. Supersonic flight is just one more step up from subsonic flight. The next realm of flight is hypersonic flight. Science and research and development is the quest for understanding the unknown and the solving of problems. If we shut the door and put our head in the sand, we will never overcome the advancement of the new state of the art in order to enhance the lives of all Americans—in fact, all citizens of the world.

Research dollars I think are a good expenditure of the taxpayers' money, especially where there is long-term benefits that cannot be realized in a short-term basis because of a profit or loss motive. Concerning supersonic flight, the R. & D. dollars are not to build an airplug, but to identify those barriers to supersonic flight so that industry, perhaps in partnership with the Government, will overcome those barriers, so that we can answer those questions that are objectionable today that caused us to cancel the plane back in the 1970's. It is an effort to find out what we do not know today, and it is a good investment in tomorrow's effort.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we would be wise in voting down this amendment so that future generations can enjoy the standards, the privi-

leges that past generations have helped to develop.

□ 1845

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CAVANAUGH. The gentleman made reference to my remarks and my query as to who should pay; then, he went on to recite many other worthwhile areas in which our Government pursues goals, but I think he misrecites the facts as we find them.

When we look at the explanation of surface transportation in this Congress in this year, you see that we are reducing that, that we have received a proposal from DOT to substantially reduce Amtrak and public transportation—

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not disagree with the gentleman in increasing those dollars.

Mr. CAVANAUGH. We did just the other day reduce our commitment to health care. The gentleman cites our commitment to health care funding, and we are reducing in each one of those areas. I think what we have to say then is question whether this area, is this one that can stand against all those others and move to the front of the priority line when there is no direct and immediate benefit and that the very industry that would benefit even says that it could not utilize this technology.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Gentlemen, I would point out to the gentleman the direct benefit of supersonic research right now, today, is our defense capability to make fighter aircraft and supersonic bombers fly better. That is the direct benefit today, and hopefully commercialization will come later.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. I am glad the gentleman made his last point, because the only place where this country now exceeds, where the exports exceed imports, is in aviation, in foods, and in computers. Hopefully, some day the aviation that will come out of this research and development in supersonic planes, the sale of those commercial planes will come to the benefit of the entire country, not just to the industry.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will reiterate what my colleague from New York (Mr. AMBRO) said. I would like to remind the gentleman that we had a colloquy last time with regard to the same issue. Nothing has changed. I do understand what the gentleman's objections are, and I do understand the serving of a provincial interest in this, and I understand some of the fears. We did go through an exercise a few years ago in very impassioned and emotional ways, and we killed the tech-

nology—or presumably we killed the technology.

Now, we find that the technology is once again upon us, but that technology has not been developed by the United States; it has been developed by other countries, in this case namely Britain and France. The SST's are a reality; they are here.

The technology we are now talking about is how to develop the power which will power this type of air frame. It is not necessarily in application today or tomorrow. We are a long way away. We have to understand that in the development of a research vehicle such as we are now talking about, which this does not even deal with, although this is the issue; that is, it will take us at least 10 years to develop this kind of an air frame, and we are going to have a powerplant for it. That is what we are talking about right now.

We are talking about an engine that operates in the dense lower atmosphere effectively and efficiently, and energy efficient. That is what we are really talking about, and that it will then do exactly the same thing in the higher-up, thin atmosphere, and again have energy efficiency. That is the sum total of what we are trying to do in this thing.

We are not going to have an SST that is pushed upon the society within the space of a few short months. If we were to go full bore, I doubt seriously that we could have a research vehicle flying within 5 years.

□ 1850

I really do not think we could, but I will say this: As has been pointed out here today, if we do not do this now, we just further the thing down the line and the powers that be in Europe are going to develop this plane and they are going to go forward. They are not going to wait for Yankee ingenuity or Yankee dominance in this area because no longer do we have it.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. LLOYD. I do indeed yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

I only wanted to inquire of him, within the context in which I spoke and having really no special vested interest in this matter, why he would use the word "provincial" in relating to my argument.

The fact is that as I have listened to the people who have been supporting the position of the committee and opposing my amendment, if there is any provinciality, it would seem to me that it would be on the part of those who are opposing this amendment, given some of the interests within their respective districts.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the gentleman would care to elucidate on that point.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I made the presumption that since there was a strong negative factor with regard to the SST in New York a few short months or a year ago, that perhaps was coloring

the gentleman's judgment. If I made that judgment erroneously, I apologize; and I am glad that the gentleman has joined the rest of us.

Mr. WEISS. I appreciate the gentleman's clarification.

That is not my concern. My concern really and truly is the fact that if the private sector—and we are talking about technological readiness with regard to a supersonic transport in the 1984–86 range, if that is what they are talking about, it seems to me that those interests in the private sector should pay for it rather than have the taxpayer pay for it at a time when we cannot afford to provide health care, hospital care, education, or whatever for the people of this country.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I will take my time back.

On that point I would remind the gentleman that the 707 was a direct development of the Federal Government in the KC-135. One hand washes the other, and we need this kind of development.

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

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

I would not impinge upon the remaining time of the debate if I were not aware of the growing number of our Members who now follow floor debate by using our office televisions. They have succumbed to the unavoidable and logical dictum, "Time is money." To save mankind's most precious commodity—time—they utilize a modern communicative tool.

I intend to, as we say, "work one of the doors" on this issue to plead for a large vote against this shortsighted amendment and thereby save us time next year and the year after and the year after because I believe that we should continue to fund each year research and development on this inevitable advance in transportation and aviation.

Mr. Chairman, I am curious as to how many Members of this body have flown supersonic to date. I know the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation and Communication, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), has in his naval career. I know the gentleman from California (Mr. LLOYD) has in his distinguished military career. I know that many of the distinguished gentlemen on this side of the aisle have. The gentleman from California (Mr. BADHAM) has just in the last week.

I first flew supersonic in the Air Force 24½ years ago. I have also flown across the Atlantic on the British Airways commercial Concorde SST as has the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER). I flew the SST last year at the instigation of the distinguished prior chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, the unique and visionary gentleman from Texas, the unforgettable Olin Teague. He said he thought it was necessary that as many Members as possible should avail themselves of the

opportunity to feel the future, particularly if we would pay for it ourselves, as I did.

That supersonic flight for me in January of 1978 was an amazing experience. Mach 2 for over 3½ hours of sustained flight only 75 years after the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk.

Mr. Chairman, anybody voting against U.S. SST research is simply holding back the future. I have no fear that I will ever be contradicted in this prophecy—simply this: That 30 years from now, not a half dozen Members or 5 dozen but fully 95 percent of the Members of this House will have flown on a commercial supersonic transport. And why should not that sleek transport be "Made in the USA."

I think it would be a tragedy if the airliners we fly on supersonically in the future are built by European consortiums because of a lack of vision in this body.

I think every Member of this House should be aware that this year we are going to pass \$8.2 billion in sales of commercial aircraft made in our country.

□ 1855

For the first time business aircraft are going to break the \$2 billion sales market barrier. Next year will see business and private aircraft sales go past \$2.5 billion mark. We will see civilian commercial aircraft sales go past \$10 billion in 1980. A remarkable achievement. Anyone who follows commercial aviation worldwide knows that the Airbus, both the 300 model and the 310 model made in Europe have had tremendous sales success including purchase by our own Eastern Airlines. They have sold dozens of models, and of course we wish them well, but in this very competitive market, which is second only to food in balancing our import imbalance we should always lead not follow. In facing up to our ghastly balance of payments problem we simply cannot give away our great lead in any area of aerospace. The money that our committee has allocated under the excellent leadership of our chairman in this area of research for high-speed flight has been carefully massaged so that "no beast is going to be unleashed" from any Pandora's box. This mischievous amendment is trying to hold back the future, and I would ask of my colleagues an overwhelming rejection of it so that it will not be back to haunt us next year or the following year or the next year by the same type of shortsighted Member who rose in this House at the turn of the century to call two bicycle manufacturers from Dayton, Ohio, "fools" when those indomitable brothers named Wright launched civilization on one of its most exciting vacations. I was at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N.C., this last December 17 for the 75th anniversary of powered flight. We celebrated that beautifully clear day how two young Americans, Wilbur 36, and Orville, 31, dazzled the world. Heavier-than-air powered flight—a dream of centuries come true—here in the U.S.A. Why now should we throttle back and give the lead in precious time-saving power to our competitors. Let us

grab that torch of progress and with careful and precise research build the cleanest, quietest, safest, and yes, the fastest commercial plane possible to close our century as we began it—leading the way. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I know the hour is late, and I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, but I would just like to mention a couple of things. I heard the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER). He and I both voted against the SST in 1971, and I think he agrees that that was the right decision at that time, and I certainly think it was. Yet the same kind of arguments that we have just heard were made at that time. I do not see what the great rush is, why we cannot wait a year until the OTA study, which will be an objective study, presumably, to give us a little enlightenment. Yesterday we voted to take out \$14 million from the NSF budget for basic research across the board, things that may do a lot more for this country than the SST down the road.

Here we are in a fuel crisis so serious that we are talking about gasoline rationing, yet all we have learned until now is that an SST is the most fuel wasteful form of transportation devised.

We have been told by the gentleman from California (Mr. LLOYD), who is a very fine, honorable, and knowledgeable person that, in the opinion of some of the aircraft manufacturers he has talked to, the SST will eventually be more fuel-efficient than current subsonic transports. Unfortunately, we have found that relying solely on the aircraft industry to give us information about their products is not always the best way to get a full and accurate analysis. The OTA is studying this question. If a year from now we have the OTA study and it does show, indeed, that this is a more fuel efficient and environmentally desirable way to go, we will be able to go ahead at that time. In the meantime, we can cut a little bit out of the budget, get a little closer to a balanced budget, and save the taxpayers not only this \$23 million but possibly billions of dollars in the future.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 246, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

AYES—137

Addabbo	Blanchard	Clinger
Albosta	Bonior	Collins, Ill.
Applegate	Bonker	Collins, Tex.
Ashley	Brademas	Crane, Daniel
Aspin	Brodhead	Crane, Philip
AuCoin	Broyhill	D'Amours
Baldus	Burton, John	Dannemeyer
Barnes	Carr	Daschle
Bedell	Cavanaugh	Davis, S.C.
Bellenson	Chisholm	Deckard
Bennett	Clay	Dellums

Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Downey
Drinan
Early
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, Okla.
English
Erdahl
Ertel
Fazio
Fenwick
Ferraro
Fithian
Florio
Ford, Mich.
Ford, Tenn.
Gephardt
Grassley
Gray
Green
Hall, Ohio
Hansen
Harris
Heftel
Hightower
Holtzman
Ichord
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Jenrette

Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kildee
Kogovsek
Kostmayer
Leland
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDonald
McHugh
Maguire
Markey
Marienese
Matsui
Mattox
Mavroules
Mica
Mikulski
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mitchell, Md.
Moakley
Mottl
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Nolan
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Ottinger
Panetta
Paul
Pease
Pursell
Rangel

Ratchford
Reuss
Richmond
Rinaldo
Rodino
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Schroeder
Seiberling
Shannon
Sharp
Simon
Solarz
Spellman
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Synar
Thompson
Udall
Van Deelen
Vento
Volkmmer
Walgren
Waxman
Weiss
Whitley
Williams, Mont.
Wirth
Wolpe, Mich.
Yates

NOES—246

Abdnor
Akaka
Alexander
Ambo
Anderson
Calif.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Anthony
Archer
Atkinson
Badham
Bafalis
Bailey
Barnard
Beard, R.I.
Benjamin
Bereuter
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bouquard
Bowen
Breau
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burgener
Burlison
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Chappell
Cheney
Clausen
Cleveland
Coelho
Coleman
Conte
Corcoran
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Courter
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Danielson
Davis, Mich.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dorman
Dougherty
Duncan, Tenn.
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Emery
Erlenborn

Evans, Ga.
Fascell
Fish
Filippo
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Fowler
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gialmo
Gilman
Gingrich
Ginn
Glickman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Grisham
Gudger
Guyer
Hagedorn
Hall, Tex.
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hance
Hanley
Harkin
Harsha
Heckler
Hefner
Hillis
Hinson
Holland
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jeffries
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
Kelly
Kemp
Kindness
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach, Iowa
Leach, La.
Leath, Tex.
Lee
Lent
Levitas
Lewis

Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lowry
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
McClary
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McKinney
Madigan
Marks
Marriott
Martin
Mathis
Mazzoli
Miller, Ohio
Mineta
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead,
Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murphy, Pa.
Murtha
Myers, Ind.
Myers, Pa.
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
O'Brien
Pashayan
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Preyer
Price
Pritchard
Quayle
Quillen
Rallsback
Regula
Rhodes
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Rose
Roth
Rouselet
Rudd
Santini
Satterfield
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schulze
Sebelius
Sensenbrenner

Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Skelton
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Nebr.
Snowe
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
St Germain
Stack
Stangeland
Stanton
Steed

Stenholm
Stratton
Stump
Swift
Tauke
Taylor
Traxler
Treen
Trible
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
White
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Whitten

Williams, Ohio
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, C. H.
Winn
Wolff, N.Y.
Wright
Wyatt
Wylder
Wyllie
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Zablocki
Zeferetti

NOT VOTING—49

Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Bauman
Beard, Tenn.
Bingham
Bolling
Brooks
Carter
Conable
Conyers
Diggs
Dodd
Duncan, Oreg.
Edgar
Evans, Del.
Evans, Ind.
Findley

Fisher
Flood
Frenzel
Gaydos
Gibbons
Guarini
Hawkins
Hollenbeck
Jones, Okla.
LaFalce
Lederer
Lehman
McCloskey
McKay
Michel
Mikva

Moffett
Oakar
Pepper
Rahall
Rannels
Staggers
Stewart
Stockman
Symms
Thomas
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Weaver
Wilson, Tex.
Young, Mo.

□ 1915

Messrs. DICKS, VENTO, ENGLISH, ROSTENKOWSKI, WAXMAN, and NEDZI changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Messrs. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, AKAKA, and SCHEUER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BEILSON, 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. 1786) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 176, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF OHIO

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Ohio moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1786, to the Committee on Science and Technology.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

□ 1920

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 323, noes 57, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

AYES—323

Abdnor
Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Ambo
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Anthony
Archer
Atkinson
AuCoin
Badham
Bafalis
Bailey
Barnard
Barnes
Beard, R.I.
Benjamin
Bennett
Bereuter
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Blanchard
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bonker
Bouquard
Bowen
Brademas
Breau
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burgener
Burlison
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Carr
Chappell
Cheney
Chisholm

Clausen
Cleveland
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Corcoran
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Courter
Crane, Philip
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Danielson
Dannemeyer
Davis, Mich.
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Deckard
Derrick
Derwinski
Devine
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dornan
Dougherty
Downey
Drinan
Duncan, Tenn.
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, Okla.
Emery
English
Ertel
Evans, Ga.
Fary
Fascell
Fazio
Ferraro
Fish
Fithian
Filippo
Florio
Foley
Ford, Mich.
Ford, Tenn.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fowler

Frost
Fuqua
Gialmo
Gilman
Gingrich
Ginn
Glickman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Grassley
Gray
Green
Grisham
Gudger
Guyer
Hagedorn
Hall, Ohio
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hance
Hanley
Hansen
Harkin
Harsha
Heckler
Hefner
Heftel
Hightower
Hillis
Hinson
Holland
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hutto
Ichord
Ireland
Jeffries
Jenkins
Jenrette
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kazen
Kelly
Kemp

Kildee	Murphy, Pa.	Slack
Kindness	Murtha	Smith, Iowa
Kogovsek	Myers, Ind.	Smith, Nebr.
Kramer	Myers, Pa.	Snowe
Lagamarsino	Natcher	Snyder
Latta	Neal	Solarz
Leach, Iowa	Nedzi	Solomon
Leach, La.	Nelson	Spellman
Leath, Tex.	Nichols	Spence
Lee	Nowak	St Germain
Lent	O'Brien	Stack
Levitas	Panetta	Stangeland
Lewis	Pashayan	Stanton
Livingston	Patten	Steed
Lloyd	Patterson	Stenholm
Loeffler	Paul	Stratton
Long, La.	Pease	Stump
Long, Md.	Perkins	Swift
Lott	Peyser	Synar
Lowry	Pickle	Tauke
Lujan	Preyer	Taylor
Luken	Price	Thomas
Lundine	Pritchard	Thompson
Lungren	Pursell	Treen
McClory	Quayle	Trible
McCormack	Quillen	Udall
McDade	Railsback	Van Deerlin
McEwen	Ratchford	Volkmere
McHugh	Regula	Walgren
McKinney	Rhodes	Walker
Madigan	Richmond	Wampler
Marks	Rinaldo	Watkins
Marriott	Ritter	Waxman
Martin	Roberts	White
Mathis	Robinson	Whitehurst
Matsui	Rodino	Whitley
Mattox	Roe	Whittaker
Mavroules	Rose	Whitten
Mazzoli	Rostenkowski	Williams, Mont.
Mica	Rousselot	Williams, Ohio
Mikulski	Rudd	Wilson, Bob
Mineta	Sabo	Wilson, C. H.
Minish	Santini	Winn
Mitchell, N.Y.	Satterfield	Wirth
Moakley	Sawyer	Wolfe, N.Y.
Moffett	Scheuer	Wolpe, Mich.
Mollohan	Schroeder	Wright
Montgomery	Schulze	Wyatt
Moore	Sebelius	Wydler
Moorhead,	Shannon	Wyllie
Calif.	Sharp	Yatron
Moorhead, Pa.	Shelby	Young, Alaska
Mottl	Shumway	Young, Fla.
Murphy, N.Y.	Skelton	Zerfetti

NOES—57

Aspin	Gephardt	Obey
Baldus	Goodling	Ottlinger
Bedell	Holtzman	Rahall
Bellenson	Hughes	Rangel
Bonior	Jacobs	Reuss
Brodhead	Jeffords	Rosenthal
Broyhill	Kastenmeier	Both
Burton, John	Kostmayer	Roybal
Cavanaugh	Leland	Russo
Clay	McDonald	Seiberling
Collins, Tex.	Maguire	Sensenbrenner
Crane, Daniel	Markley	Shuster
Dellums	Marlenee	Simon
Donnelly	Miller, Calif.	Stark
Early	Miller, Ohio	Stokes
Erdahl	Mitchell, Md.	Studds
Evans, Ind.	Murphy, Ill.	Vento
Fenwick	Nolan	Weiss
Garcia	Oberstar	Yates

NOT VOTING—52

Anderson, Ill.	Findley	Mikva
Ashbrook	Fisher	Oakar
Bauman	Flood	Pepper
Beard, Tenn.	Frenzel	Runnels
Bingham	Gaydos	Staggers
Bolling	Gibbons	Stewart
Brooks	Guarini	Stockman
Carter	Hall, Tex.	Symms
Conable	Harris	Traxler
Conyers	Hawkins	Ullman
Daschle	Hollenbeck	Vander Jagt
Dickinson	Jones, Okla.	Vanik
Diggs	LaFalce	Weaver
Dodd	Lederer	Wilson, Tex.
Duncan, Oreg.	Lehman	Young, Mo.
Edgar	McCloskey	Zablocki
Erlenborn	McKay	
Evans, Del.	Michel	

□ 1735

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Mikva.
Mr. Guarini with Mr. Vanik.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Lederer with Mr. Beard of Tennessee.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Runnels.
Ms. Oaker with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Bauman.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. LaFalce with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Lehman with Mr. Evans of Delaware.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Symms.
Mr. Young of Missouri with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Frenzel.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Hollenbeck.
Mr. Edgar with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Hall of Texas with Mr. Traxler.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.

Mr. McKay with Mr. Jones of Oklahoma.
So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill just passed, H.R. 1786.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3173, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1979

Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-76), on the resolution (H. Res. 184) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3173) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to authorize international security assistance programs for fiscal years 1980 and 1981, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 595, AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF TIN FROM NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-77) on the resolution (H. Res. 185) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 595) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to dispose of 35,000 long tons of tin in the national and supplemental stockpiles, and to provide for the deposit of moneys received from the sale of such tin, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 3(a), House Resolution 118, 96th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee on Committees the following Members of the House:

Mr. PATTERSON of California, chairman;

Mr. CLAY of Missouri;
Mr. McCORMACK of Washington;
Mr. BREAUX of Louisiana;
Mrs. SCHROEDER of Colorado;
Mr. TRAXLER of Michigan;
Mr. DERRICK of South Carolina;
Mr. FISHER of Virginia;
Mr. KOSTMAYER of Pennsylvania;
Mr. WHITLEY of North Carolina;
Mr. CLEVELAND of New Hampshire;
Mr. HORTON of New York;
Mr. FRENZEL of Minnesota;
Mr. LEACH of Iowa; and
Mr. LOEFFLER of Texas.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE RELIEF FOR CONSUMERS OF NUCLEAR GENERATED ELECTRICAL POWER

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

Mr. ATKINSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that seeks to protect consumer interests when suspected unsafe conditions force the closing of nuclear power facilities.

The recent shutdown of five nuclear powerplants in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States because of questionable seismic tolerances is but one more example of an alarming trend occurring in the nuclear power industry.

Similar shutdowns have occurred with disturbing regularity throughout the Nation, and, I suspect, the shutdowns will continue.

I do not disagree with the shutdown procedures per se, because of the potential dangers in operating a nuclear powerplant that might have a design or built-in deficiency.

I do, however, disagree with the practice of automatically passing along to the consumer, the the excess costs of utility company purchased power during a mandated shutdown period, or the automatic pass through of costs incurred in remedying deficiencies.

This bill requires that the power companies seek redress of excess power costs through the courts. A power company, under the provisions of this bill, will have to file suit and recover its excess power costs from the party found to be at fault.

Likewise, a fund will be established by the Federal Government to initially pay for any reconstruction or upgrading of the nuclear power facility, if such action is required. The Federal Government will then follow the court procedure for recovering its funds.

In this manner, the consumer will not be penalized for faulty design, construc-

tion, or licensing, nor will the consumer be required to subsidize these conditions.

The major provisions of the bill:

First, make it unlawful for power companies to automatically pass through excess power costs in the event of a mandated shutdown;

Second, make it unlawful for power companies to automatically pass through the costs of reconstruction or upgrading in conjunction with a mandated shutdown;

Third, provide relief for power companies through the courts; and

Fourth, provide for the Federal Government's initial underwriting of reconstruction or upgrading with relief to be sought through the courts.

INTRODUCTION OF SPOUSE OF NURSING HOME PATIENTS RELIEF ACT

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Spouse of Nursing Home Patients Relief Act to alleviate one of the more severe problems faced by older couples in America. The bill would amend title XIX of the Social Security Act. It would permit States to exercise flexibility in establishing income contribution and resource standards for couples to qualify for Medicaid when one spouse is in a nursing home.

All too often under the present system, a person must forgo income and live in impoverished circumstances when his or her spouse resides in a nursing home and Medicaid funds are needed to pay for that nursing home care.

The most common example of this dilemma occurs among older couples who have lived in retirement on the husband's pension. The husband is often the first to require nursing home care. When he does, HEW guidelines require that most of his pension income must be used to pay for his care before he is eligible for help from Medicaid. There is then often not enough pension income left over to provide the healthy wife with a decent standard of living.

Even though the couple had been an economic unit with the wife contributing to its sustenance throughout her working life and even though the couple had planned to live out their days sharing the husband's pension, the wife is left with far less than half the couple's income. She often can no longer afford to live on her own and is typically forced to go into the nursing home, too. Such a situation costs the Government money and it erodes the freedom and dignity of the healthy wife.

The bill I am introducing today would allow the Secretary of HEW to approve State medical assistance plans which contain more flexible income and resource standards than current rules allow. Under this bill, States could pass laws which would allow these couples to qualify for medical assistance while retaining enough income to support the healthy spouse. No State would be re-

quired to pass such a law and in States where current rules are adequate, no change need be made. However, in States where the cost of living is high, the legislatures would be able to pass a law providing the necessary flexibility to insure their older couples the medical assistance they need.

INDEPENDENT STUDENTS

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

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the basic educational opportunity grant program, independent students are those who do not or cannot rely on their families to support them in getting an education beyond high school. To be considered independent, a student must meet several rigorous criteria spelled out in the regulations governing the program. Generally, independent students are not typical 18- to 22-year-old college students. They are displaced homemakers, widows, or divorcees who often return to school to attain marketable skills to support themselves and their families. They are housewives whose children have grown and who seek an education to broaden themselves intellectually or to enable them to seek employment. They are Vietnam veterans, who are trying to reenter the American society which treated them so inhospitably after our tragic experience in Southeast Asia. They are people employed full time trying to better themselves through education. Those independent students of the traditional college age are usually individuals pursuing an education despite the unwillingness or inability of their parents to pay a share. In short, independent students are generally highly motivated and committed individuals for whom education is a way to advance and improve their condition. They, of any target population of our student aid programs, should be effectively served by Federal student aid programs.

During the current academic year, 1978-79, independent students receive grossly inequitable treatment in the basic grant program. The families of dependent students now have the first \$17,000 of their assets (\$50,000 if they have farm or business assets) exempted from consideration in determining their ability to contribute to their children's postsecondary education. Independent students, including independent students with families, have no asset reserve; all of their assets are considered to be available to pay for their education. In addition, the unexempted assets of the family of a dependent student are taxed at a rate of 5 percent to establish the portion of their assets they are expected to contribute for the education of their children. All of the assets of an independent student are taxed at a rate of 33 percent in determining their expected contribution toward their own education.

This treatment of the assets of independent students is harsh and unfair.

For example, a widowed mother returning to school would be expected to contribute toward her education one-third of the total value of the family home willed to her by her deceased husband.

The Middle Income Student Assistance Act corrected this inequity by requiring that independent students with families have the same asset protection and have their assets assessed at the same rate as the parents of dependent students for purposes of determining their expected contribution toward their education.

Also in the current academic year, single independent students are provided with a living allowance of only \$1,100. The rest of their income is taxed at a rate of 70 percent if they are single, 50 percent if they are married but have no children and 40 percent if they are married and have children to determine their expected contribution toward their education.

The Middle Income Student Assistance Act retained these high assessment rates on the income of independent students. However, it required that the living allowance for independent students be calculated for the single independent student in the same way it is calculated for the families of dependent students and for independent students with families. The result will be that single independent students will have a living allowance of approximately \$3,400 before the rest of their income is taxed at 70 percent in determining their expected contribution.

These modest changes to treat independent students more equitably under the basic grant program were approved by the President when he signed the Middle Income Student Assistance Act on November 1, 1978. In his remarks upon signing the bill the President noted: "this legislation is completely compatible with the recommendations made by me to the Congress earlier this year."

The basic grant family contribution schedule for 1979-80 was transmitted to the Congress on August 14, 1978 as a proposed regulation. This proposed family contribution schedule, which is subject to congressional review and disapproval under section 411 of the Higher Education Act, included all of the changes in the treatment of independent students which were subsequently enacted into law by the Middle Income Student Assistance Act. This proposed family contribution schedule was not disapproved by the Congress under section 411.

The fiscal 1979 Labor-HEW Appropriations Act provides funding for the basic grant program in the 1979-80 academic year since the program is forward funded. This act contains sufficient funds for the cost of the changes in the treatment of independent students made by the Middle Income Student Assistance Act.

This Appropriations Act also contains legislative language deferring the funding for the more liberal treatment of independent students until the 1980-81 academic year. However, this language was superseded by the Middle Income Student Assistance Act which became

law after the fiscal year 1979 Labor-HEW Appropriations Act.

In addition, House and Senate Members from the authorizing and appropriations committees with jurisdiction over the basic grant program wrote to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Joseph Califano on February 2, 1979, expressing their clear understanding that it is the intent of Congress that these changes be implemented for the 1979-80 school year. The original intent of the legislative language in the fiscal 1979 Labor-HEW Appropriations Act, even had it not been superseded by the Middle Income Student Assistance Act, was to assure adequate funds for students currently eligible for the program within the constraints of a responsible budget. Since the basic grant program was managed much more tightly in the current academic year, there is a substantial amount of fiscal year 1978 funds available to be spent in fiscal year 1979 and this concern is moot. Mr. Speaker, I am including the text of the February 2, 1978, letter for printing at the conclusion of my remarks.

Now any reasonable person would assume that the more equitable treatment of independent students would be available for the coming school year. But at the final moment someone at the Office of Management and Budget seems to think he or she has found an easy way to save some money. The final regulation on the family contribution schedule for 1979-80 was transmitted to the Speaker on March 16, 1979, after an inordinate delay of 7 months since the proposed regulation was sent to the Congress on August 14, 1978. The "summary" of this regulation offhandedly notes that, while the Middle Income Student Assistance Act "made two changes in the treatment of independent students . . . it was decided to postpone implementation of these two changes in the treatment of independent students until the 1980-81 award period, because of the need for fiscal constraint with respect to fiscal year 1980 outlays. Accordingly, these two changes are not included in the 1979-80 family contribution schedules." In other words, it was decided not to follow the law of the land.

Thus, despite the mandate of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act, as approved and hailed by the President; despite the availability of sufficient already appropriated funds; despite the clear expression of congressional intent in the letter of February 2; and despite the proposed regulation of August 14 which received no adverse comments on the issue of the treatment of independent students and which the Congress chose not to disapprove, the final regulation proposes to break all of the promises that have been made to independent students for the coming year. Approximately 60,000 students will be asked to continue to bear an unfair burden in financing their education or they will be denied assistance completely.

The final regulation, which was transmitted to the Speaker on March 16, is subject to review by this Congress under section 431 of the General Education Provisions Act. Section 431 provides

that Congress can disapprove this regulation within 45 days by concurrent resolution if it determines that the regulation "is inconsistent with the act from which it derives its authority." This regulation derives its authority from section 411 of the Higher Education Act as amended by the Middle Income Student Assistance Act. The regulation is not only "inconsistent" with this act but it flatly contradicts and violates section 411. I therefore introduced a resolution of disapproval (H. Con. Res. 84) on March 22, 1978. I expect that the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, which I chair, will hold a hearing on this resolution in the very near future. I hope that my colleagues will support this resolution of disapproval if the situation cannot be remedied short of bringing the resolution before the House.

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1979.
Hon. JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, JR.,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have recently learned that the Office of Education has decided not to fund the independent student provisions of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act, Public Law 95-566. The decision prohibiting the funding for independent student provisions is apparently based upon an opinion by the HEW General Counsel that language in the FY 1979 Labor-HEW Appropriations bill, Public Law 95-480, prohibits funding for independent students regardless of the carryover funds which were not anticipated at the time P.L. 95-480 was passed.

The intent of the language in the Appropriations bill was to protect students already eligible for financial assistance, as well as the many new students who became eligible for assistance under P.L. 95-566, and are still dependent on their parents. The question discussed by Senate and House Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee members at the time was simply whether enough money was available to fund all these students. The current estimates of as much as \$700 million in carryover funds indicate that there is now ample funding to fully implement the Middle Income Student Assistance Act.

Further, it has been suggested that the effective date in MISAA for independent students of enrollment periods beginning on or after August 1, 1979 indicates the intent of Congress that the expanded eligibility provisions not be implemented until that date. Clearly, this is not the case. For independent students entering school next fall to benefit from expanded eligibility, the new provisions must be implemented immediately.

We anticipate immediate action in conformity with Congressional intent as stated above.

Sincerely,

CARL D. PERKINS,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
JOHN BUCHANAN,
Members of Congress.
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
U.S. Senators.

FOOD ADVERTISING AIMED AT CHILDREN

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, after 20 years of captivating food and snack commercials, parents, consumers, nutritionists, educators, psychologists, dentists, and national leaders are speaking out in favor of the Federal Trade Commission's proposed ban on advertising aimed at children.

Seldom has there been such a clear-cut case for Government action to protect children from deceptive, unfair, and harmful practices as in the case of televised advertising aimed at our Nation's 40 million youngsters.

As chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition, I have been deeply committed to improving Federal nutrition efforts.

I believe that enactment of the FTC's proposals can go a long way toward greatly improving and enhancing the effectiveness of these multi-billion-dollar nutrition programs.

Mr. Speaker, last week I testified at the FTC's rulemaking hearings on children's advertising. I would like to share with my colleagues the testimony I delivered at that time.

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE FRED RICHMOND

The late British Actor Peter Finch, in his academy award-winning performance as a T.V. anchorman in the movie "Network," implores his audience to scream, "I'm mad as hell and I'm not going to take it anymore."

After ten years of debate, 20 years of multi-colored fruitloop commercials and 30 years of Popeye, Mighty Mouse and Fred Flintstone; parents, consumers, nutritionists, educators and psychologists, dentists and Members of Congress are echoing Mr. Finch's outcry by supporting the Federal Trade Commission's proposed ban on advertising directed at children.

Nowhere in our society has there been as clear cut a case for government intervention to protect children from deceptive, unfair and harmful practices as in the case of televised advertising aimed at children.

The Federal Trade Commission, under the direction of its Chairman Michael Pertchuk, should be applauded for its diligence, determination and dedication in venturing into an arena which for decades has been dominated by the powerful forces of Madison Avenue, the television networks and the food manufacturing industry.

The central question raised by the FTC petition is one of corporate accountability and governmental responsibility for the health and well being of our nation's 40 million children.

As Chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition, I have been deeply involved and committed to improving and expanding the food stamp, school lunch, school breakfast, child care feeding and nutrition education efforts of the Federal government.

I believe that enactment of the FTC's children's advertising proposals can go a long way toward greatly improving and enhancing the effectiveness of these multi-billion dollar nutrition programs.

In the past five years, I have spoken out repeatedly against the use of fortified grain products in the school meals programs, against junk foods being sold in schools; against the use of highly sugared cereals in the school breakfast programs; and against the joint promotional scheme of Kellogg and the federally subsidized Amtrak system to reward families which consume Frosted

Flakes, Raisin Bran and Corn Flakes with free train rides for their youngsters.

We have won some battles and lost others to improve the diet of the American family. However, I must emphasize that, each step, we have been confronted by an army of highly paid food industry lobbyists whose influence is unsurpassed on Capitol Hill and in the halls of the Agriculture Department.

During the past two sessions of Congress, one of the major thrusts of our Subcommittee has been to improve the nutritional awareness of consumers through the development of accurate, easy-to-understand, and comprehensive nutrition education programs.

Unfortunately, no matter what innovative and exciting nutrition education plans are developed by the Federal Government, I believe that their effectiveness will be undermined by the \$5 billion advertising assault of the food corporations.

A favorable decision by the FTC to ban advertising on children's television takes on a greater significance enabling our school systems and parents to better influence the food choices of our children. An FTC ban would be a major victory in the struggle to improve the dietary habits of our nation.

During our study of nutrition education in America, the Nutrition Subcommittee held ten hearings, heard more than 200 witnesses, developed two Congressional Research Service reports, inaugurated a General Accounting Office study, surveyed food industry opinions and finally passed comprehensive legislation.

Our work was based upon the findings of two Congressional Research Reports; the first published in March, 1976, by the Senate Nutrition Committee on "The Role Of The Federal Government In Nutrition Research" and the second released a year after by our Subcommittee on "The Role Of The Federal Government In Nutrition Education."

The CRS found that federally funded human nutrition research is a haphazard jigsaw puzzle whose pieces fail to fit together because of a lack of coordination funding, guidance and planning.

Furthermore, that the Federal Government in 1975 spent a total of \$73 million on human nutrition research, yet only a trivial portion of that money was invested in USDA activities related to improving consumer food purchase patterns and diet practices.

In their subsequent report on nutrition education, the CRS again found that there was no coordination of Federal efforts. In fact, nutrition education programs totalling \$69.3 million in 1976 were fragmented among 30 programs in 11 agencies of two Departments and two regulatory agencies.

At this juncture the FTC should take notice of a House Nutrition Subcommittee Staff report issued in January of 1978 on the American food industry's attitudes towards nutrition education.

The findings of the survey of nutrition education efforts of 38 food companies and 5 trade organizations revealed that:

(1) Nutrition education is viewed in the Boardroom as a means of encouraging consumers to purchase a product rather than to maintain a healthy diet.

(2) Food companies, on the whole, lack any stated nutrition policy.

(3) Those food companies which engage in public nutrition education believe the only message consumers need is to eat... without any consideration as to the health problems associated with obesity.

(4) Most of the nutrition education in the public schools by large food companies is designed to promote their products rather than a healthy diet.

This voluntary survey, analyzed by the Subcommittee staff which included nutritionists, should serve as a warning to the FTC. It must be noted that self-regulation

by the food industry, through the development of nutrition education commercials, is not a viable alternative to the banning of highly sugared commercials aimed at children. Product promotion and hence profits are the cornerstone of even the most altruistic nutrition education efforts of the industry.

A follow up study by the General Accounting Office, released in March, 1978, aptly entitled "Informing The Public About Nutrition: Federal Agencies Should Do Better," reaffirmed that there has been an overall lack of coordination within and between the Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education and Welfare.

Moreover, wide distribution of nutrition materials intended for the public appears limited, since only 5 of the 352 publications identified by the GAO had a total distribution of over one million copies in fiscal year 1975-76. The GAO reported that clearly efforts of the Federal Government to help inform the American people about nutrition have been insufficient. While the Federal Government is one of the top ten purchasers of radio and television advertising, the GAO found that neither USDA nor HEW purchased any television advertising time for nutrition information.

These studies and hearings served as the impetus for the National Consumer Nutrition Information Act of 1978 which was passed by our Subcommittee last April 29.

The measure initiated with the bipartisan support of my Massachusetts colleague, Representative Margaret Heckler, mandated a coordinated Federal nutrition policy, establishing a National Nutrition Education Council. The Council would have been comprised of 18 consumers, farmers, food processors, nutritionists, scientists, voluntary organizations and the media. It was empowered to review USDA and HEW nutrition education efforts, make recommendations for coordination and improvement in current programs. Furthermore, the bill required USDA to provide competitively produced T.V. public service announcements, aimed at adults, stressing the relationship between diet and health.

Unfortunately, the National Consumer Nutrition Information Act of 1978, which I thought was as uncontroversial as apple pie and motherhood, died in the full Agriculture Committee after members were subjected to an intensive lobbying campaign by those who have the most to fear from a nutritionally aware populace—the food manufacturers themselves. This bill was killed by the same unholy alliance of Madison Avenue, the T.V. networks and food manufacturers which are currently besieging the FTC with a high priced, three-piece-suited legion of lawyers.

Let me emphasize that in traveling around this country I have found that consumers, nutritionists, parents and educators believe that the Federal Government has the responsibility to provide a well coordinated and comprehensive nutrition education program. Americans more than ever are rededicating themselves to a sound nutritionally adequate diet, returning to natural foods, engaging in more home cooking and shopping more economically than any time in recent history.

In this session of the 96th Congress, our Subcommittee is determined to carry through the mandate of the people and navigate nutrition education legislation through the Congress.

I can report that the USDA, under the direction of Assistant Secretary Carol Foreman, has already responded to our call for mass media education. Nevertheless, this modest Pilot Program to develop commercials is misplaced since it seeks to counter \$600 million of children's advertising, by enticing youngsters to eat nutritionally wholesome foods. I believe that a few public serv-

ice commercials developed by the Federal Government can have but a minimal effect on the average youngster, who weekly is viewing approximately 25 hours of children's television filled with commercials for Reggie Bars, Baby Ruths and Oreos. According to the New York State Assembly Program and Committee Staff, the message of these ads 80 percent of the time is to eat cereals, candy, gum, cookies and crackers.

Today's debate before the Federal Trade Commission brings the battle over the control of our Nation's nutrition policy to the forefront.

Will control and influence over the diets of our children continue to be manipulated by the profit-motivated, Machiavellian hands of the multinational food conglomerates, advertising executives and network time salesmen?

Or will consumers, parents, nutritionists, the medical profession and Members of Congress finally have a direct and meaningful impact on the eating patterns of our youngsters?

The FTC, in proposing a ban on all advertising aimed at children below the age of 8, and prohibiting televised advertising of sugared products to children under the age of 12, is taking a bold, courageous and correct step toward improving the health and well being of our nation's 40 million children and generations yet to come.

This proceeding has heard Dr. Julius Richmond, Surgeon General of the United States, accompanied by Dr. James Carlos, Director of the National Caries Program at the National Institute for Dental Research, assert that tooth decay is the leading chronic disease affecting America's children; that tooth decay is a preventable disease whose cure is directly related to a simple reduction in the intake of sugar; that excessive consumption of sugar products can lead to obesity. Finally, commenting on televised advertising of sugared products, Dr. Richmond seriously questions the wisdom of permitting a steady stream of advertising promoting consumption of sugared foods to children who are too young to make informed judgments about risks to their health.

I believe the Federal government, and in particular the FTC, has the responsibility to intervene on behalf of children who lack overall sophistication, are unable to discern the difference between a product which tastes good and one which is good for them, and are incapable of comprehending or evaluating the commercial message.

It has been demonstrated that nutritional habits developed during the formative years leading to adolescence more often than not last a lifetime.

The Congress and the Carter Administration are in the process of ratifying a \$97 million national nutrition education effort for 1980. This new push includes a \$27 million child nutrition state grant program, to develop nutrition education in the schools, for school food personnel, teachers and students. The newly organized program will utilize the School Lunch room as a focal point.

But how long will these programs be successful when children once they leave school are subjected to animated, fun-filled, male authoritarian, commercials and enticed to munch candy bars, gulp Hawaiian Punch and devour huge quantities of sugary cereals.

I fear that our nutrition education efforts will all go for naught, if the FTC ignores the warning of Dr. Richmond that one of the most productive ways to improve the health status of the nation is to increase the understanding of nutrition and prudent dietary practices. As he noted, small children have a great difficulty distinguishing fantasy from reality, and products from advertising.

The constant televised bombardment of

children by Captain Crunch, The Sugar Bear, Count Chocula, and the Lucky Charms Leprachaun promoting cereals such as Cap'n Crunch with 44.1 percent sugar, Super Sugar Crisp with 45.2 percent sugar, Count Chocula with 47.9 percent sugar and finally Lucky Charms with 58 percent sugar—has led to a sugar addicted cavity-plagued and nutritionally impoverished population.

Throughout the FTC Staff report, in petitions by actions for children's television, and the Center for Science in the Public Interest, and in testimony delivered at these hearings, it is made painfully clear that the average American child aged two through eleven watches well over 1,300 hours of T.V. a year and is subjected to 20,000 commercials. That many children fail to comprehend the Madison Avenue message of buy buy buy; that anywhere between 60 and 80 percent of all commercials directed at children promote sugared products and that sugar is the leading cause of tooth decay among our nation's children.

It has been argued that parents make the ultimate decision regarding food purchases for the home. If that were truly the case involving cereals, candies, toys, and other heavily advertised products, then why does Madison Avenue currently spend \$600 million annually on commercials whose design is obviously meant to influence an audience under the age of 12?

I have spent 30 years of my life as a businessman and am fully aware that corporations allocate their advertising budget based upon sophisticated psychological and marketing studies in order to get the best return on their investment. I submit that if parents were the ultimate decision makers and had total control on the products consumed by their children then commercials which are aimed at children would disappear from the airwaves. As you can tell from the corporate, network and advertising concern with these rulemaking procedures that simply is not the case.

As Dr. Joan Gussow, the well known nutritionist of Columbia University, noted you cannot reform food advertising. I join her and other nutrition advocates in rejecting the proposed FTC remedy of concurrent counter nutrition messages. "All the cleaning up of messages and all the inserting of nutritional information and all the running of alternate spots cannot—where young children are concerned—take care of the powerful sustained message of children's television advertising—eat, eat, eat—sweet, sweet, sweet."

In conclusion, I must emphasize as a Member of Congress concerned with the nutritional future of our citizens, that I support the FTC proposals. I endorse the banning of all advertising directed at children under the age of 8 and the elimination of all ads for sugary products directed to audiences under the age of 12. These two actions would greatly enhance the multi-billion dollar federal nutrition effort, as well as improve the quality of life for the citizens of our nation.

□ 1505

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO HALT FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION RESTRICTIONS ON HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the health care delivery system has come under increasing scrutiny by Federal

Trade Commission investigators. The FTC's occupational licensure program, for example, is directed at eliminating certain State laws and restrictions on entering a number of important occupations, including the health professions. These laws and regulations represent the judgment of the States as to what is necessary and proper to protect the health and welfare of their citizens. In addition to occupational licensure at the national level, the FTC and the Justice Department are attempting to apply commercial antitrust principles to activities of the health professions which are, to my mind, already adequately monitored and regulated by the respective States to say nothing of the appropriateness of this action.

What I am today proposing is legislation that would exempt incorporated or unincorporated nonprofit associations of health professionals from the Federal Trade Commission Act and the antitrust laws. In proposing this legislation, I am not breaking new ground as numerous precedents have been established for such an exemption. Currently banks, common and foreign carriers subject to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, labor organizations and agricultural and horticultural organizations are all expressly exempted under one or both of these antitrust statutes.

This legislation would not apply to activities such as price fixing or boycotts and it would not, of course, have any effect on the constitutional question recently considered by the Supreme Court regarding the parameters of the first amendment with respect to the truthful advertising of professional services.

In answer to the question of just who would be covered under the proposal, it would extend to those health organizations which are, in the eyes of the IRS and the States, nonprofit. Nearly all State associations of health professionals are nonprofit by definition and in nature. As such, these organizations are not engaged in trade or commerce nor are they organized to carry on business for their own profit or that of their members. On the contrary, most of these organizations were founded and continue to encourage the improvement of public health to promote scientific research and development, and to represent their respective health professions.

I see no earthly reason why the FTC should substitute its judgment for that of experts in the health sciences, operating under the State and Federal laws and regulations, when it comes to such things as determining the adequacy of the training in health profession educational institutions and the proficiency of their graduates. I believe the FTC can put its resources and the taxpayers' money to better use. In short, I believe that the States can continue to regulate health professionals and their representative organizations by establishing licensure and minimum education requirements without further "help" or interference from the Federal Government.

This is an important piece of legislation in that if the FTC goes unchecked in

this regard, serious precedent will be set for future restrictions not only on health professionals, but on all professionals in this country. I would therefore like to solicit your sympathetic consideration of this measure.

□ 1510

THROWING AWAY MONEY THROUGH CETA

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

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in both major daily newspapers in Phoenix, the city government ran large display advertisements offering several hundred well-paying CETA positions, because they cannot find takers for these federally funded public jobs for the unemployed.

In the same editions of these newspapers, there were seven pages of help-wanted classified ads for private sector jobs which the city government sought to hire with CETA funds.

It is a travesty that CETA funds are being so lavishly distributed by Congress and the Federal Government that tempt local governments to go to these extremes to spend taxpayers' money for jobs they cannot fill, when so many jobs go wanting for employees in the private sector.

It is even more unfortunate that the city of Phoenix did not follow the example of the State of New Hampshire, which recently stunned Federal officials by returning \$3 million of CETA funds because the State could not use them.

Local governments have swelled their own staffs by more than 625,000 additional workers at a cost of more than \$11.3 billion in Federal funds, because of the extravagant and wasteful CETA program, which Congress would do well to eliminate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the city of Phoenix CETA advertisement from the Phoenix newspapers at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette, Mar. 27, 1979]

Jobs

Tuesday, March 27th at the Phoenix Civic Plaza (2nd Street and Washington) the City of Phoenix is hiring over 200 Federal funded CETA program employees. All Jobs and applicants are subject to Department of Labor guidelines and availability of funds for this program. Applicants will be hired into temporary positions.

ALL APPLICANTS MUST

Be City of Phoenix residents—documents such as Drivers license, I.D. card issued by the motor vehicle department, rent receipts, voter registration, or a notarized statement of a person living in the same household must be shown to prove residence.

Be Unemployed—At least 10 out of the past 12 weeks for Title VI funded jobs;

At least 15 out of the past 20 weeks for Title II funded jobs.

Meet Low Family Income Requirements of Guidelines—Information about total family income is required, income verification will be made.

JOBS INCLUDE

	Per mo.
Laborer	\$733
Typist I (Typing Required)	627
Secretary I (Typing Required)	686
Clerk I	600
Salary in addition to an excellent benefit program	

To be hired Social Security Card must be presented—An Equal Opportunity Employer m/f.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1979

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

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation designed to correct a glaring injustice to a sizable number of Federal employees across the Nation. The Federal Protective Service Act of 1979 seeks to provide the over 3,445 Federal Protection Officers throughout the United States with adequate compensation and benefits for the families of officers killed or assaulted while on duty, and to extend and clarify the authority of the General Services Administration (GSA) with respect to the protection of buildings and areas owned or occupied by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, several Federal Protective officers in the Nashville, Tenn., Federal courthouse where my offices are located recently alerted me to many of the issues involved in this legislation. This proposed legislation, among other things, would amend title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 383, as amended (Property Act), by adding new section 213 establishing within the General Services Administration, a security force to be known as the "Federal Protective Service" to be responsible for the protection of buildings owned and occupied by the United States and under the control of the Administrator.

In addition, the proposal would repeal the act of June 1, 1948, 62 Stat. 281, as amended (40 U.S.C. 318, 318a-d), the Administrator's present authority to appoint special policemen for protection of Government property. Such special policemen are now designated by administrative order as Federal Protective Officers. The legislation, if enacted, would clarify statutory recognition of Federal Protective Officers, more clearly define their jurisdiction, enumerate their law enforcement powers, and adjust their benefits to those received by other Federal employees engaged in similar hazardous duties.

Enactment of the proposed legislation is considered essential if the General Services Administration is to carry out adequately its functions regarding the protection of life and property under its charge and control. Until recent years, the primary duties of GSA special policemen, appointed under the authority of 40 U.S.C. 318, were of patrolling buildings, detecting fires, and providing a first line of defense when fires did occur.

However, civil unrest in the form of

mass demonstrations, bombing, bomb threats, and vandalism beginning in the late sixties, began to affect Federal operations in all parts of the country. Demonstrations in Federal courts and other federally protected buildings placed additional demands on the protective services of GSA. In response to these problems, GSA, in 1971, redesignated its protective force as the Federal Protective Service, intensified training of its personnel, and instituted other reforms necessary to increase the force's efficiency.

There are approximately 3,445 uniformed officers in the Federal Protective Service at the present time. These officers, in addition to performing the routine duties of facility security, enforce identification and inspection procedures at building entrances and institute arrest procedures for the violations of Federal law occurring on GSA controlled property. Federal Protective officers have been responsible for approximately 1,000 arrests in the last 2 years.

In the past calendar year, they have responded to over 300 assault situations, over 7,500 reported thefts of personal and Government property, and 795 demonstrations involving over 70,000 participants. These figures should be viewed with the understanding that research indicates only 50 percent of crime is actually reported.

The jurisdiction and policing powers of GSA Federal Protective officers is limited under Section 1 of the 1948 Act to "Federal property over which the United States has acquired exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction." Beginning in 1971, however, a proviso in the GSA appropriation acts has extended the authority of Federal Protective officers to all buildings and areas owned or occupied by the United States and under the charge and control of the General Services Administration.

Proposed subsection (a) of the new section 213 of the Property Act would enlarge the jurisdiction of Federal Protective Officers to include all property owned or occupied by the United States and under the administrator's charge and control and would eliminate the need for the above mentioned proviso in GSA's annual appropriation acts. Public Law 91-383 effected a similar change in legislation applicable to the authority of the U.S. Park Police.

The remainder of proposed subsection 213(a) would clarify the enforcement and arrest authority of Federal Protective officers and would also permit the enforcement of laws of the District of Columbia on property located in the District, and under the Administrator's charge and control. Similar authority to enforce laws of the District is vested in the Capitol Police under 40 U.S.C. 212a.

Proposed subsection 213(b) to the Property Act grants to the Administrator essentially the same substantive authority now contained in section 5 of the 1948 act (40 U.S.C. 318d). Changes in the language have been made to conform substantially the authority of the nonuniformed GSA officials authorized to perform investigative functions with uniformed Federal Protective Officers.

Proposed new subsection 213(c) to the Property Act restates the authority of the Administrator to issue rules and regulations governing property under his charge and control now set forth in section 2 of the 1948 act (40 U.S.C. 318a). Language changes, not of a substantive nature, have been made to conform the section with the remainder of the draft bill and to eliminate the express provision in the 1948 act to delegate authority to issue rules and regulations. Section 205 (d) of the Property Act expressly authorized the Administrator to delegate any functions vested in him under the act.

Section 4 of the 1948 act (40 U.S.C. 318c) limits the penalty of the violation of rules and regulations to a fine of \$50 and/or imprisonment for 30 days. Proposed new subsection 213(d) would increase the maximum penalty to a fine of \$500 or imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both. The present penalty and punishment is so minor as to classify the most aggravated or most gross infraction as a petty offense.

The proposed increased penalty is not absolute but is merely a maximum and allows the court latitude of sentence commensurate with the circumstances of the offense. The increased penalty provisions would provide a credible deterrent to a breach of the rules and regulations without requiring an unreasonable level of punishment.

Subsection (e) of the proposed section 213 restates the authority of the Administrator to detail Federal Protective Officers for duty in other Federal agencies upon application of the head of such agency. The Administrator presently has this authority under section 3 of the 1948 act (40 U.S.C. 318b).

Section 3 of the draft bill would amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, to include certain officers and employees of GSA among those Federal officials afforded the protection of the Federal statutes pertaining to punishment for the murder, manslaughter, or assault of such officials. Included in the scope of section 1114, as it presently stands, are personnel of the Justice; Post Office; Treasury; Agriculture; Interior; Aeronautics and Space Administration, who are engaged in judicial, investigatory, enforcement, correctional, protective, and other potentially hazardous duties.

Because the role of GSA Federal Protective Service personnel is carried out in a climate where antagonism against police is manifested, we believe that they should be included among those afforded the protection of the Federal statutes pertaining to punishment for the murder, manslaughter, or assault of specified Federal officials.

Section 4 of the draft bill would amend section 6324 of title 5, United States Code, by providing that the absence of a Federal Protective officer due to injury or illness resulting from the performance of duty would not be charged to sick leave. This would provide the Federal Protective officer with the same benefits enjoyed by the U.S. Park Police and the Secret Service Uniformed Division.

Section 5 of the draft bill would pro-

vide the survivors of Federal Protective officers with certain benefits. Federal Protective officers, like their counterparts in the Secret Service Uniformed Division and U.S. Park Police, are constantly exposed to hazards not commonly encountered by other Federal employees.

To compensate for the exposure to the risks likely to result in serious injury or death, many States have provided for special annuities to be paid to survivors of law enforcement officers. A survivor, having received support from a Secret Service Uniformed officer or U.S. Park Police officer prior to his death, is entitled to a lump sum payment of \$50,000 should the officer be killed in similar hazards. It is considered proper that the Federal Protective officer receive benefits similar to those received by members of other law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is long overdue. In fact, it corrects, I feel, a discrepancy in the application of Federal law which I hope the appropriate House and Senate committees will consider this session.

I am taking the liberty of attaching to the conclusion of my remarks a complete listing of Federal Protective Service uniformed personnel by State and city reference purposes.

The list and a copy of my bill follows.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish at this time to commend my colleague, PARREN J. MITCHELL of Maryland for introducing his own version of the Federal Protective Service Act of 1979 on February 21, 1979. My bill differs significantly from the Mitchell bill in two basic areas: First, the Mitchell bill provides that Federal Protective Service officers' grades, salaries, and fringe benefits be comparable to those in the Executive Protection Service for a cost of millions of dollars—our bill does not provide for comparability but only provides for benefits in the event of death or injury, second the Mitchell bill addresses the "guard" functions of the EPS officers but does not address their jurisdictional areas of operations, whereas my bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to having committee and congressional debate on some of the issues raised in this legislation during the 96th Congress. The bill should be considered a first draft piece of legislation to begin needed discussion for a group of Federal employees who protect and secure over 10,000 Federal Government buildings throughout the United States.

H.R. 3284

A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend and clarify the authority of the General Services Administration with respect to the protection of buildings and areas owned and occupied by the United States and under the charge and control of the Administrator of General Services, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this act may be cited as the "Federal Protective Service Act of 1979."

SEC. 2. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is further amended by adding the following after Section 212:

"FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE"

"SEC. 213. (a) (1) There is hereby established a permanent trained security force within the General Services Administration to be known as the Federal Protective Service. The Federal Protective Service shall perform such duties as assigned by the Administrator or by duly authorized officials of the Administration for the protection of persons and property and the conduct of authorized activities in or on real property or occupied by the United States and under the charge and control of the Administrator.

"(2) Uniformed members of the Federal Protective Service (hereinafter referred to as 'Federal Protective Officers') shall have the power to enforce while on such property (1) Federal laws; (2) District of Columbia laws on such property within the District of Columbia; and (3) rules and regulations issued pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Such officers shall have the authority to make arrests on such property without a warrant for any offense committed in their presence and may also arrest without a warrant for any offense if they have reasonable grounds to believe the offense constitutes a felony under the laws of the United States, that the person to be arrested has committed the offense, and such person is on or fleeing from such property. The jurisdiction and policing power of the Federal Protective Service shall not extend, however, to the service of civil process.

"(b) Officials or employees of the General Services Administration who have been duly authorized to perform investigative functions may be authorized by the Administrator to exercise the same powers as uniformed Federal protective officers and to carry firearms while on real property owned or occupied by the United States and under the charge and control of the Administrator, or on travel status.

"(c) The Administrator is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for under his charge and control, and to annex to such rules and regulations such reasonable penalties, within the limits prescribed in subsection (d) of this section, as will insure their enforcement: Provided, that such rules and regulations shall be posted and kept posted in a conspicuous place on such property.

"(d) Whoever shall violate any rule or regulation promulgated pursuant to subsection (c) of this section shall be fined not more than \$500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(e) Upon the application of the head of any Federal agency having under its charge and control property owned or occupied by the United States, the Administrator is authorized to detail any such Federal protective officers for the protection of such property and, if he deems it advisable, to extend to such property the applicability of any rules and regulations issued pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Such Federal protective officers are empowered to enforce Federal laws and said rules and regulations in the same manner as set forth in subsection (a) of this section. The Administrator, whenever it is deemed economical and in the public interest, may utilize the facilities and services of existing Federal law enforcement agencies, and with the consent of any State or local agency, the facilities and services of State or local enforcement agencies."

SEC. 3. Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the words "or law enforcement functions," the following words: "or any officer or employee of the General Administration assigned to enforce laws and rules and regulations enacted for the protection of people and property of the United States or to perform investigative or law enforcement functions."

SEC. 4. Section 6324 of title 5, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) by inserting after "the United States

Park Police Force," in subsection (a) the following: "the Federal Protective Service," and

(2) by deleting in subsection (b) the word "and" where it appears in paragraph (2) and the period (.) at the end of paragraph 3, and adding the following at the end thereof: "; and

(4) The Administrator of General Services for the Federal Protective Service."

SEC. 5. Section 8133 of Title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof: "(g) If a law enforcement officer or firefighter as defined in section 8331 of this title 5 and who is not otherwise covered under section 12 of the act of September 1, 1916, 39 Stat. 718, as amended, dies as a result of injuries sustained in the performance of duty which were not caused by his willful misconduct, the United States shall pay, in addition to other benefits authorized by law, a lump sum payment of \$50,000 to the person or persons surviving at the date of his death in the order of precedence established under subsections (a) and (b) of section 8705 of this title. No payment shall be made, however, under this subsection if, after four years following the death of the employee, no claim for payment by a person entitled under this subsection is pending. Payment under this subsection shall be made by the head of the Federal agency concerned out of appropriations available to such agency."

SEC. 6. Sections 1 through 5 of the Act of June 1, 1948, 62 Stat. 281, as amended (40 U.S.C. 318, 318a-d), are repealed.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE UNIFORMED PERSONNEL

Distribution by region, State, and city

REGION 1	
CT (16)	
Bridgeport, 3.	
Hartford, 6.	
New Haven, 7.	
ME (7)	
Augusta, 1.	
Bangor, 3.	
Portland, 3.	
MA (95)	
Boston, 75.	
Fitchburg, 1.	
New Bedford, 2.	
Springfield, 2.	
Waltham, 12.	
Worcester, 3.	
NH (9)	
Concord, 2.	
Manchester, 7.	
RI (25)	
Providence, 17.	
West Warwick, 8.	
Total, 152.	
REGION 2	
NJ (30)	
Belle Meade, 11.	
Camden, 4.	
Newark, 10.	
Trenton, 5.	
NY (194)	
Albany, 14.	
Binghamton, 10.	
Buffalo, 18.	
Hyde Park, 9.	
New York City, 129.	
Rochester, 3.	
Scotia, 10.	
Syracuse, 3.	
PR (16)	
San Juan, 5.	
Hato Rey, 11.	
VI (1)	
Charlotte Amalie, 1.	
Total, 241.	
REGION 3	
De (3)	
Wilmington, 3.	

DC (457)
District of Columbia, 457.
Md (548)
Baltimore, 137.
Bethesda, 19.
Ft. George G. Meade, 300.
Germantown, 48.
Suitland, 44.

Pa (99)
Erie, 3.
Harrisburg, 7.
Philadelphia, 71.
Pittsburgh, 11.
Wilkes-Barre, 5.
Williamsport, 2.

Va (594)
Alexandria, 11.
Arlington, 337.
Big Stone Gap, 2.
Charlottesville, 15.
Langley, 166.
Norfolk, 32.
Portsmouth, 5.
Richmond, 21.
Roanoke, 5.

WV (49)
Bluefield, 3.
Charleston, 4.
Elkins, 5.
Huntington, 4.
Martinsburg, 17.
Parkersburg, 8.
Point Pleasant, 5.
Wheeling, 3.
Total, 1750.

REGION 4
Al (18)
Birmingham, 7.
Mobile, 5.
Montgomery, 5.
Tuscaloosa, 1.

Fl (42)
Ft. Lauderdale, 1.
Jacksonville, 12.
Miami, 11.
Orlando, 3.
Pensacola, 3.
St. Petersburg, 4.
Tallahassee, 3.
Tampa, 4.
W. Palm Beach, 1.

Ga (34)
Atlanta, 24.
Gainesville, 1.
Macon, 4.
Rome, 1.
Savannah, 4.

Ky (22)
Covington, 6.
Lexington, 1.
Louisville, 14.
Owensboro, 1.

Ms (2)
Greenville, 1.
Jackson, 1.

NC (17)
Asheville, 3.
Greensboro, 4.
Raleigh, 7.
Winston-Salem, 3.

SC (14)
Charleston, 5.
Columbia, 6.
Greenville, 3.
Total, 164.

REGION 5
Il (78)
Alton, 1.
Chicago, 67.
East St. Louis, 3.
Springfield, 7.

In (31)
Fort Wayne, 3.
Indianapolis, 12.
Jeffersonville, 15.
South Bend, 1.

Mi (42)
Battle Creek, 14.
Detroit, 24.

Flint, 1.
Grand Rapids, 5.
Kalamazoo, 1.
Saginaw, 2.
Mn (28)
Duluth, 2.
Minneapolis-St. Paul, 26.
Oh (68)

Akron, 5.
Cincinnati, 15.
Cleveland, 18.
Columbus, 6.
Dayton, 8.
Shelby, 2.
Toledo, 9.
Warren, 5.

Wl (13)
Milwaukee, 13.
Total, 265.

REGION 6
LA (14)
Des Moines, 8.
West Branch, 6.

KS (16)
Abilene, 13.
Kansas City, 3.
MO (131)

Independence, 10.
Kansas City, 60.
St. Louis, 61.

NE (9)
Omaha, 9.
Total, 170.

REGION 7
AK (6)
Little Rock, 6.

LA (35)
Baton Rouge, 7.
New Orleans, 26.
Shreveport, 2.

NM (17)
Albuquerque, 12.
Santa Fe, 5.

OK (10)
Oklahoma City, 10.

TX (95)
Austin, 24.
Brownsville, 4.
Corpus Christi, 3.
Dallas, 10.
El Paso, 1.
Fort Worth, 27.
Houston, 16.
San Antonio, 5.
Tyler, 45.
Total, 163.

REGION 8
CO (52)
Denver, 52.

UT (26)
Salt Lake City, 26.
Total, 78.

REGION 9
AZ (14)
Phoenix, 7.
Tucson, 7.

Ca (174)
Fresno, 6.
Los Angeles, 59.
Sacramento, 14.
San Diego, 20.
San Francisco, 65.
Santa Ana, 10.

HI (7)
Honolulu, 7.

Nv (7)
Las Vegas, 7.
Total, 376.

REGION 10
Ak (10)
Anchorage, 10.

Id (4)
Boise, 4.
Or (27)
Eugene, 3.
Portland, 24.

Wa (45)
Auburn, 13.
Richland, 2.
Seattle, 25.
Spokane, 5.
Total, 86.

	Number of States	Number of cities	Number of FPS uniformed personnel
1-----	5	16	152
2-----	12	15	241
3-----	25	30	1,750
4-----	8	33	164
5-----	6	25	265
6-----	4	8	170
7-----	5	16	163
8-----	2	2	78
9-----	4	10	376
10-----	4	8	86
Total--	45	163	3,445

¹ Plus Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.
² Plus the District of Columbia.

GAO REPORT ON PROJECTS OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS QUES- TIONED

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1979, the GAO issued a report entitled "Congress Needs Reliable Cost Estimates and Established Priorities for Allocating Funds for Water Resources Projects." The report indicates that construction of three projects under the jurisdiction of the South Pacific Division of the Corps of Engineers were delayed because of insufficient funding. I point out they base their discussion on only three of hundreds of projects.

The report states the Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and Channel project was funded below the optimum level for 10 of the 14 years since construction funds were first received, resulting in a delay of 6½ years. The report also refers to the New Melones Lake project and indicates delays of 3 years due to insufficient funds. The GAO also states the Alameda Creek project was also delayed 3½ years since 1962 because of limited funds.

During hearings held with the corps by my Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, I questioned the division engineer regarding the allegations contained in the GAO report. The corps' immediate response was that although the projects may have been delayed due to litigation, environmental considerations, and so forth, they were not aware of delays because of funding.

Inasmuch as the corps had not at that time reviewed the GAO report, the division engineer subsequently furnished the committee the information indicating any funding delays on the projects named. In order to keep the record straight, I believe the following materials furnished by the corps should be made available for Members' information:

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Fiscal year	President's budget	Conference amount	Capability	Allocations	Funding delay (years)
Alameda Creek (Del Valle Reservoir), Calif.:					
1965	\$750	\$750	\$750	\$385	
1966	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,070	
1967	2,600	2,600	3,200	2,990	
1968	4,300	4,300	7,000	3,985	1
1969	3,300	3,201	3,300	3,055	
1970	2,200	2,200	5,000	2,530	1
1971	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,431	
1972	1,215	1,215	1,650	1,890	
1973	2,994	2,994	2,994	2,994	
1974	490	490	490	686	
1975	720	720	720	756	
1976	1,810	1,810	1,810	1,914	
1977	0	0	0	256	
1978	0	300	570	311	
1979	270	270	270	270	
Total					2
Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and channel, California:					
1966	933	933	1,600	858	1
1967	0	2,700	2,700	1,800	
1968	1,800	2,315	5,000	1,814	1
1969	2,500	2,425	6,300	1,240	1
1970	1,500	2,500	6,000	1,352	1
1971	7,000	8,000	7,000	8,468	
1972	5,300	7,150	9,000	10,010	

Fiscal year	President's budget	Conference amount	Capability	Allocations	Funding delay (years)
1973	8,400	10,400	10,400	11,960	
1974	3,850	2,650	6,850	2,315	(2)
1975	13,500	3,000	13,500	—50	
1976/76T	2,800	2,800	2,800	1,280	
1977	3,300	750	3,300	7,818	(3)
1978	600	12,500	18,000	20,175	(4)
1979	35,000	45,000	45,000	47,730	
Total					4
New Melones Lake, Calif.:					
1966	1,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	
1967	2,500	2,500	5,000	2,415	
1968	2,750	2,750	4,000	2,690	
1969	2,800	2,716	8,000	2,000	1
1970	1,230	3,000	11,600	800	1
1971	10,130	10,130	12,700	11,810	
1972	20,300	22,000	22,000	21,135	
1973	26,000	26,000	26,000	22,050	
1974	18,000	15,000	16,000	17,050	
1975	15,500	15,500	20,500	15,905	
1976	40,100	43,000	43,000	32,865	
1976T	13,500	15,000	15,000	15,690	
1977	59,000	64,000	64,000	63,650	
1978	68,000	69,000	69,000	67,000	
Total					2

¹ Budget and conference amounts for completion of A.E. & D. Corps also expressed capability to initiate construction.

² Construction enjoined May 30, 1974.

³ Injunction removed Jan. 27, 1977.

⁴ Litigation resolved May 27, 1978.

⁵ Includes supplemental appropriations.

As you can see, there has been no slip-page in these projects because of lack of funds in the last 9 years.

The General Accounting Office is apparently not now doing a creditable job in their reports as they once were.

TRIBUTE TO JOE BARTLETT

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in salute to my good friend and the recently retired minority clerk, Joe Bartlett. How and where does one begin to say thank you to a man who has spent 37½ years of dedicated and faithful service to the House of Representatives?

As one who has known Joe for but 13 of those 37½ years, I cannot recount, other than by hearsay, his early accomplishments and contributions to this body; so I will focus my remarks on the first hand experiences I shared with Joe during my service in the Congress. It is a shame that so many of those Members that could give testimony to the fine job Joe did all those years cannot be with us here today to join in this tribute. I know many of them would like to be. By my tally there have been 2,033 Members that have served in the House of Representatives since Joe began his long career of public service in 1941. Only one Member who was a part of that 77th Congress remains, and that is the able chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN.

A lot of water has gone under the bridge since Joe first set foot in these Chambers as a 14-year-old page appointee from Clarksburg, W. Va. Five speakers have overseen the activities of the House, eight Presidents have appeared before this body to give state of

the Union addresses, and the country has been in and out of three major wars. Social change has been considerable. From the tail end of the New Deal, through the Fair Deal, the New Frontier, and the Great Society, Joe has seen our country evolve from a predominantly rural society to an urban one.

Joe Bartlett has seen a lot and done a lot during his 37½ years service to the Congress. And everything he has done, he has done well.

I first became acquainted with Joe when he was the minority reading clerk. Particularly helpful to new Members, he went out of his way to familiarize newcomers such as myself with the procedures and practices of the House. His helpful hints and observations have proven invaluable to me as a legislator, and I will be forever grateful to him for providing this guidance. That was Joe's way. He was always accessible, always available, always willing to be of assistance. The excellent aptitude, and attitude he brought to his work made him stand out from the rest, and carried him from his first position as a page to the top Republican staff position in the House of Representatives, that of minority clerk.

A person of his caliber is hard to find, no less replace. We miss Joe Bartlett. For me, and for many others, he helped to make service in this Chamber a more pleasant and meaningful experience and for that he will long be remembered. May he and his lovely wife, Jinny, enjoy the new challenges and experiences that lie ahead. I am sure that whatever they are the Bartletts will approach them with the same vigor and enthusiasm that they displayed through all their years of association with the Congress.

□ 1945

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. Speaker, there are many fine things we could say about Joe Bartlett, one of our favorite Buckeyes, but I thought I might take a different tack and use the two Websters, Noah Webster and Daniel Webster, to provide the words that I would want to use.

In the office formally occupied by Joe there is a well-worn dictionary, Webster's New International Dictionary, and in that dictionary they define a "patriot" as "one who loves his country and zealously supports its authority and interests."

How well that describes Joe Bartlett. Webster's says that a definition for "dedicate" is "to become committed to." And again that is a beautiful description of the life of Joe Bartlett as he served his Nation in so many different ways.

I could go on with many others: "Devote," "loyal," "friend," and so on. All of those words in the dictionary are very aptly used in describing the life of Joe Bartlett.

But let me turn to the other Webster, Daniel Webster, and let us be reminded of the words that are inscribed so beautifully in the plaque above the Speaker's chair as a quotation from Daniel Webster. These are the words of that plaque:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Those are the words that are inscribed in this Chamber as a challenge to every Member who serves here.

And certainly in the way that Joe Bartlett conducted his life, both in his

service to the House of Representatives and to his Nation in the military service, he did strive to meet the goals that are so beautifully outlined in this quotation from Daniel Webster.

The poets say that the two most beautiful words in the English language are "summer afternoon," and on a day like today we might agree. But I would say that two equally beautiful words are "good friend." Joe Bartlett and his wife, Jinny, have been good friends to all of us in a lot of different ways, and all of us who have served with Joe appreciate him so much for being the good friend he always has been.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) for yielding, and I commend him for this thoughtful special order to honor a great American and a person who has served well the House of Representatives and his country in a number of capacities.

I do not know of anyone I have met who is more well-rounded and who is better thought of than Joe Bartlett. Certainly it has been a great pleasure for me to know him, to know of his wise and accommodating ways, and to partake of his good advice and assistance while we have been here getting acclimatized and then as the years roll on in the endeavors we have before us.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my colleagues from Ohio, the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), for taking this special order for our good friend, Joe Bartlett.

□ 1950

I welcome the opportunity to salute a friend and fellow Ohioan and his lovely wife, Jinny. Joe was most helpful to me when I first arrived on the scene in 1966, shortly after the election. He was always ready, willing and able to serve any Member of Congress who sought his assistance—and I sought it on many occasions. His tireless and solicitous efforts evidenced a concern which helped me produce many beneficial results. I congratulate Joe for his extremely impressive service as a reading clerk. I think he contributed greatly to the image of the House through his faithful years of service as a reading clerk. One of the things I remember most, as I arrived on the scene, was the way he acted as reading clerk. He had a kind of rhythm and a tone which was unique and, as I say, I think certainly improved the image of this House for

visitors who came to see us from the gallery. I salute Joe also for his dedication as a soldier, as a brigadier general in the Marine Corps. I know his wife, Jinny, and his daughters, Linda and Laura, are very proud of Joe and his career, to which they have contributed a great deal. Marjorie and I wish him happiness in the years ahead.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's yielding. I want to thank him for taking the time to express our appreciation for the service of Joe Bartlett. He certainly gave loyal and reliable service to the House of Representatives, especially to the minority. He was always on the job and, as my several colleagues from Ohio have already indicated, he went out of his way, as many new Members came here—and we all did at one time—to make sure that we understood the procedures of the House and the ways in which each of us as individuals could be more effective. Joe was always more than willing to take the time to be helpful and to explain how each of us could be of greater service to our districts. I am sure that Joe must have been disappointed, as all of us were, that he did not become the Clerk of the House, because I am sure he would have been a major candidate for that position had we ever been smart enough to figure out a way to become the majority during his time of service.

I have always been impressed with Joe Bartlett's great sense of patriotism and great sense of duty to the country. I think that we all recognize and realize that his sense of patriotism was epitomized by his constantly asking himself the question: "How can I best serve the country?" That one question was ever prominent in his mind.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is most appropriate that my colleague has taken the time to say, in our own way here, "Thank you, Joe Bartlett, for the fine job you have done in serving the Congress and especially the Members of the minority."

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for taking this time to pay our respects to one who was a most dedicated public servant for many, many years. Each of us has been a freshman at some point in our career, and in most cases there has been someone who has kind of taken us under his or her wing and guided us through the difficult task of becoming a legislator in a very competitive atmosphere. I can recall that I had hardly been confirmed as the winner, back in 1966, when I had received a letter from the reading clerk of the House of Representatives, the minority reading clerk, a man I did not know at that time.

Most of us, I am sure, found ourselves in a similar situation. But Joe took an interest right away in the freshman Members, not for a self-serving purpose, but because he sincerely wanted the Members to become better Members. His was not a biased or selfish view, so far as partisanship was concerned.

□ 1955

He offered the same kind of friendship and assistance to both political sides, but very early Joe was always one to come back off the stand here after reading and come down and give little hints, little suggestions. Time and time again we received special little notes from Joe, something that he had read and witnessed on the floor, trying always to give help to make the House of Representatives a better place.

So, it is with sadness that this year we learned that Joe had made his decision not to continue his service here as the minority Clerk of the House, which he had assumed several years ago, because he continued to be the same type of servant, always wanting to help Members to be better Members and to do their jobs better. But, after he made that decision, we all certainly wish him well and congratulate him for the tremendous service he has given the country and given especially to this House to make it a better House.

So, as he now is pursuing new adventures in life, I want to join his many, many friends who wish him and Jinny many years of happiness and success at whatever he attempts—and Joe will be a success at whatever he decides to do. So, we do wish him well and thank him for the help he has given the House and the Nation.

I might add here that it is sad that he served before television came to the floor, because many, many Members will remember Joe, but the Nation will remember Joe not as serving as reading clerk of the House of Representatives, but as permanent clerk of several Republican national conventions when he most eloquently served in that capacity. So, we will miss him but we wish him well.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON).

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also thank the gentleman for bringing this special order as well. As one of the more recent additions to this body, I also would like to express my sincere appreciation to Joe Bartlett for the dedicated work that he did as minority clerk of the House.

When I came to Congress, Joe was extremely helpful to me. I looked to him for guidance and he was always cordial in manner and wise in counsel. His resignation was a great loss to me.

Joe's long career in the House, his interest in Congress, his sincere desire to serve his country by his service in this

House, and his capacity for hard work—all these are qualities we should mention in expressing our gratitude to Joe. But it is his friendship which is most important.

I shall always be glad that I was elected to the 95th Congress; that I knew General Joe Bartlett; that I worked with him in Congress and had his friendship.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN).

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from the 95th Congress. I had a freshman Congressman ask me in this new 96th Congress what I thought he would be missing by not having been here 2 years earlier, and the first thought that came very quickly to my mind was that he would not be able to avail himself to the counsel of Joe Bartlett.

He has the wisdom and philosophical astuteness of an Aristotle; the patience of a Job; he is, of course, as patriotic and "gung ho" as a Gen. George Patton, with the personality and demeanor of lovable Ike Eisenhower. I feel ashamed for mentioning prominent Army generals except that Joe's career in the Marine Corps, if it had not been interrupted by his brilliant service in this House, would certainly have led him to the esteemed title of commandant.

It was no small accomplishment that in his spare time and in those great periods of his life when he gave of himself to active duty, he still carved out a distinguished record in this body while attaining the rank of brigadier general in the U.S. Marine Corps. I do not think I ever came on the House floor as a new Member without being greeted by Joe Bartlett's smile. Moreover, he unsparingly counseled me and other new Members and gave counsel to those Members who were senior to him by several decades.

□ 2000

I think that Joe's loss not only to our party but to the whole House is one that will not be made up for many, many years.

I think the assistance which some of the Members have mentioned which Joe Bartlett gave when they were freshmen in pointing out an article in some distinguished newspaper across this country, in assisting us, and in guiding us in the approach which freshmen sometimes made in their exuberant attempt to go into the well at all times on every issue, and Joe Bartlett's general counsel of, "Don't blunt your pick on this one; save yourself," constituted one bit of advice which this Member needed, I think, more than did most Members in the House.

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that Joe looks 20 or 30 years younger than his years on this planet. I know he will not deny his party his wisdom and counsel over the years. I know we will

all see him in Detroit in the summer of 1980, and I hope he haunts the halls of this great Capitol Building which he loved so well, with his beautiful Ginny, and lets the freshmen Members of both parties in the 96th Congress know just what they are missing by not having Joe's handsome visage sitting in front of that new little computer which he used so effectively over the years.

I look forward to his careful and studious analysis of what these six monster RCA cameras are going to do with us.

I think I will put in the RECORD this year, as I did last year and as many, many others before me have put into the RECORD for each Congress in the last five or six Congresses, Joe's brilliant analysis of how we could all serve our country better by making this body of ours run more efficiently and more smoothly.

So I hope my great and dear friend of 2 years and 3 months—actually, longer than that because he visited me in my district when I had 6 months to go in my first race—will make sure that this Congress gets that brilliant analysis of his forthwith so that it can be put in the RECORD during the next few days.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) for taking this special order, and I thank him for letting me participate in it at the last moment. It is the nicest honor that I have had so far in the 96th Congress, just as the nicest honor I had during the 95th Congress was making the acquaintance of Joe Bartlett.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DORNAN) for his comments.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for taking this special order.

Mr. Speaker, if a word could describe Joe Bartlett, it is "friend"—friend of this House of Representatives. No more loyal friend, no more understanding person of this institution and its greatness, with tolerance for the frailties of its Members on occasion, could be found than Joe Bartlett, friend of the House of Representatives, and Gen. Joe Bartlett, friend of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Anyone who knew Joe Bartlett knew that he was a Marine; and those of us who did not have the honor of serving in that corps knew about it because we were invited to the Congressional Marines Breakfast and other functions.

Joe is a friend of that corps, and he was a friend of those of us serving here.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the one word to describe Joe Bartlett would be "friend." He was a staunch friend. What Joe believed in, Joe knew: this institution, this country, his beloved Marine Corps, and those of us whom he so ably and so generously assisted.

Going back, Mr. Speaker, to the 89th Congress, I remember how hopeful Joe

Bartlett was then and was all through the years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity of joining with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) and with so many others in just saying "Thank you," to friend Joe Bartlett and to Jinny, and may they have the very best of years ahead of them.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEWEN) for his comments.

□ 2005

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable CLARENCE MILLER, for allowing me to close this tribute to Joe Bartlett.

I think we do not as Members of Congress pay tribute enough to the people that many of our constituents think of as anonymous but we know very well by first name and by face, the staff that serves us here in this Chamber, because it is these people who make the whole operation run smoothly. Some of them are now rewarded by being on camera all the time, but many of them are not because they serve in the rear of the Chamber and are the ones who offer us a little advice when we come in about the nature of the legislation and when the next vote is likely to occur, and the processes that are going to be pursued in the next few minutes, and the schedule of the House. So, indeed, it is an honor for me and a great personal pleasure to have the chance to pay tribute to Joe Bartlett—I, perhaps, should say parenthetically to his friend, Charlie Hackney, who retired about the same time, and to all the others who have served here. But particularly because it is Joe, I personally welcome this opportunity to officially recognize the innumerable contributions he has made to the U.S. House of Representatives and the Government of this country during his 37 years of service here.

From his days as a page to those 8 years as the ranking Republican staff officer in the House, Joe's service spanned the events of a momentous historical period, a period of great significance to our country, and permitted him to become personally associated with, as my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) said, 2,000 Members of Congress, 5 of whom eventually served this Nation as the President of the United States: Harry Truman, Lyndon Johnson, Jack Kennedy, Richard Nixon, and Jerry Ford.

Joe Bartlett maintained throughout his distinguished career on Capitol Hill an unsurpassed reputation for propriety, for loyalty, and honesty in the performance of his myriad duties, justly earning him the esteem and confidence of the Members of both sides of the political aisle, the friendship of all of us and all of the staff members on the Hill.

Joe first came to Washington to represent his native State, West Virginia, at a national school boys safety patrol con-

vention as "America's Typical Schoolboy Patrolman," but not quite typical because he was smaller than most at that age, and he was the only one from West Virginia. So he marched singly behind this great placard which was carried indicating that this was the West Virginia contingent, and that so attracted one of our former colleagues that he named Joe to a 30-day appointment as a page in the House of Representatives. Joe continued in that position without portfolio, I guess it could be said, for 3 years—those were the years I first knew him—and graduated from the Capitol Page School in 1944.

As a 17-year-old volunteer, he joined the U.S. Marine Corps to serve in the remaining months of World War II. After being honorably discharged as a private first class, Joe returned to the Capitol to become, at the age of 19, the youngest chief of pages on record in this body. He continued his Reserve activities and won a commission from the ranks as a "meritorious noncommissioned officer" when the Korean emergency broke out, during which he served a year with the Second Marine Division in North Carolina. In the ensuing years, Joe had varied and worldwide Reserve experience in the Marines, eventually, of course, serving as brigadier general in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve until his retirement from the corps on July 1, 1978.

He was known here as the organizer and chief factotum of the Marine Corps Breakfasts which have been held regularly on Capitol Hill for Members of Congress who formerly served in the Marines, and for other Marines in the Washington area, and for the friends of Marines, of which I was pleased to be one—because I served in the amphibious forces, and I always told Joe that I helped make those Marines heroes by stepping on their hands so they would go down into the small boats and charge the beach. Joe enjoyed that Marine Corps association and was honored suitably by his friends in the Marine Corps.

But no mention of Joe's Marine Corps experiences would be complete unless it included that "hazardous duty" assignment he had as a young lieutenant in the spring of 1951 when he was asked to escort the Ohio cherry blossom princess, the attractive Miss Virginia Bender, daughter of the late House Member and Senator from Ohio, George Bender, and his wife who still survives. His friends and his biography will tell you that the romance between the two blossomed that week, and it has been in full flower ever since.

□ 2010

The following year Jinny and Joe were married. They are now the parents of two lovely daughters, Linda Louise, now Mrs. James L. Hobgood of Fredericksburg, Va., who was graduated "with distinction" by the University of Virginia, where she also earned a graduate degree, and Laura Lee, a junior at Virginia Tech. Both girls were honored to be selected to follow their mother as Ohio princesses in

the National Cherry Blossom Festival, so he is a good sire, as well as these other qualifications.

While working for Congress, Joe attended George Washington University at night, and West Virginia Wesleyan College briefly during a recess of the House. In 1971, Salem College, Salem, W. Va., bestowed on Bartlett the degree of doctor of laws. He also has received a similar honor from the Atlanta Law School in Atlanta.

In addition to his duties as an employee of the House, Joe has become a well-respected and active member of the Republican Party, and a dynamic force in Republican politics at the local, State, and national levels.

Although he has served in this body on a bipartisan basis and is as respected and held in affection by our friends on the other side of the aisle as he is by the minority party, his dedicated and determined efforts have truly helped to strengthen our two-party system, and therefore, the very basis of our democratic form of government.

Joe, incidentally, will be the last minority clerk of the House. His title has been officially retired, and his successors will be titled counsel to the minority. Joe now will be known as the clerk of the minority emeritus.

To those of us who have had the opportunity to work with Joe, that title will mean a great deal because of the man behind it. Joe has given us a fine example of warm humanity and civic culture that contributes so much to our society. He has demonstrated by his behavior the deep meanings of human dignity and the rule of law. His friendly smile, his great enthusiasm and his endless willingness to help, to befriend new Members, will always be remembered in this House by all of us who have served here.

Joe, Jinny, I join my colleagues in wishing you and your fine family much happiness and success in all your future endeavors, wherever they may lead you.

Call on us, if you ever need us, because we feel that sense of loyalty to our honorary Ohioan.

I am joined in this tribute to you by a number of Members who could not stay and share their personal affection for you; but I just want to read the list of Members who before this session ended today asked me to tell you how much they think of you:

CALDWELL BUTLER, LARRY COUGHLIN, BOB WALKER, DICK SCHULZE, DON CLAUSEN, ROBERT DORNAN, who spoke, and GEORGE HANSEN, who spoke, BOB LAGOMARSINO, who spoke, MATT RINALDO; the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, PETE RODINO; DANTE FASCELL, DICK WHITE of Texas; JOEL PRITCHARD; JOHN SEIBERLING, another Buckeye; TOBY MOFFETT, LARRY WINN; DAVE TRENN; MRS. MARGARET HECKLER; JAMES MARTIN of North Carolina; MORGAN MURPHY of Illinois; LINDY BOGGS, whose husband served as a majority leader of this body and then she succeeded him; GILLIS LONG of

Louisiana; ROBERT ROE of New Jersey; MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD of Tennessee; and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JAMES WRIGHT of Texas; and a former colleague of ours, Clark MacGregor, who shares with us this moment.

In addition to that, I have special order requests from Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia; from TENNYSON GUYER of Ohio; from MORRIS UDALL of Arizona; and a tribute from the Ohio House of Representatives inserted by the State representative from Mechanicsburg, Ohio, whose father served as the Senator from Ohio, Charles Rockwell Saxbee of District 75; a letter from Chet Newland, professor of the University of Southern California, Washington Public Affairs Center, who praises you and wishes you well.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, ask for the opportunity to insert in the RECORD not only that resolution from the Ohio House of Representatives and the letter from Mr. Newland; but the last biography of Joe Bartlett when he completed his service as clerk of the minority of the House of Representatives.

The material follows:

OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—H.R. No. 48

Recognizing Joe Bartlett for his outstanding service to the United States House of Representatives

Whereas, The members of the House of Representatives of the 113th General Assembly of Ohio, fully aware of the innumerable contributions Joe Bartlett has made during his eight years as clerk of the minority of the United States House of Representatives, take this opportunity to express our appreciation; and

Whereas, A former resident of Chagrin Falls, Joe Bartlett, prior to his election as clerk of the minority, served Congress for seventeen years as the House Republican reading clerk, having first acquired an interest in the legislative branch of government as a page in 1941; and

Whereas, Throughout his distinguished career on Capitol Hill, Joe Bartlett maintained an unsurpassed reputation for loyalty and honesty in the performance of his myriad duties, justly earning him the esteem and confidence of members from both sides of the political aisle; and

Whereas, A well-respected member of the Republican party, Joe Bartlett has been a dynamic force in Republican politics at the local, state, and national levels, and his dedicated, determined efforts have truly helped to strengthen our two-party system, the cornerstone of American democracy; therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the House of Representatives of the 113th General Assembly, in adopting this Resolution in honor of Joe Bartlett, recognize this innumerable Ohio son for his thirty-seven years of outstanding service to the United States House of Representatives and wish him much happiness and success in all his future endeavors; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislative Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit duly authenticated copies of this Resolution to Joe Bartlett; to The Cleveland Press; and to The Plain Dealer, Cleveland.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
WASHINGTON PUBLIC AFFAIRS CENTER,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1979.

CLERK TO THE MINORITY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Joseph D. Bartlett, trustworthy and distinguished Clerk to the Minority of the House of Representatives, has now served 40 sessions of Congress. He has served with distinction—always outstanding in meeting ever-increasing demands. But far more, he has provided a superb example of warm humanity and civic culture which has stretched far beyond Capitol Hill to nourish the basic values and principles of American constitutional government.

Joe Bartlett demonstrates by his behavior the deeper meanings of human dignity and rule of law. At the same time, he knows by disciplined study and experience the conceptual and practical dimensions of those most basic values. He teaches them well by example, and he also has a rare talent for articulating them.

Joe attended the Federal Executive Institute as a distinguished career Federal executive while I was privileged to serve as FEI's director. Of the superior participants in the Institute's major developmental program, Joe was clearly at the top in every respect. He invariably helped others to perform at their best. He led effectively in groups, even as a quiet participant. But he also spoke eloquently and with impressive knowledge when that was appropriate. He was a masterful teacher—and in all respects a most thoughtful student, always learning.

Joe's positive impact on executives and on government generally was recognized when FEI alumni selected him as the principal speaker at the Institute's Tenth Anniversary celebration in 1978. He was outstanding in that role.

The combination of vast practical knowledge, informed political theory, and personal integrity demonstrated by Joe Bartlett is exceptional. His talent in working with people and helping them to surpass themselves and his deep understanding of American government and politics make him a resource without equal. He must continue to be utilized, for as an ever-growing, good human being, Joe Bartlett will never be used up.

With sincere, great respect,
CHESTER A. NEWLAND,
Professor.

Joe Bartlett, the Clerk to the Minority of the United States House of Representatives, is the ranking Republican staff officer in the House, and is elected to that position by the Members of the Republican Conference at the beginning of each Congress. Joe is serving his fifth term as Clerk, having commenced his unusual career as a House Page in 1941, and having served seventeen years as House Reading Clerk.

A familiar voice in the Congress for many years, Joe Bartlett is widely recognized for his similar role as Chief Reading Clerk of the Republican National Conventions. He has been selected for that assignment since 1960, and has served each convention since 1948, when he was Chief of the Pages.

Well into his 37th year with the Congress, Bartlett is now "dean" of the legislative attaches. His service has spanned events of momentous historical significance and rich personal experiences in association with some two thousand Members of Congress, five of whom he has seen become President of the United States. Of the Congressmen who were there when Joe started as a Page, August 1, 1941, only three remain, and all three have announced this will be their final session; they are not seeking re-election.

Erstwhile citizen of Chagrin Falls, Ohio, Bartlett continues to serve as an adjunct member of the Cuyahoga County Republican Executive Committee. Born in Clarksburg, West Virginia, August 7, 1926, Dorsey Joseph Bartlett is the sixth of the ten children of Flavius Dorsey Bartlett (deceased) and Blanche Hacker Bartlett, both descendants of early pioneer families.

Chosen as a lone delegate to represent West Virginia at a national safety convention in Washington, D.C., Joe was singled out as "America's Typical Schoolboy Patrolman." From this, came the opportunity to serve a 30-day appointment as a Page in the House of Representatives, after which Joe continued "without portfolio" for three years, graduated from the Capitol Page School in 1944, and joined the Marine Corps, to serve the remaining months of World War II.

Honorably discharged as a Private First Class, Bartlett returned to the Capitol and became, at 19, the youngest Chief of Pages on record. He continued his reserve activities and won a commission from the ranks as a "meritorious NCO" when the Korean emergency broke out, during which he served a year with the Second Marine Division at Camp Lejeune, N.C. In the ensuing years Joe had varied and world-wide reserve experience, and was commanding VTU 4-1, Washington, D.C., when he was selected for promotion to flag rank.

Bartlett served as a Brigadier General in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve from July 1, 1975 to July 1, 1978. At retirement ceremonies on the parade field at historic Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., Marine Corps Commandant, General Louis H. Wilson, decorated General Bartlett with the Legion of Merit "for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services."

During basic training at Quantico in 1951, Lieutenant Bartlett was among a small group of junior officers ordered to Washington for a week of "hazardous duty" as escorts in the National Cherry Blossom Festival. Joe was assigned to escort the Ohio Princess, Miss Virginia Bender of Chagrin Falls, daughter of then-Congressman George H. Bender (deceased) and Mrs. Edna Bender. Romance also blossomed, and the following year "Jinny" and Joe were married.

While working for the Congress, Joe attended George Washington University at night, and West Virginia Wesleyan College briefly during a recess of the House. In 1971, Salem College, Salem, West Virginia, bestowed on Bartlett the degree of Doctor of Laws. A year earlier he had been awarded a similar honor by the Atlanta Law School, Atlanta, Georgia.

The Marine Corps selected General Bartlett to participate in Defense Strategy Seminar '75, of the National War College (National Defense University) in June 1975.

On the nomination of the Speaker of the House and House Minority Leader, Bartlett became the first representative of the Congress to attend the Federal Executive Institute at Charlottesville, Virginia. Completing Senior Session No. 33 in December, 1975, Bartlett was elected to deliver the graduation address, and subsequently to serve on the Board of Directors of the FEI Alumni Association.

A frequent speaker at public events, Bartlett was honored to be asked to make the address at the 102nd Memorial Day Services at Gettysburg National Cemetery. The U.S. Jaycees presented him their Distinguished Service Award for his work in helping to organize a Federal Affairs program for their membership. In 1969, as the author of a patriotic essay, he received the George Washington Honor Medal of the Freedoms Foundation.

A member of numerous professional organizations, Joe has long been an officer of

the National Republican Club of Capitol Hill, presently serving on its Board of Governors.

Jinny and Joe Bartlett have two daughters, Linda Louise (now Mrs. James L. Hobgood of Fredericksburg, Va.) who was graduated "with distinction" by the University of Virginia, where she also earned a graduate degree, and Laura Lee, a junior at Virginia Tech. Both girls were honored to be selected to follow their mother as Ohio Princesses in the National Cherry Blossom Festival. The Bartletts make their capitol home in McLean, Virginia.

□ 2015

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for those very good remarks and I yield now to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR).

Mr. ABDNOR. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding and I certainly want to commend him for taking out this special order. And I would just like to add my few words to the beautiful tribute that has been paid to Joe Bartlett and his lovely wife, Jinny.

I would just like to say that I was not a frequent visitor by any means to Washington prior to coming to Congress but I felt like I knew Joe Bartlett before I ever arrived here because I did have one thing in common with him. We were both frequent visitors to Chagrin Falls, Ohio, where his wife was reared and raised.

Back in Chagrin when people knew I was coming here I heard many, many wonderful things about Joe Bartlett and what a great fellow and American he was. Everything I heard from back in his second home was true. I heard Member after Member recite the assistance he gave each of them when they came to Congress. The same was true with me.

The thing that went through my mind as I look back is regardless of how much we imposed upon his time he always seemed like he thoroughly enjoyed helping us all and assisting us in any way he could. We appreciate the great leadership and guidance he gave us. He is a great American. He not only devoted a great part of his life to working in the House of Representatives and therefore working for his country but he continued his great service in the military by staying in the Marine Reserves rising to the position of general. We all miss him but we all wish him well, he and his lovely wife in their future endeavors.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

One of the many highlights of Joe's distinguished career came in 1975 when he was nominated and confirmed as brigadier general in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. An overflow crowd of friends and well wishers that July day saw Marine Corps Commandant, Gen. Louis Wilson administer the oath of office to Joe and read the following letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 10, 1975.

Brig. Gen. JOE BARTLETT,
U.S. Marine Corps Reserve,
Washington D.C.

DEAR JOE: Knowing how much the Marine Corps has meant in your life, and how much the values which Marines cherish have contributed to your outstanding career of service to the House of Representatives, I want to

add my congratulations on this happy occasion for you and your fine family. Warm good wishes. General, from a reserve Lieutenant Commander who got recalled to active duty.

Sincerely,

JERRY FORD.

Joe is truly the citizen-soldier—a patriot who unswervingly heeds the call of his country in time of war and peace. No one could have a deeper and more abiding love for his country and desire to serve it than Joe Bartlett.

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, in the book of Ecclesiastics we are directed: "Whatever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." For 37 years of dedicated service to the House of Representatives, Joe Bartlett worked enthusiastically at whatever task he was assigned. His trademark was unflagging cheerfulness, a ready smile, and willingness to tackle what needed to be done.

Joe was active in many areas—and rose to the rank of brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve. He was a familiar fixture at Republican National Conventions, where he helped keep things flowing as official reader and with his knowledge of parliamentary procedure.

He served the Congress during a time in which the Nation faced three wars and many domestic crises. I know that I speak for all my colleagues, those now serving as well as those who have served during the past four decades, in expressing our appreciation for all the hard work Joe Bartlett put in to make our jobs a little easier.

I join my fellow Republicans in wishing him a long and fulfilling retirement, and I know that whatever he turns his hand to now, he will be doing it with all his might. That was Joe Bartlett's way.

● Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, Joe Bartlett gave new dimensions to a long and eventful career of public service. For 37 colorful years, Joe served in the House of Representatives. From page to minority clerk, Joe was the epitome of service above self.

Nobody was prouder of Ohio than Joe Bartlett. Few esteemed his country more than Joe. While he was Republican all the way, he never forgot that being a gentleman is the first requisite of good citizenship.

Whatever new horizons Joe seeks, he has cast a long shadow in the Nation's Capitol. We all wish him and his family new mountains to climb and new goals to achieve.

● Mr. ROBINSON. There have been several occasions on which it has been appropriate to express publicly a high regard for Joe Bartlett, and it has been a genuine pleasure for me to have such opportunities.

I recall the occasion's of Joe's advancement to the grade of brigadier general in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve—a very unusual distinction for a reservist of that service. More recently, many of us attended the impressive retirement parade for him at the Marine Barracks in Washington.

Now, it is with mixed feelings that we express again our admiration for Joe, because we are noting that he closed out, as this 96th Congress began, a career of service to the House spanning 37 years. It was a remarkable record, and, while we regret that Joe no longer is an officer of this body, we rejoice that he is able to look back with satisfaction on so long a service while still a relatively young man, and enjoying good health, the comfort of a fine family and opportunity to explore other opportunities to help preserve and advance our systems of representative government and free enterprise.

As others have recalled today, Joe joined the House as a page in 1941. Later, he was to be appointed chief of pages, reading clerk and, from May 11, 1970, through the 95th Congress, he was elected minority clerk of the House.

That he did not have opportunity to serve as Clerk of the House was not because of any shortcoming of this dedicated man. This miscarriage of fate—probably the major disappointment of Joe's long tenure with us—must be laid to the failure of the minority to preach its gospel effectively enough, or the failure of a sufficiently large segment of the national electorate to recognize the truth of the message.

After God, family and country, Joe Bartlett's loves have been this House and the Marine Corps—and his heart has been large and vigorous enough to give without stint, through the years, to all of these.

While I cannot claim Joe as a constituent, I value highly the friendship of the Bartlett family. There is a specific link to the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia, in that one of the two attractive and intelligent Bartlett daughters, Linda, has been active in advancing the cause of sound government as assistant to a Virginia State senator and lives in the Fredericksburg area, where her husband is in charge of my congressional district office.

I am glad to be able to salute Joe on this occasion, and to extend best wishes to him, his wife, Ginny, and the rest of his family.

● Mr. MOTTL. Mr. Speaker, today we pause for a few moments to pay tribute to 37 years of dedicated and loyal service to the House of Representatives by Joe Bartlett. I am proud to note that Joe hails from my own 23d District of Ohio. He further represents a proud family tradition of public service to the Nation and to the Cleveland area.

Joe's career with the House began in 1941, when he joined us as a page. He later became chief of pages, and then reading clerk. From May 11, 1970, through this past Congress, Joe served as minority clerk of the House.

Joe Bartlett, always cheerful, helpful, and friendly, will be missed in our corridors. I join in wishing Joe and his family all of the best for the future.

● Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly appropriate that we set aside this time today to pay tribute to a man who has given the major portion of his life in service to the House of Repre-

sentatives, and to the Government, and the people of this Nation.

Joe Bartlett's career is one which all should envy, and which few could duplicate. He is truly the classic example of the ideal public servant, thinking rarely of his own needs and interests, but rather those of the public, and the House of Representatives.

It gives me great pleasure to take this opportunity to publicly commend Joe for his long years of dedicated service, and to thank him on behalf of the House of Representatives.

● Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, this year witnesses the retirement of one of the most dedicated public servants we have had the good fortune to know. After 37 years of work in the House of Representatives, Joe Bartlett decided to take his leave. We will miss him.

Joe first came to the House in 1941 and worked as a page for the minority. Within 3 years he learned the ropes well enough to be appointed Republican chief of pages, and from there his career was a steady ascent in authority and respect, finally culminating in his tenure as minority clerk. Over the years I was pleased to make his acquaintance and even become friends with Joe, despite the fact that he insisted upon staying on the other side of the aisle. No matter, intelligent men may differ in their political inclinations and, more important than any political opinion, Joe and I shared an experience that itself would make us friends in the face of any adversity.

Of course, I refer to Joe's career as a marine. And Joe Bartlett was not just any marine. The loyalty and dedication that he brought to his public service in the House was also brought to his service in the U.S. Marine Corps. Joe served two tours in the corps, eventually retiring as a lieutenant colonel. But his efforts and dedication did not end there, either. Joe remained active in the Marine Corps Reserve program and, in 1975, was rewarded with a promotion to brigadier general in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve.

It is the Nation's ability to make men of Joe Bartlett's character that is our hope and promise for a continued freedom and prosperity. Laurels, tributes, thanks, and a hearty handshake to Joe on his retirement and career success.

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Joe Bartlett, who was, until earlier this year, minority clerk of the House.

Joe served the House for 37 years in a number of capacities including page, reading clerk, and finally from May 11, 1970, through the 95th Congress, as minority clerk. To his job, Joe brought dedication and hard work, making the job of a minority member less arduous.

In addition to his service to Republican Members of the House, Joe devoted a great deal of energy to occasional assignments for the National Congressional Campaign Committee, as secretary of the Capitol Hill Club, where he was a member of the board of governors, executive committee, and as an of-

ficer of the Republican National Conventions since 1948.

Although he has devoted most of his working life to the House of Representatives, it is significant to note that the Marine Corps has played an important role in his life. Many of us recall July 11, 1975, when the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Louis Wilson, administered the oath of office to newly promoted Brigadier General Bartlett.

By his service and dedication, Joe Bartlett contributed greatly to the House, the Marine Corps, and his community. I join my colleagues today in wishing him well and extending our thanks for 37 years of praiseworthy service. ●

● Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged and honored to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives today to pay well-deserved tribute to our friend and indeed my very good friend, Joe Bartlett. While other Members will undoubtedly outline the many accomplishments of Joe's distinguished career, I would be remiss in not mentioning some of the highlights as well.

Joe's dedicated service to the House of Representatives began in 1941 when he became a page. From this position, Joe advanced to become the youngest chief of pages on record at age 19, and then to House reading clerk. On May 11, 1970, Joe was elected to serve as clerk to the minority of the House of Representatives, the position in which he served through the 95th Congress.

With Joe's retirement earlier this year, we have lost a valuable and experienced individual. I am sure that I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that Joe Bartlett will be sorely missed not only by the minority, but also the majority Members of the House. Joe Bartlett was so much a part of this House that the loss of his service is truly a major loss to the institution.

Joe brought to the Congress not only his wealth of experience within its halls, but his interests as a distinguished military leader, a student and a scholar, and, above all, a concerned American. Time and again Joe Bartlett's ideas were translated into legislation with little or no credit to the originator, but with full knowledge that the source of those ideas was a man whose wealth of experience and interpretation of experience was deserving of recognition and respect.

My wife Sue and I extend our very best wishes to Joe and his family for many healthy and happy years ahead. ●

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that we recognize Joe Bartlett today, who for 37 years served his country in the House of Representatives as chief of pages, reading clerk, and for the last 9 years as minority clerk of the House.

Although Joe and I viewed the Capitol from different sides of the political aisle, his dedication, and abundant willingness to do a difficult job managed to cross party lines and confirm his reputation on both sides of the House floor. Joe has succeeded in weathering the storms of Washington through 9 Presidential terms and 18 Congresses. He has witnessed a myriad of change— interna-

tional and domestic, political and cultural. His knowledge of the Congress and the arena in which we function is vast; and, as such, he will serve as an example for all of us to follow many years after his departure.

All of us will miss Joe as the 96th Congress progresses. My wife, Lee, and I would like to wish him the very best of luck in his retirement and to extend our thanks for a job very well done. ●

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) for creating the opportunity to pay tribute to Joe Bartlett, who recently retired as minority clerk of the House after 37 years of service to the Congress. Joe started as a page in 1941, and was chief of pages in the House and reading clerk along the way to become minority clerk. During those years he served the House capably and faithfully, but he also served his country. Twice, Joe left his congressional duties for Marine Corps service, culminating in the high honor of being commissioned a brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve.

Joe was senior reading clerk when I came to the Congress 10 years ago. We quickly developed a friendship which has lasted over the years. His great abilities, his sense of humor, his humility: All combined to make him a valued acquaintance. We have had many discussions during that time about issues which concerned us both. We agreed at times and had strong differences at others. But at all times I had total respect and admiration for Joe and his principles. I have missed our frequent meeting since his retirement, for he is a rare person, but I wish him the best of all that life has to offer in the future. He was a real credit to the U.S. Congress. ●

● Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the brief remarks I am about to make are made with mixed feelings. I am grateful for the opportunity to pay tribute to Joe Bartlett, but at the same time I sincerely regret that he is retiring.

While Joe has served primarily the minority Members of the House I am sure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree that Joe has served the entire House with distinction.

In addition to his service to the Congress, Joe Bartlett has also distinguished himself in other ways. He is a devoted husband and understanding father, and I know that his fine family shares his pride on this day. He has served us in other ways as well, as a member of one of our proudest military forces, the U.S. Marine Corps. He joined the corps as a private during World War II, and 4 years ago was promoted to the rank of brigadier general in the Reserves, which was one of his proudest experiences.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on but I want to give my colleagues ample time to express their feelings. So I will conclude by saying to you Joe, that you have been a great credit to this institution, and we will all miss you. I wish you well in your retirement, and hope that you will come back to visit often. ●

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join in paying tribute to one

of the most conscientious and loyal servants of the House of Representatives, our former minority clerk, Joe Bartlett.

Joe's association with this body goes back further than almost any Member of the House today. He began his distinguished career, which spans more than three and a half decades, as a House page in 1941. From that beginning, he rose to become the chief assistant for this side of the aisle.

During those years, Joe received many tributes and special recognition. He was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal of the Freedoms Foundation, the Jaycees Distinguished Service Award for assistance in Government Affairs programs, and was invited to speak before distinguished organizations such as the Brookings Institute and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Everywhere Joe went, he brought credit to himself and to the House of Representatives.

Joe's second career, and his other love, has been the Marine Corps.

For nearly 30 years, Joe has been a conscientious Marine Reserve officer who has risen through the ranks from second lieutenant to brigadier general. Twice, in the spirit of a true citizen-soldier, he voluntarily left his position with the House to go on active duty with the Marines. With his unbounded energy and talent, Joe has been a great credit to both his careers.

Mr. Speaker, as a personal friend, I extend my warmest, best wishes to Joe, his gracious wife, Jinny, and their two daughters, and I offer my heartiest congratulations for his full and dedicated service to the House of Representatives. I will always be grateful for the many kindnesses and friendship he has extended to me during our joint service in this body. ●

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Joe Bartlett leaves a positive and important mark on the House. Intelligent, fair, possessed of a brilliant and quick mind, he is universally respected not only by his friends in the minority, but by all of us in the majority. For 18 years, I have worked with Joe and always found him responsive and helpful to all Members.

I have been privileged to be his neighbor in McLean where he is a favorite as well. I wish him all the best in his new career. ●

● Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a long-term public servant, Joe Bartlett, who retired earlier this year.

Joe came to the House in 1940 as a 30-day page and through these many years Joe climbed the ropes till reaching the position of minority clerk, where he served for 8 years.

But we are not here today to review Joe Bartlett's service, because his dedication and success speak for themselves. Rather, we are here to say thank you to this man who aided so many of us through the years. I think Joe's service to the House of Representatives will best be remembered for his unending belief in the democratic system of government, and his dedication to those principles. He gave more than 37 years

of outstanding service to the House, and for those years I say, thank you, Joe, and best wishes for those wonderful retirement years ahead.●

● Mr. SLACK. I wish to join with those who are taking the occasion to express their admiration for our hard-working minority clerk, Joe Bartlett, who has retired after 37 years of service in the House of Representatives. He is a former West Virginian whom I have known ever since I entered the Congress, and down through the years I have admired his loyalty and sense of dedication to this body. He was always helpful to Members of both sides of the aisle and was extremely cooperative on all occasions. We will miss him greatly, and I hope that his years of retirement will permit him to enjoy the leisure time which his many years of service to the House has earned for him.●

● Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend, Joe Bartlett, who has retired after 37 years of dedicated service to the House of Representatives.

His concept of public trust was without parallel and in every position he held, he achieved distinction. His service in all of his assignments was marked by a high sense of conscience and duty. Joe Bartlett possesses outstanding moral and intellectual qualities that are essential in carrying out the assignments that he has held down through the years, utilizing at all times, sound judgment, patience, and perseverance. His character, his achievements, and his faithful service will be an inspiration to generations yet to come.

I want to wish my friend, Joe Bartlett, his lovely wife and family the best of everything in the future.●

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join with my other colleagues this afternoon to pay tribute to a truly outstanding and dedicated former employee of this body.

Joe Bartlett was a friend to everyone with whom he came in contact. It was certainly a pleasure to be associated with him in the House of Representatives and even though he was on the minority staff, Joe was always very thoughtful to me and those of us on the majority side.

During the first few years I was in Congress I was also a member of the National Guard and Joe was a member of the Marine Corps Reserve. I enjoyed being with General Bartlett at the various military functions we would attend.

Joe Bartlett's retirement is already being felt in this body. We miss him, but at the same time we wish him the very best and hope he will come back to visit often.●

● Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, if ever a man deserved to be called an institution it is Joe Bartlett. His long years as a House staff member enabled him to know the House as few know it, and to serve as few have served it.

His knowledge and judgment made him a valuable member of the minority team, and earned him respect and affection on the other side of the aisle as well.

We will miss him, but his long and distinguished career established a standard to which all of us can aspire.●

● Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has had a distinguished career in service to the House of Representatives for over 35 years. Joe Bartlett began working in this historic Chamber before a good many of us who now serve here were even aware of the existence of the U.S. House.

In 1941, when Joe was working here as a page, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was President of the United States, the United States was on the brink of entering what would become the Second World War, and within 5 years, that rare creature, a Massachusetts Republican, would become that rarest of all creatures—a Republican Speaker of the House.

And Joe Bartlett has been here through it all, walking the corridors of history and constantly serving the Members of this House. His was a steady progression—page, chief of pages, reading clerk, and, finally, 8 fruitful years as minority clerk of the House of Representatives. He was here to serve and to assist, and he was able to have a career in which he saw four Members that he had worked with daily succeed each other as President—former Congressmen Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Ford.

I will always be grateful for the kindnesses shown to me by Joe Bartlett when I came to this House. I wish him a long and happy retirement.●

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this tribute to a very good friend of mine, Joe Bartlett.

I was disappointed when Joe resigned earlier this year because I hated to see those of us on our side of the aisle lose the thoughtful assistance Joe always provided and the inestimably valuable experience he garnered in his 37 years of association with the Congress.

Joe's career, first as a page, then as chief reading clerk, and finally, as clerk to the minority of the U.S. House of Representatives, has been a unique one and one unlikely ever to be duplicated, either in its breadth or in its performance.

He has been a faithful servant of the people of the United States not only in his various capacities with the Congress but also in his wartime military service and his many years with the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve.

Joe is truly a great American, and we shall miss him and his good services.

In attempting to convey the gratitude I feel and the respect I hold for Joe Bartlett, I am reminded of Sallust's speech on the state addressed to Caesar in his later years:

Experience has shown that to be true which Apollus says in his verses, that every man is the architect of his own fortune; and this proverb is especially true of you, who have excelled others to such a degree that men are sooner wearied in singing the praises of your deeds than you in doing deeds worthy of praise.

I wish for Joe continued success and satisfaction beyond his fondest dreams in all that he does.●

● Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend, Joe Bartlett.

As the record shows, Joe started his

career on Capitol Hill as a page for the House of Representatives in 1941. He later served as chief of pages, reading clerk and for the past 8 of his 37 years of service was the minority clerk of the House. In addition, he has managed to combine his service in the House with a distinguished career in the Marine Corps rising to the rank of brigadier general in the Reserves.

During his nearly four decades of service, Joe has made many friends. However, I may be able to claim one of the longest friendships. I first met Joe in 1949 when we attended a Young Republican Convention in Salt Lake City. Since then our paths have crossed many times and when I was elected to Congress 11 years ago we were able to renew our acquaintance on a permanent basis.

Joe's many years of service to the minority have been greatly appreciated. Because he was there faithfully doing his job throughout many transitions, he made our jobs a little easier.

I am sure I speak for all my colleagues when I thank Joe for his many years of service and to wish him the best in his retirement.●

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio yielding. I am pleased to have this opportunity to add a few words about my good friend Joe Bartlett. We miss Joe from the House and we especially miss his friendly smile and enthusiastic spirit. He has served our party well. Joe always knew what was going on. He knew how to sum up the issue in a few words. If you needed facts, he could put his hands right on them.

When I think of Joe Bartlett, I think immediately of two things. He was smart and he was a marine. The fact that he was smart made him a tremendous asset to us in his capacity to coordinate all the activities on the floor. Being a marine impressed me, since I am a Texan where defense and love of country with strong patriotism still gives us the measure of a good man.

Joe should run for office and join us here in Congress. He is a winner all the way.●

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to take part in this tribute to our former minority clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives and my longtime friend—Joe Bartlett. During my 16 years in this body, I have come to know many Members and staff personnel serving the membership of the House, as well as its committees. From the standpoint of versatility of experience and depth of knowledge regarding the U.S. House and its operations, as well as a personal acquaintanceship with most of the Members of the House during the period I have been here, Joe Bartlett stands at or near the top of the list.

Mr. Speaker, we frequently hear expressions on the part of Members and House personnel who exclaim, "I love the House." However, I do not think that anyone uttered these words with greater meaning than Joe Bartlett. Coming up the hard way from a House page to a top administrative role in the House of Representatives—as minority clerk of the

House—Joe Bartlett earned his spurs by reason of the excellence of his service and his steadfast application to the job.

In addition to my close association to Joe Bartlett in our contacts here in the House, I have been privileged to serve as part of the congressional Marine Corps group which owes its principal organizational support to Joe Bartlett, a brigadier general in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Joe Bartlett will move on from his service in the U.S. House to other activity, as I simply cannot believe that he could remain inactive very long. In whatever direction his service leads him, the good wishes of his friends here in the U.S. House will be a supporting influence. We join today in expressing appreciation to Joe Bartlett for a job "well done" and extend to him and to his lovely wife, Jinny, our congratulations and our every good wish for healthy and happy lives together.●

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOPKINS. 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 therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

AN ENERGY-SAVINGS PLAN FOR CAPITOL HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Schlesinger, the Secretary of Energy says that the best, and really only solution to our oil crisis is to force the people to use less oil.

Pure, simple and to the point: Use less gas—import less oil.

Well now that statement is not new. Mr. Schlesinger has been saying it over and over for the better part of 2 years. Nor is the rationale behind that statement new, and particularly not new to anyone sitting in this Chamber.

But, Mr. Speaker, what may be new to this body is the thought that we, Congress, may be like every American business and institution. Maybe we talk a lot about the problem of energy, but when it comes right down to the brass tacks of doing something about it we look to others to plan, to others for solutions, to others for action, and to others for sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we show the Nation how to plan, take action and make sacrifices. But most of all Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we provide the leadership in this situation. Leadership by example.

Ask yourself—What are we in Congress actually doing to conserve energy? The Comptroller General in a recent letter to the chairman of all energy-related committees and subcommittees noted that one of the overriding prob-

lems concerning energy is "The lack of aggressive, coordinated effort to conserve energy in Federal operations and facilities."

Let us see, just what have we done? The superintendent has turned off every other light in our halls and in some locations there is just minimal lighting. The clerk has come up with a vast and complex carpool system—which very few people use. I am told that last year that of the 18,500 individuals employed on the Hill only 400 to 500 people requested information on the operation of the carpool. All of us admonish our staffs to keep the thermostats at 65. All of this is good—it is an effort, true. But really, is any one of those a real sacrifice? Is any one a burden on our daily lives? I have been told that the reason the carpool program does not work is that staff members have rigid hour requirements in their offices and the Members refuse to bend to allow persons to leave early enough to catch the carpool home.

Mr. Speaker, if we are salvaging our consciences with this effort and telling ourselves that we are making a real effort then I think we are only kidding ourselves. Just like every other American we are making nothing more than a token effort while waiting for others to make the big moves.

This country needs some leadership. Not the type that tells them they have a problem and speaks in generalities. But some leadership that is going to speak in specifics and call for American action and cooperation.

We have an energy problem in this country. It is not going to go away. It is here, it is going to stay and it is going to get worse if we do not do something about it.

None of this is new either—it is just a restatement of the problem. To go one step further—the root of the problem can be many things but if you really search around in those roots you keep coming back to the same theme—convenience. We as a nation have become convenience minded—everything is for our convenience, no matter the cost, no matter the waste, our convenience comes first. We have nearly buried ourselves in junk cars, throw away cans, and throw away plastic and paper products.

Think about it for a minute. How much did our energy consumption increase when the drugstores began to stay open 24 hours a day. A little—true. But then the grocery stores decided that they too should stay open 24 hours and the consumption increased a little more. Then we had the department stores staying open 7 days a week. Think about it real good—the energy consumption for what—convenience.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to suggest that we do battle against the American public and demand that they close the stores on Sundays and that drugstores and grocery stores go back to 12-hour days. This will have to come in time; however, it will not come until we, the Congress, show them how it is done.

In my office we have researched the problem thoroughly and if you will refer to the hand out being passed among you, you will see how we, the Members of

Congress, can with some real convenience sacrifice save this country 102,068 barrels of imported crude oil every year. This can be accomplished by putting staffs on a 4-day work week. No cut in hours, Mr. Speaker, but a staggered 4-day work week with 10-hour days.

Mr. Speaker, I will be more than happy to have another Member join me or I will go it alone—but as of this day my staff will work a staggered 4-day workweek—each day will be 10½ hours long and the job assignments will not be altered in any manner. They must do their jobs in this time frame.

I have directed my executive assistant to keep a journal of the next 8 weeks and I will report back to this body at that time to give you the results of our experiment. I would like to have other Members join me and we can work along with one another through the next 8 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress can save 102,068 barrels of imported crude a year. If this concept were carried through to all Federal employees located in the District of Columbia this would be an additional savings of 1,293,774 barrels of crude each year. And suppose the American citizenry took our lead and began to boycott stores open 24 hours a day—suppose they did not go into stores after 9 in the evening—soon stores would close at night and we would have further savings.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress can take the lead and give the type of leadership needed at this crucial time. Leadership by example:

HOW OUR FACTS READ

1. Our figures estimate that on the average, Hill employees travel approximately 20 miles per day traveling to and from work.

2. If you multiply this 20 mile figure times 5 days per week times 48 weeks (figuring that each employee takes 3 weeks vacation as well as 1 week off for Federal Holidays) this comes to a total of 4,800 miles per person traveled to and from work.

3. If you multiply this 20 mile figure times 4 days per week times 48 weeks, you come up with a total of 3,840 miles traveled.

4. Therefore working a 4 day week would save 960 miles per person per year.

5. The Congressional Budget Office report entitled "Urban Transportation and Energy; The Potential Savings of Different Modes" reports that miles per gallon for:

Automobiles 11.3–12.

Bus—9.

Commuter Rail 0.8–1.3.

Averaging all three forms of transportation yields 6.9 m.p.g.

6. If you divide the miles per year saved on a 4 day week by the average miles per gallon you find that each employee will save 139.1 gallons on the 4 day week.

960 divided by 6.9 = 139.1 gallons.

7. If you multiply the gallons saved (139.1) times the total number of Hill employees as reported by the House Finance Office and the Senate Dispersing Office this comes to a total saving of 2,573,913 gallons per year.

139.1 × 18,500 = 2,573,913 gallons saved.

8. As reported by officials at Gulf and Texaco Oil, there are 24 gallons of gasoline in each barrel of unrefined oil imported into the U.S. This comes to an average savings of 107,246 barrels of crude oil if Hill employees worked a staggered 4-day week.

2,573,913 divided by 24 = 107,246 barrels

9. If this concept were carried on to all Federal Employees working in the District of Columbia, the net savings would be 28,476,-

691 gallons or 1,186,528 barrels of imported crude saved per year.

Number of civil service employees in D.C. 204,721.

$139.1 \times 204,721 = 28,476,691$ gallons saved
 $28,476,691$ divided by $24 = 1,186,528$ barrels.
 10. $107,246$ barrels + $1,186,528$ barrels =
 $1,293,774$ barrels saved/year.

□ 2025

THE NEED TO EXTEND THE RESTRICTION ON THE EXPORT OF ALASKAN OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. McKINNEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1977, I offered an amendment to the Export Administration Act Amendments of 1977 because in my judgment, there had been an insufficient effort on the part of both the producers and the Federal Government to fulfill the intent of the Trans-Alaskan Pipeline Act. That amendment, restricting the export of Alaskan oil, was passed by a voice vote in the House and a subsequent motion to instruct the conferees was approved by 240 Members. When offering this measure, I agreed to limit the export restriction to a period of 2 years because, despite a history of noncooperation by the North Slope producers and despite my intuitive mistrust of further promises, opponents of my amendment assured me that a domestic distribution system for Alaskan oil would be well on the way to completion at the end of that period.

That has not happened. In fact, I would venture to say that the American consumer—the party that has the most at stake in this issue—is no closer to enjoying the supply security that Alaskan oil was intended to provide than he was in 1973. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, the Alaskan North Slope producers have not acted in good faith and for the sake of those people who are most adversely affected by such negligence, we must see to it that compliance is enforced.

The issue of Alaskan oil exportation is not often referred to as a consumer issue, but clearly the destination of North Slope crude oil is of growing importance to oil-hungry Americans. Each development in recent months, in the world oil market, has presented us with compelling evidence that Alaskan crude is of growing importance to the U.S. consumer. The importation of high priced oil, some costing \$20 per barrel, rose 9.7 percent from January 1978 to January 1979, and U.S. oil consumption rose 5.1 percent in that same period. Iran recently closed the tap on one-half million barrels of oil that this country imported every day. As a result, the administration is proposing weekend gas station closings and hinting at \$1 per gallon gasoline. The consumer has only begun to feel the effects of OPEC's latest price increase and shortages of No. 2 and No. 4 heating fuels are beginning to appear. At last count, the North Slope producers were among a group of 26 domestic suppliers implementing allocation plans for domestic petroleum. Why then, the con-

sumer might ask, should we export oil at a time of growing shortage? The answer: To save producers a few pennies per barrel in transportation costs and to assure them of sufficient production incentives. At which point the consumer might ask further, are these not the same producers who just recorded record-breaking earnings in the fourth quarter of 1978? The answer is "yes": They are Sohio, which as a result of a tripling of production on the North Slope reported an incredible 134-percent increase in earnings during that last quarter and Phillips Petroleum, which reported a 103-percent increase in earnings; and ARCO, a 30-percent increase; and Exxon, a 49-percent increase. In fact, Mr. Speaker, these are the same producers who plan to expand production on the North Slope by 200,000 barrels a day by the end of this year. And perhaps most important, these are the companies which are guilty of a breach of the promise to develop a domestic distribution system for Alaskan oil.

Consider, that since the passage of the Export Administration Act, when further assurances that a domestic distribution system would be established were made, Standard Oil of Ohio has made virtually no progress in developing a pipeline route between Long Beach, Calif. and Midland, Tex. In fact, that project has now been abandoned because, we are told, of the "endless Government permit procedures, pending and threatened litigation." These are the reasons advanced even though Governor Brown was quoted, the same day, as saying, "California had reached the point where it was ready to go." Further, the director of that State's Air Resources Board, Tom Quinn, said:

Sohio knew that they would have the green light by the end of this month and that the key permits would be issued by April.

As for the other alternatives, the Northern Tier pipeline project has been hamstrung in the State of Minnesota and is years away from initial work. The Kitimat pipeline that would cut from Alaska through Canada to the Middle West is even further away from reality since there seems to be no enthusiasm for that proposal in Ottawa. On top of all this, we have just received yet another study from the Department of Energy on proposed pipeline alternatives for the delivery of Alaskan oil to the Midwestern and East Coast States.

But, the problem of Alaskan oil distribution is not restricted to foot dragging on pipeline proposals. Since the discovery of oil on Prudhoe Bay, the North Slope producers have known that refining capacity on the west coast was not properly equipped to handle high-sulfur Alaskan crude. Yet, since that time little or no progress has been made to rectify the problem. In fact, one of the North Slopes major producers, Exxon Corp., has recently canceled its plans to enable its Benicia, Calif., refinery to handle 40 percent more Alaskan crude. A company official was quoted as say-

ing that the plans were nullified because Exxon was concerned over getting permits. I would not hesitate to add that the financial attraction of, and the increasing possibility for, the export of Alaskan oil figured prominently in that decision. Actions such as these make it inordinately difficult for me to believe that either the Federal Government or the North Slope producers plan to make good on the promise of delivering Alaskan oil to the lower 48. Furthermore, a short review of the history of North Slope development leads me to believe that neither party ever intended to fulfill those commitments. I will not ask my colleagues to accept my word on that, the evidence is best presented by the participants, the Government, and industry officials involved.

In August 1969, Rollin Eckins, vice chairman of Atlantic Richfield, in a presentation to the Alaskan science conference said Japan would be willing to pay a premium for a secure supply of Alaskan oil. Phillips Petroleum president, John M. Houchin, submitted a proposal to the House Interior Committee in the spring of 1970, in which Alaskan oil would be exported to Japan in exchange for that country's share of Persian Gulf oil. The idea, I should add, was to save the producers some transportation costs. And, in 1970, Edward L. Patton, president of Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., submitted confidential estimates to the U.S. Department of Interior which targeted 25 percent of the North Slope crude for sale beyond the west coast of the United States, including direct sale to Japan by 1980.

Clearly, the proposed sale, export or swap of Alaskan oil to Japan is not, as we are asked to believe, a result of unforeseen changes in the world petroleum markets. The plans to export Alaskan oil to Japan were formulated long before the OPEC embargo, the subsequent price increases and the development of the Outer Continental Shelf. These plans were made with the full knowledge that the West Coast could never absorb the flow of oil from Prudhoe Bay. In February 1970, President Nixon's Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control reported that—

Every projection of North Slope production indicates that it will far exceed the petroleum demands of the West Coast.

The report estimated that even if the West Coast gave up all its non-Canadian imports, the North Slope would produce 600,000 barrels a day more than the West Coast could absorb. In December 1970, the Alaskan State Legislature was told much the same thing and in July 1970, the National Petroleum Council informed the Department of Interior of similar findings.

The arguments for exportation that we hear today are as fallacious as the assertions made by producers about West Coast demand. I have been repeatedly told that exportation of Alaskan oil is necessary in order to provide sufficient production incentive for the North Slope producers. These claims are made despite the fact that ARCO vice chairman,

Bill Keischnick, told *The Oil Daily* this month, that plans to expand ANS production by 300,000 barrels a day "look encouraging." And, as I mentioned, Sohio attributed its record earnings in the last quarter to a tripling of production on the North Slope. We hear further arguments that to export Alaskan oil would help reduce our balance-of-trade deficit. However, selling ANS production to Japan at Prudhoe Bay for \$13 per barrel in exchange for \$14 or \$15 per barrel OPEC or Mexican oil leaves a lot to be desired as a means of shrinking the trade deficit. It has been further estimated that the quality differential between high sulphur Alaskan oil and lower sulphur OPEC, Indonesian or Mexican crude would result in a \$250 million trade deficit each year in a barrel for barrel swap.

The argument for transportation savings is one of the most enduring ploys used in the effort to export Alaskan oil, but that argument falls short for several reasons. First, the entitlements program, which spreads the cost of all crude evenly throughout this Nation's refinery network, excludes any possibility of passing those savings on to the consumer. Any savings in transportation costs will be captured by the North Slope producers and added to their recordbreaking earnings totals. Furthermore, the \$2 per barrel cost differential between the delivery of Alaskan oil on the west coast and on the gulf coast, via the canal, could be substantially reduced if the North Slope producers would engage in long-term shipping contracts rather than the spot contracts they now select. Unfortunately, as long as the possibility of Alaskan oil exports exists, producers will have as little incentive to engage in long-term contracts as they will to expand refining capacity or construct pipelines.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we all should be extremely concerned with the implications an Alaskan oil export or swap would have for petroleum supply security for the United States. The original proposed oil swap, whereby Alaskan oil would go to Japan in exchange for OPEC supplies was termed by the *New York Times* in 1978 to be "the most dangerous solution of them all." I certainly agree. Had the controversy surrounding export of Alaskan oil not developed, there is every possibility that this country would have engaged in a swap involving the shah of Iran. Of what value would our transportation costs savings have been in that instance? With other members of the OPEC organization issuing warnings to the West that the future of oil supplies will depend on the resolution of the Palestinian question, the advisability of any swap with OPEC becomes all the more frightening. Perhaps the least publicized of the Alaskan oil export options is the delivery of that crude to Israel. This proposal, presently under study by the administration, was suggested as a means of fulfilling a 1975 treaty obligation in which the United States guaranteed Israel a secure supply of oil in the event that her supply was shut off—as it has been by Iran. It is ironic that if Israel decides to invoke the treaty, they have

assured the United States that they have both the tanker capacity and appropriate refining capacity to utilize Alaskan oil.

And what of the potential strain on our relations with those countries engaged in a swap arrangement should the cancellation of the agreement be necessary? In the conference committee compromise on my amendment of 2 years ago, a provision was included allowing this country to terminate the swap if the U.S. supply of the trade was jeopardized or shut off. Again, Mr. Chairman, if this country had presently been engaged in a trilateral agreement with Iran, we would not be in a position of stopping delivery of Alaskan oil to Japan. And, such a scenario does not bode well for the success of delicate trade and monetary agreements presently being worked out between Japan and the United States.

As you know, the latest, most vigorously promoted export option, now being pursued, involves the sale of Alaskan oil to Japan in exchange for that country's share of Mexican petroleum. I like to characterize this latest proposal as the methadone approach since it does nothing to relieve our addiction to foreign oil; it just replaces our current pusher. We cannot afford to allow ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security by merely replacing OPEC supplies with Mexican oil. Despite the obvious marketing potential, Mexico does not represent the salvation of this country's petroleum problems. The recent rejection of the natural gas proposal between Mexico and the United States should provide us with sufficient warnings that Mexico, like Canada (which in the next 2 years, will phase out all exports to our Northern Tier refineries), does not find the happenstance of common boundaries to be a compelling enough reason to assure this country's energy security. The only way this Nation can move toward a more secure energy future is through the expansion of refining capacity; the utilization of domestic production in available domestic markets (we presently import 3 million barrels a day of sour oil into PAD's I, II, III and we import 600,000 barrels of high sulphur crude to fill our strategic petroleum reserve); and through the establishment of a transportation system to deliver Alaskan North Slope crude to the Midwest and east coast.

As all my colleagues are aware, the provision of the Export Administration Act made possible by my amendment will expire on June 22 of this year. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to cosponsor the bill I have introduced today to extend and strengthen the existing export restriction. It is not my intent to deny the oil companies their fair share of profits nor to add costs to an already overburdened consumer. I simply want to move this country farther down the road of self-sufficiency by asking that the commitments made to this Congress in 1973 are commitments kept to this country in 1979.●

SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL—PUTTING IT BACK ON THE TRACK

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

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a young man I have known for many years, who is planning to retire from the Navy in the near future, recently asked my opinion as to whether he should participate in the survivor benefit plan for military personnel. Frankly, I was hard-pressed to respond. A few years ago, my answer would undoubtedly have been in the affirmative. Such advice would be glib today. As our conversation progressed, in fact, I felt more and more like Jimmy the Greek, giving odds on the likelihood of correcting the several remaining serious inequities in the survivor benefit plan, rather than a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee.

It is a sad state of affairs when you would hesitate to advise a retiring serviceman to participate in a Government-sponsored program to provide for his widow. The purpose of the bill I am introducing today is to correct that situation.

This is basically the same legislation which the House passed overwhelmingly on two previous occasions. Although the Senate has subsequently approved some portions of the House-passed measures, they have failed to come to terms with the meat of the legislation and the heart of the problem in SBP—the dollar-for-dollar social security offset.

The survivor benefit plan, as established by Congress in 1972, was closely patterned in terms of both costs and benefits on the survivor program already in existence for a number of years for civil service retirees. The plan was designed to make it possible for every retiree, particularly those with limited means who could not afford adequate private insurance, to take a reduction in retired pay during their lifetimes in order to assure at least a minimal income for their widows in the event of death. The cost of the program was structured so that a basic amount of coverage could be offered at low cost, with higher premiums for those who wanted to pay for more protection.

The original premise was to supplement the survivor coverage provided by the social security system, in which the military has participated since 1957. The actual integration of social security and SBP for the widow, however, is a prime example of the "best laid plans" going astray. In practical application, this is several hundred dollars each month out of an elderly widow's pocket.

Although SBP was designed for all retirees, we were particularly interested in making the plan an attractive buy for lower ranking retirees who would have the least access to other financial assistance for their survivors. The sad irony of the present situation is that we have achieved the exact opposite. The offset is so disadvantageous to much of the enlisted force that an ever-growing number

of enlisted retirees each year are opting not to participate. Increasingly, SBP is becoming a Government-subsidized survivor plan for the officer corps.

The legislation I am introducing today will put the survivor benefit plan back on track. It includes the same provisions which the House approved unanimously in September 1977, plus several additional corrections which have come to light since that time. The major thrust of the bill is a reduction in the social security offset.

As mentioned previously, SBP is a voluntary program whereby the retiree elects to reduce his retired pay in order to provide a certain percentage of that retirement to a designated survivor. When the widow reaches age 62, and becomes eligible for social security, every dollar which she receives from social security, based on the late husband's military service, is deducted from her survivor benefit plan annuity. In the case of enlisted retirees, it is possible for the social security offset to completely eliminate any SBP payment whatsoever. The determination of the amount of the offset is made considerably more complex by the heavy weighting toward those at the lower end of the earnings scale which exists in the Social Security System. The net result is a substantial loss of income to the widow. The legislation I am proposing would reduce the offset or reduction from 100 percent to 50 percent, based on the fact that both the Government and the serviceman have contributed toward the ultimate social security benefit.

The inequity most often cited to me is the case of a widow who has worked for many years and paid sufficient social security taxes to be entitled to benefits based on her own earnings. Under present law, she may not receive both a widow's and a worker's benefit, even though she and her late spouse paid taxes for both, but only the higher of the two. Logic would dictate that a widow receiving no benefits from the late husband's account would not be subject to an offset, but this is not the case. Because she is technically entitled to a benefit based on the husband's military service, even though she receives no payment from his account, nonetheless, the offset applies. In this instance, my bill would eliminate the offset entirely. Also removed would be the offset for a widow under age 62 with one child, since widows with two or more children are already subject to no offset, and the offset for Reserve retirees whose only active service after 1956 consisted of short periods of training.

As previously mentioned, the intent of Congress was to pattern the military survivor program closely on the civil service plan in terms of both costs and benefits. Because of the manner in which semi-annual Consumer Price Index raises are calculated under the two systems, however, the military retiree is currently paying \$16.32 per month more for the same coverage. As a result, this legislation includes language, which was also a part of the last House-approved measure, to assure that the formula used to

apply cost-of-living increases to the reductions in retired pay is the same as that used for civil service.

Last year Congress made one additional revision in the civil service survivor plan and I am including a similar change in the military program. As a result of an improvement enacted several years ago, the retiree is not "locked into" the survivor program and reductions in retired pay cease when there is no longer an eligible survivor through either death or divorce. Should the individual remarry, coverage for the second spouse is automatic. The pension entitlement and other financial resources of the new spouse may be considerably different, however, so that a survivor annuity is neither needed or desired. Public Law 95-317 granted civil service annuitants the right to elect 1 year after remarriage whether to reinstitute survivor coverage. Section 2 of my bill provides a similar opportunity to the military retiree to decline survivor coverage for a new spouse.

Section 8 of my bill is a series of conforming amendments. The minimum income widows' program established by the 1972 survivor benefit plan law is tied closely to the nonservice-connected pension program of the Veterans' Administration. At the end of the 95th Congress, we enacted Public Law 95-588, the Veterans' and Survivors' Pension Improvement Act of 1978, which represents a substantial restructuring of VA pension programs. This necessitates some redesignation of sections in the minimum income widows' portion of the code, which would be accomplished by the technical amendments incorporated in the final section of my bill.

When the House Armed Services Committee originally looked at the survivor benefit plan several years ago, we felt that the changes approved by our committee were so significant and made the plan so much more attractive that it should be reopened for participation by those who had originally opted not to join. Projected enrollment in SBP, at the time of enactment, was 85 percent, based on the Civil Service plan. Unfortunately, the actual percentage is barely 50 percent because of serious shortcomings, primarily the "lock in," which has been removed, and the 100 percent Social Security offset, which we hopefully will eliminate this year. With these major improvements, we should reopen the plan and I feel that this would be advantageous to both the retiree and to the Government in the long run.

In SBP, we have a program where the retiree elects to provide insurance for his survivor through payment of premiums, namely the reductions in his retired pay. The present low participation is a time bomb with a short fuse. We see this situation all too clearly in the current "Forgotten Widows," the widows of pre-SBP retirees who did not join the previous survivor plan because it was very costly in comparison to the meager benefits provided. If more retirees do not opt for SBP, we will face the specter of another group of unprotected widows not too many years down the road. The Government will ultimately bear nearly

all the burden through welfare programs, rather than through the shared-cost concept embodied in SBP.

I am, therefore, proposing that we reopen the survivor benefit plan for 9 months for all current retirees not presently enrolled. There is some question in my mind as to whether this should be an unconditional reopening, however, in fairness to those currently participating and I have been weighing several alternatives. It would be possible, for example, to require a larger reduction from retired pay for new enrollees, in the same way that private insurance plans charge a higher premium rate the longer the period of time that an individual delays coverage. The logistics of designing an equitable penalty system mitigate against this approach, however. Another option would be to simply impose a waiting period during which the designated survivor would be ineligible for benefits. I have incorporated in my bill a third alternative. The criticism has been made that a new enrollment period would result in a rash of deathbed elections by elderly or seriously ill retirees who did not sign up the first time around. Obviously, this does not contribute to the long-term fiscal viability of the program, nor to the best interests of the majority of participants. As a result, I propose that we exclude from death benefits those joining under the new open period who have any preexisting condition, sickness, disease, or injury.

Preexisting condition would be defined as one for which medical treatment was rendered or recommended by a currently licensed physician or surgeon within 12 months prior to the effective date of enrollment under the plan. This preexisting condition would no longer be a bar to the receipt of SBP benefits by the survivor after a lapse of 12 months from the time of enrollment during which no medical treatment was necessary for the condition or a period of 24 months from the enrollment date, regardless of the individual's health at that time. With such a restriction, we would eliminate the possibility of deathbed elections and encourage the participation of younger, healthy retirees who would contribute to the system for a number of years before their survivors began to draw benefits. This approach is based on similar language incorporated in the serviceman's group life insurance program enacted for reservists several years ago.

Now is the time to explore various ways to open enrollment and I welcome both comments and criticism of the several options I have outlined, as well as other recommendations. We will make a tragic mistake if we do not endeavor to make SBP participation as high as possible, while the program is still in its formative years.

I have incorporated two final revisions in this legislation. First, some retirees elected only minimal coverage in the plan because of the "lock in" and the 100 percent offset. With the corrections incorporated in this bill, I feel that they should be given the opportunity to increase the amount of their coverage and, of course, the amount of the reduction from their retired pay. It would be illogical to re-

open enrollment and not permit the election of a higher benefit for those already in the plan. Second, last year's SBP revision, Public Law 95-397, provided cost-of-living raises for widows receiving benefits under the old program, the retired serviceman's family protection plan. Such cost-of-living adjustments will only be applicable, however, to widows whose husbands died prior to the expiration of the original sign-up period for SBP, March 20, 1974. Those widowed subsequent to that date will continue to receive fixed annuities. If we are going to provide an additional enrollment period, then, in all fairness, the termination of eligibility for cost-of-living protection under RSFPF should be the end of the new open period.

Enactment of this legislative package will correct the remaining inequities and omissions in the military survivor benefit plan and make it a fiscally responsible program, both for the military family and for the Government, for many decades to come. I hope we will be able to see it enacted before the end of 1979.●

NATIONAL CEMETERIES SYSTEM— CONGRESS SHOULD HAVE GREATER CONTROL

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

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which, if enacted, will give the Congress greater control over the national cemeteries system as administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Joining as cosponsors of this important legislation are the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Honorable RAY ROBERTS, and the Honorable ELWOOD HILLIS, and the Honorable GEORGE HANSEN, members of the Subcommittee on Cemeteries and Burial Benefits during the 95th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues have long felt the need for this legislation. Entirely too much authority is centered in the Office of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs concerning the construction of, and acquisition of land for, national cemeteries. The basic thrust of this legislation is that it will give the Congress the opportunity to disapprove future expansion or alteration of the national cemetery system. The bill simply requires that for an expenditure in excess of \$500,000 the Veterans' Administration must first submit its plans to both Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Enactment of this legislation will thus insure the equitable distribution of national cemeteries throughout the United States.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. AuCoin) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the floor on

March 8, 1979, when rollcall No. 26 was taken. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 26, on an amendment to H.R. 2479 that sought to reaffirm the Mutual Defense Treaty with Taiwan requiring the United States to act, in accordance with constitutional processes, to meet the danger of an armed attack against Taiwan, "no".●

NO EFT REVERSIBILITY RESULTS IN OHIO BANK HATCHING ITS OWN TURKEY

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

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress, John Fisher, senior vice president of City National Bank & Trust Co. of Columbus, Ohio, and a leading advocate of EFT services, severely criticized legislation I had introduced to provide consumers important protections should they decide to use EFT services. Columbus is a test market area for EFT services. Mr. Fisher enthusiastically supported expansion of EFT services. He predicted consumers would demand EFT services. Mr. Fisher described my legislation as the "Turkey bill", "so premature, so unnecessary, and so misguided that it would quietly sink under its own burden * * *."

Now, a little over a year later, Congress has enacted the EFT Act and Mr. Fisher has hatched his own turkey: The bank's EFT point-of-sale check guarantee program. Mr. Fisher's point-of-sale check guarantee program has been so unsuccessful that the program has been withdrawn. One-half of the bank's 135 terminals in grocery stores are being closed down. The point-of-sale program suffered losses resulting from a high amount of fraud. An "American Banker" article attributed the fraud to inadequate security measures. The system was also so expensive as to probably prevent such point-of-sale systems from ever being profitable. Yet, advocates of EFT have claimed consumers and financial institutions would save money using EFT services. This cutback in EFT services signals a major retreat from electronic fund transfer services.

Ironically, it is Mr. Fisher's program, not the EFT law, that has now quietly sunk under its own burden.

The crucial reasons for the failure of this and other EFT point-of-sale systems are lack of reversibility and the absence of EFT protections being in place. By reversibility, I am referring to a consumer being able to stop payment or reverse a transaction if the merchant has failed to provide the goods, or if the goods are defective. Although stop payment is seldom used, it is an extremely important consumer right. It is a right a consumer has with conventional checks and credit cards. This right helps insure that a merchant is prepared to stand behind his product or service. The EFT legislation provided for reversibility of transactions, but the banking industry and retail industry shortsightedly opposed it. They opposed reversibility so

vehemently that the provision was struck out of the bill.

In my judgment, point-of-sale EFT systems will never be profitable or demanded by consumers as long as a consumer is denied his fundamental right to reverse or stop payment on transactions. Financial institutions should offer reversibility voluntarily and support legislation to require reversibility.

Also, consumers will not trust EFT services until they know there is in place a set of standards and protections for their use of EFT services. At that time, consumers will know what to do if they do not get a receipt or believe there is an account error. Now, the EFT Act which has these standards and protections and others will not go into full effect until May of 1980. It is extremely important that this effective date be moved up. This would benefit not only consumers, but also is essential to the successful marketing by financial institutions of EFT services.●

CITY OF MADISON TO VOTE ON SPENDING PRIORITIES

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

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, April 3, the voters of the city of Madison, Wis., will have the opportunity to voice their opinion on the spending priorities to be established by the Congress.

On February 6 the Madison Common Council voted 18 to 3 to place on the April ballot what has become known as the Peace and Jobs Referendum, which reads:

Do the people of the city of Madison urge the President and their congressional delegates not to use tax dollars to increase spending for military purposes and instead urge them to use those tax dollars to create jobs and provide needed services to our people?

I do not know whether any other community in the country will have such an opportunity to express its will on the priorities to be set by the fiscal 1980 budget. Needless to say, I will be interested in the results of the referendum, since I support its language.

I have long held that our priorities were skewed far too much in favor of death and destruction, as evidenced by the size of our military budget. That the defense budget in the President's proposed fiscal 1980 budget would be increased by \$11 billion at the same time cuts are proposed in health, education and other social service programs, which are designed to meet the needs of the people of this country, continues those skewed priorities, and I am hopeful that the people of Madison will overwhelmingly reject these priorities.●

A FEDERAL CHARTER FOR THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation with the cosponsorship of 15 of my colleagues to grant a Federal charter to the American Council of Learned Societies. This year is the 60th anniversary of the founding of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), and a Federal charter would serve to recognize its service to humanistic scholarship in the United States and abroad. Federal charters have been granted in the past to other scholarly and cultural organizations. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences, the parallel organization to the American Council of Learned Societies for scientists, has had a Federal charter since 1863.

The ACLS is a federation of professional and honorary associations with a constituency today of approximately 250,000 scholars. Its purpose, as stated in its constitution, is the advancement of humanistic studies in all fields of learning and the maintenance and strengthening of relations among the national societies devoted to such studies.

The ACLS is the intermediary for the U.S. Government for official associations with the Academies of Science of the U.S.S.R., of most of the countries of Eastern Europe, and of the Republic of China; it has more recently developed ties with academic officialdom in the People's Republic of China. The council has represented the Nation in the Union Académique Internationale with distinction for six decades; two of the Union's presidents have been outstanding American scholars who were serving as the council's delegates. Through its membership in the UAL, the ACLS participates in the work of the Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines (CIPSH). The council is also represented on the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. Through its support of international scholarly congresses in the humanities and social sciences and through its informal relations with many other scholarly organizations abroad, the ACLS has come to be well known by scholars and professional associations throughout the world. Thus, the ACLS speaks for the United States in matters pertaining to scholarship in the humanities.

While continuing to fulfill its role as representative of American humanistic learning in the international community of scholars, the council is also the principal privately administered national representative of the humanities in the United States.

Over the years, the ACLS has developed and administered programs which have served the interests of the Nation, of humanistic scholarship in general, and of individual scholars. Central to the council's mission are its programs of fellowships and grants. Conducted on a national competitive basis, these programs have been funded by the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corp. of New York, the Andrew W. Mellon

Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the State Department.

Two of the programs, ACLS Fellowships and ACLS Grants-in-Aid, have been in continuous operation for the greater part of the council's existence, and in the period since 1970 alone some 1,600 men and women have received approximately \$9,000,000 in research support.

In addition to its support of individual scholars, the ACLS has served the cause of American scholarship in many other ways. Perhaps its most important contribution to the welfare of the Nation as a whole was the initiative it took in establishing a national Commission on the Humanities in 1963.

The commission, sponsored jointly by the ACLS, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, consisted of distinguished humanists and scientists, educators, businessmen, and interested citizens under the chairmanship of Barnaby Keeney, then president of Brown University.

Its report, describing the state of the humanities in America in the mid 1960's, concluded that massive support of the humanities was urgently needed and recommended the establishment of a national humanities foundation. Published in 1964 and widely circulated, the report had an impressive impact, and the legislation which established the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities the following year largely reflected its recommendations.

The council has also contributed in more specific ways to the cause of humanistic scholarship.

It pioneered in the application of modern linguistic science to the preparation of language teaching materials and supervised the Army language program during World War II; in 1958, the council established a program to encourage international scholarly congresses and conferences in the United States, and in the ensuing decade international scholarly associations in most humanistic and social science disciplines took advantage of the opportunity thus provided; the development of area studies in this country owes much to the impetus provided by the council, and since World War II, the ACLS, jointly with the Social Science Research Council, has organized and developed programs in Asian, Latin American, Near and Middle Eastern, Slavic and East European, and African studies; the council has had a continuing interest in the problems of scholarly publication and has at various times surveyed publication needs, established a publication service to advise scholars on inexpensive ways to communicate research, and administered programs of subsidies and subventions both to scholarly presses and to individual scholars; among its own publication ventures the best-known are the great reference words, the "Dictionary of American Biography," begun in 1921, and the "Dictionary of Scientific Biography,"

begun in 1970. These are but a few of the programs and projects that have made the ACLS uniquely valuable to American scholarship.

The confidence of scholars and of scholarly organizations is essential to the council's role as a promoter of humanistic learning in this country and throughout the world. Such confidence is shown in many ways, not least by the willingness of individual men and women to serve the council without compensation. At present approximately three hundred scholars serve as delegates to the council, as members of the Board of Directors, and as members of the council's numerous committees.

The council also benefits from the support of the 94 institutions of higher learning and research libraries that make up the Associates of the ACLS. This support, from both individuals and institutions, is vital to the functioning of the council and has never been lacking. It is a continuing witness to the importance of the ACLS to American scholarship.

In further recognition of the service to humanistic studies that the ACLS has provided throughout its distinguished history, I have also introduced on March 6, 1979, a bill (H.R. 2666) to authorize funds for an endowment for the American Council of Learned Societies.●

HEALTH CARE

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

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Laurence S. Seidman, an assistant professor of economics at the University of Pennsylvania, has written a first-rate column for the New York Times about the financing of health care in the United States.

Mr. Seidman has taken a complex issue and boiled it down to startling clarity. His analogy is a good one: suppose all Americans were told that their lunches would be paid by a "third party." The result would be that the number of expensive lunch orders would multiply rapidly—because no one would have to pay their own bills. At least not directly.

Such has been the case, Mr. Speaker, in the case of American health care. American medical bills and health care costs generally have skyrocketed in the past several years, until the rate of increase has far surpassed even the national rate of inflation. This cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely, and we in the Congress must find an acceptable alternative.

I commend Mr. Seidman's column to my colleagues. It makes an excellent point.

The column follows:

AND PAYING DOCTORS' BILLS

(By Laurence S. Seidman)

PHILADELPHIA.—Why has inflation in the health sector far surpassed general inflation for the last two decades, and what can be done about it? An analogy can help provide the answer.

Suppose it were announced that, beginning today, everyone's lunch bill would be paid by a "third party." Naturally, people would seek the finest restaurants, which would multiply in number, and the cost per lunch would escalate rapidly. There would be, of course, a catch. If the average daily lunch bill per person turned out to be \$15, then the "third party" would have to collect a \$15 "premium" from each of us. Instead of billing us directly, the insurer would bill our employers, who in turn would reduce our next pay increase by \$15 per person per day.

Even if we realized that we were ultimately bearing the burden of our extravagant orders, nobody would have an incentive to alter his behavior. Each would want others to limit their orders. But as long as each person's daily premium were unrelated to his own consumption, he would act as though his lunch were free. Thus, no one would conserve, and rapid inflation would continue.

The solution to lunch inflation would be simple: End the third-party arrangement and return to individual checks. The solution to health-sector inflation, of course, is not as simple. Eliminating third-party arrangements is unthinkable, because complete reliance on "individual checks" would subject families to the risk, and reality, of financial hardship and even bankruptcy. Most households value highly "major-risk" health insurance that protects against financial catastrophe and enables them to afford whatever medical care they might need.

Today, however, most households have far more health insurance than they require to protect against major risk. For the average hospital patient, a third party pays virtually the entire bill, regardless of whether the patient can afford to pay part or all of it.

In light of the analogy, on the one hand, and the desire for major-risk insurance, on the other, a sensible compromise suggests itself: Restructure insurance coverage so that most households must bear a fraction of their own medical bill "out-of-pocket" with the fraction scaled according to the household's ability to pay. At the same time, give every household an out-of-pocket ceiling, also scaled to its income, beyond which it is fully protected by the insurer.

This strategy can be implemented by replacing the current medical deduction on the personal income tax with an income-related medical tax credit, by guaranteeing the availability of medical loans, and by removing the current tax subsidy to private health insurance to discourage complete coverage.

For example, under a new tax credit, a household with an income of \$20,000 might have to pay the first \$1,000 of its annual medical bill out-of-pocket. It could then file for a tax credit equal to 80 percent of the cumulative bill in excess of \$1,000, until its cumulative bill reached \$6,000, so that its out-of-pocket burden was \$2,000 for the year. It could then file for a tax credit equal to 100 percent of its bill in excess of \$6,000, so that its maximum burden would be 10 percent of its income. A guaranteed loan would ease the household's cash-flow problem until the Internal Revenue Service processed its tax credit.

These reforms would sharply alter the perspective and behavior of physicians—the key decision-makers in the health sector.

The average doctor would begin to receive feedback from patients after they received their hospital bills. Once they recuperated, patients would want to know whether the last hospital day was necessary, or whether the most costly hospital was best for their particular problem. Many doctors would recognize that they would gain a patient's ap-

preciation by avoiding unnecessary cost and letting the patient know it.

If at least an important fraction of doctors began to weigh cost in selecting a hospital, hospitals would be compelled to improve efficiency. Today, hospitals compete to please doctors who have no reason to weigh cost. When enough doctors changed their criteria, hospitals would change the basis on which they compete. As in other sectors of the economy, higher cost would have to be justified by sufficiently higher quality.

Any market would fail if a third party paid the entire bill. These reforms could restore the missing ingredient—income-related consumer cost-sharing—to the medical market while preserving equity. They deserve consideration. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, a long-standing commitment to attend a meeting in my district necessitated my missing two recorded votes yesterday. Both votes (rollcall No. 59 and rollcall No. 60) were on amendments offered by Mr. ASHBROOK to H.R. 2729, authorizing appropriations to the National Science Foundation. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on both amendments. ●

LILA KEISER—AN OUTSTANDING CITIZEN OF MORRO BAY

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

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the accomplishments of a most outstanding resident of my district—Mrs. Lila Keiser, of Morro Bay, Calif.

Mrs. Kesler, through her involvement in community life, in government, and in business groups, has been a sterling example of active and productive citizenship. She is the kind of person that no community can do without, and it is for that reason that the people of Morro Bay have honored her with a testimonial evening.

I would like to take this opportunity to cite just a few of Lila's accomplishments over the past many years. Among other things, she served as a member of the Morro Bay City Council for 8 years, she worked as a school nurse in Morro Bay for 10 years, and she was the director of the Morro Bay Chamber of Commerce, a Morro Bay recreation commissioner, an original board member of the Morro Bay Senior Citizens, and a charter member of the Morro Bay Quota Club, a vital women's organization in that city.

In short, Mrs. Keiser has been hard at work these many years, much to the benefit of her community. I commend her to the House, and I congratulate her on her richly deserved testimonial. It is my hope that she will continue for many years her record of service and that she will continue to obtain from her work the satisfaction and happiness she most surely deserves. ●

NATIONAL COWBOY HALL OF FAME OPPOSES U.S. CONVERSION TO THE METRIC SYSTEM

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Metric Board last week appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee for its fiscal year 1980 appropriations hearing.

The Board also hosted a reception in the Rayburn House Office Building in honor of our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Olin E. Teague, who until his retirement last year was chairman of the House Committee on Science and Technology.

There is no doubt that the U.S. Metric Board and nongovernment prometric organizations with which it works in close harmony are continuing the major push to gain influential support for efforts promoting total U.S. conversion to the metric system of weights and measures.

One key metric promoter put these efforts into perspective during his brief remarks at the Metric Board reception. He noted the widespread public opposition to metric among the broad mass of American people, and urged prometric forces to continue their "education" efforts to eliminate public resistance to this wholesale change in our social, working, and consumer lifestyles.

Looking at the Metric Board's fiscal year 1980 appropriation request of \$3,335,000, one quickly recognizes its serious intent to fully push this "educational"—some would call it a "propaganda"—effort.

This 1980 funding request is more than double the Metric Board's current 1979 budget. The Board proposes to increase its "public information" efforts by 142 percent, and its "research, coordination and planning" for metric conversion by more than 205 percent, which I believe is unsupportable in a policy sense or at a time of budget austerity.

I took the opportunity during the Capitol Hill reception last week to talk to many Metric Board members and staff about their efforts. While they are very careful always to use the word "voluntary" in describing the conversion effort, these metric proponents make no secret of their objective to use every available Federal taxpayer dollar, along with other Government agency efforts at the Federal and State level, to promote and even coerce increased public use of metric, regardless of popular feeling.

The Metric Board has even started holding its monthly meetings at various different locations throughout the country. I was informed that this is an effort to "spread the metric gospel" to wider numbers of Americans, and to hold associated receptions and "informational" meetings to enlist the active support and efforts of citizen leaders and government officials at all levels in the metric conversion process.

This is just one further example of the Federal Government bureaucracy, and

a small elite group of social change agents, using the resources and machinery of the Federal Government to impose a massive change in our American way of life that is not wanted or needed by the American people.

I believe that Congress should repeal the law that allowed this effort to take place, so that taxpayer funds will no longer be used to impose metric on the American people, and I have introduced H.R. 739 for that purpose.

Opposition to metric conversion is widespread among our people. I think it is most appropriate that the National Cowboy Hall of Fame, an organization that stands as a monument to the pioneer spirit and American greatness that made our Nation a world leader—without metric—has now gone on record in firm opposition to metric conversion efforts within the Federal Government.

Such stalwart Americans as John Wayne, Gene Autry, Rex Allen, Joel McCrea, and Joe Foss are among the directors and trustees of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame who have formally declared their opposition to these Federal Government pro-metric-conversion efforts, through a resolution urging repeal of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 and all related Federal edicts.

I was pleased to present copies of this resolution to Metric Board chairman Louis Polk, House Science and Technology Committee chairman DON FUQUA, and House Science, Research and Technology subcommittee chairman GEORGE BROWN at the Metric Board reception last week.

In addition to their resolution, the National Cowboy Hall of Fame's top officials—Jasper D. Ackerman, honorary life chairman of the board of directors, and Dean Krakel, executive vice president—have filed suit against the National Bureau of Standards in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, to enjoin further use of Federal funds to impose metric upon the American people.

I commend these efforts, and hope that additional Members of Congress will co-sponsor H.R. 739, in order to repeal the Metric Conversion Act which has become the vehicle for these Federal promotional efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the National Cowboy Hall of Fame resolution, along with the brief of the plaintiffs in the anti-metric suit, at this point in the RECORD:

**NATIONAL COWBOY HALL OF FAME AND WESTERN HERITAGE CENTER
RESOLUTION**

The Board of Directors and Board of Trustees of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Western Heritage Center representing the seventeen western states, meeting in the city of Palm Springs, California, on March 5, 1977 at their annual winter meeting, pass the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED

1. Whereas we the Board of Directors and Board of Trustees meeting in a joint and duly authorized meeting do resolve to oppose the adoption of the Metric Conversion Act passed by both houses of the Congress,

the 94th Congress, signed into law in 1975 by President of the United States of America, Gerald Ford.

2. Whereas members of the Board of Directors and Board of Trustees of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Western Heritage Center attending this meeting are of the unanimous opinion that the adoption of this metric system domestically within the United States of America is contrary to the principles of our founding constitutional fathers and of those who have pioneered, served in war, and contributed in both large and small ways to the building of this great nation over a period of more than 200 years.

3. Whereas members of the Board of Directors and Board of Trustees are of the unanimous opinion that adoption of the Metric Conversion Act will become one of the most expensive and certainly the most unnecessary adventure ever forced on the American people who are already so heavily burdened by taxation and the rising cost of living.

4. Whereas members of the Board of Directors and Board of Trustees of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Western Heritage Center believe adoption of the metric system would cause domestic estrangement, further division and unnecessary confusion to millions and millions of American citizens of all age groups, especially those of limited education laboring in non-industrial and commercial capacity.

5. Whereas members of the Board of Directors and Board of Trustees of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame do feel that the metric system is contrary to the principles and basic precepts of our heritage and the movement of American civilization from east to west—by the inch, the foot, the yard, and the mile, and is contrary to the basic system of registration of land measurement by U.S. Government survey of the section, the township, and the district expressed in feet, acres and yards.

6. Now therefore members of the Board of Directors and Board of Trustees acting in unison and in consent do petition the Honorable Jimmy Carter, President of the United States, honorable members of the United States Congress, the Senate and the house of Representatives and the governors and members of the legislature of each of the fifty states to repeal or rescind all laws, orders, or directives heretofore promulgated enforcing or encouraging the adoption of the metric system of measurement in this country.

Sponsored by members of the Board of Directors and Board of Trustees of seventeen western states.

Duke (John Wayne), California.
Charles Nicholas, Montana.
Lloyd Taggart, Nevada.
John Hinckley, Utah.
David Hawthorn, Texas.
D.C. "Rusty" Holler, Wyoming.
W. W. Hulsey, Oklahoma.
Fred J. Fritz, Arizona.
Watt R. Matthews, Texas.
Dale Smith.
Glen W. Faris, Oklahoma.
Fred H. Dressler, Nevada.
Gene Autry, California.
Edward L. Gaylord, Oklahoma.
J. E. Browning, Arizona.
Miss Freda Hambrick, Colorado.
William L. Arrington, Texas.
Robert C. Norris, Colorado.
Ed Rutherford, California.
Homer Scott, Wyoming.
Spike Van Cleve, Montana.
Belton K. Johnson, Texas.
Chester Paxton, Nebraska.
Harold Schafer, North Dakota.
Marshall McArthur, California.
Mrs. D. D. Payne, Texas.
T. Ross Clement, Idaho.
Albert K. Mitchell, New Mexico.

J. B. Saunders, Texas.
Albert J. Mitchell, New Mexico.
Rex Allen, California.
Ned Elvin Wick, South Dakota.
Chesley Pruet, Arkansas.
John F. Hirschy, Montana.
William D. Harmsen, Colorado.
H. A. True, Jr., Wyoming.
J. V. Hawn, At Large.
Ken Curtis, California.
J. B. Saunders, III, Oklahoma.
Bill House, Kansas.
Mrs. Herman Werner, Wyoming.
S. L. A. Marshall, Brig. General, Retired.
Ralph Jones.
William M. Foneker.
Chauncey Flynn.
S. J. Agnew, Washington.
George Warde, Oklahoma.
Mrs. Rex L. Nicholson, California.
W. Brooks Park, Nevada.
Joe H. Watt, Wyoming.
Harry Blair, South Dakota.
Jasper D. Ackerman, Colorado.
Raymond Adams, Jr., Kansas.
Robert F. Lute, II, Nebraska.
E. H. Shoemaker, Jr., Nebraska.
Joel McCrea, California.

[In the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma]

JASPER D. ACKERMAN AND DEAN KRAKEL,
PLAINTIFFS V. NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS AND ERNEST AMBLER, ITS DIRECTOR,
DEFENDANTS

COMPLAINT

Come now plaintiffs and for cause of action against the defendants allege and state as follows:

1. That plaintiffs are individual residents, citizens and taxpayers of the United States of America, and more specifically, are residents of Colorado and Oklahoma. The defendant, Ambler, is and was at certain times referred to later herein, Director of the United States Bureau of Standards.

2. That this action is brought for the purpose of having construed by the Court the meaning of certain laws of the United States of America and particularly public Law 90-472, 82 Stat. 693, 15 USCA 204 nt., determining specifically the authority granted therein to defendants, determining the propriety of certain expenditure of public funds in the State of Oklahoma and elsewhere by said defendants, and for injunctive relief against further expenditures of public funds which plaintiffs allege are unlawful.

3. That Public Law 90-472 was approved by Congress on August 9, 1968. It authorized a study of the desirability of increasing the use of metric weights and measures in the United States. It authorized only investigation and appraisal of this subject and gave the Secretary of Commerce authority and responsibility to make such a study and report the results to the Congress of the United States in three (3) years. Not to exceed Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000.00) was authorized to be expended for such purpose out of funds previously appropriated to the Department of Commerce during the first year of such three-year period.

That the Department of Commerce assigned full responsibility for making such study to the National Bureau of Standards, notwithstanding it historically had been an instrument and headquarter for the promotion of metric propaganda for more than fifty (50) years.

That thereafter this "study" was conducted between 1968 and 1971 and defendant Ambler's predecessor, Lewis M. Branscomb, Director of U.S. Bureau of Standards, reported in July 1971 to the Secretary of Commerce that the National Bureau of Standards and its Metric Study Group had "based their work primarily on the informed

views of citizens in every walk of life—"and that it had given "everyone an opportunity to express his or his views—" and recommended conversion to metric. The Secretary of Commerce, then one Maurice H. Stans, then reported to Congress again claiming that "thousands of individuals, firms and groups, representatives of our Society—" had participated in the study and that a conversion to metric was recommended.

That, in truth and in fact, these statements were untrue and some 700 consumer groups, labor unions, guilds and associations were invited to attend six public hearings—including such "representative" groups as National Association of Postal Supervisors and National Institute of Governmental Purchasing, Inc., Oregon Consumers League and Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen. Also a group of U.S. government Bureaus and Departments were invited and participated—including HEW, FCC, FPC, FTC, U.S. Postal Service, VA, Office of Management and Budget, Government Printing Office and the President's Committee on Consumer Interests.

That six (6) "public hearings" were held in Washington, D.C. and one (1) in Deerfield, Massachusetts during the latter half of 1970.

No individuals, private citizens (non-"group" representatives) or families were contacted, interviewed or questioned except some 1,400 individuals and family members were personally interviewed by the Survey Research Center Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan where approximately sixty percent (60%) expressed the view they did not believe a conversion to a metric system in the United States should be done.

That the records pertaining to this so-called "study" which formed the basis for this report have mysteriously been destroyed according to agents and employees of the defendant Bureau who report no one knows how, when or why. That the "cover-up" of the true facts of such "study" resulted in a fraud being perpetrated on the Congress of the United States and the American people. That the people of the United States, individual plaintiffs, do not want a mandatory and exclusive conversion to the metric system which has been legally optional as a system of measurement in the United States since 1866. That from its very beginnings to the present time the United States of America has been an independent nation and grown and prospered under its own preferred system of conventional measurement of weights and measurements to be the most advanced industrially, powerful militarily, and affluent nation in the world. Its people are freer and do not want forced upon them any system of weights and measurements that comes from a foreign country or countries whose institutions and political beliefs are foreign and repugnant to them, even though coddled by the bureaucrats that infest our national government.

That the Metric Study Law of 1968 did not authorize expenditures of public funds for propagandizing for metric conversion, although this has been done repeatedly since 1968 to present date by defendant or his predecessor in the form of various publications authored and authorized by the defendants and distributed, all at taxpayers' expense, bearing such titles as "All You Need To Know About Metric", "U.S. Metrification—Why?", "All You Will Need To Know About Metric For Your Everyday Life", "Household Weights and Measures", "Guidelines For The Use Of The Metric System", "The Metric System of Measurement" and "A Metric Conversion Kit", to residents of Oklahoma and other states. That plastic rulers and conversion tables likewise have

been similarly produced and distributed by defendants. That such expenditures and activities were not and are not authorized by law. That plaintiffs verily believe and therefore allege and state that defendants will continue these unlawful expenditures and acts unless enjoined from so doing by this Honorable Court.

4. That Congress passed, in December 1975, Public Law 94-168, 15 USC 205 et seq. known as the Metric Conversion Act of 1975. That said law expressly provides that the conversion of the United States of America to the metric system shall be voluntary only. A U.S. Metric Board of seventeen (17) members was created who were appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States in January 1978. This Board, according to the express language of the Statute, has no compulsory powers. As a consequence thereof, plaintiffs therefore verily believe and allege and state that it will use defendant herein as its propaganda agent involving the same unlawful expenditure of public funds in the future as has been done by defendant or his predecessors in the past to deceive Congress and the American people unless restrained by order of this Honorable Court.

5. Plaintiffs further allege and state that both the Metric Study Act of 1968 and the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 provide solely for a voluntary conversion to metric on the part of citizens of the United States of America and that particularly the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 expressly provides that the United States Metric Board shall have no compulsory powers. However, notwithstanding this provision of the law, defendants have and are by coercion, threats of withdrawal of federal funds by other agencies of the United States Government and withdrawal of federal aid and assistance by such other agencies, seeking to force an absolute conversion to metric system upon the American people and openly have announced their plan to convert the entire country to a metric system by 1980. In this regard plaintiffs further allege and state that the defendants have induced most federal agencies to designate "metric coordinators", including the Department of Interior, the National Weather Service, the Maritime Administration, the Forestry and National Park Service, the Treasury Department, the Patent and Trademark Office, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That within the last twelve (12) months various states, including Oklahoma, have been threatened with the withdrawal of federal highway funds unless speed limit and similar traffic signs are not changed to metric and expressed in kilometers. That the Patent and Trademark Office now requires the use of metric in patent applications and all signs and brochures used in national parks and forests are being converted to weights and measures designated in metric. That the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has instituted a massive program to "encourage" educational agencies and institutions to convert to use of the metric system. That this latter activity admittedly is authorized by the provisions of Public Law 93-380, 20 USC 1862, enacted August 21, 1974, and provides that the sum of Ten Million Dollars (\$10,000,000.00) for each of the fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1978, may be expended for such purpose. That these funds are available, however, only upon application approved by the Commissioner of Education of HEW and only if he finds that the grant will make a "substantial contribution" toward attaining the purpose of converting all education within the United States of America to metric. That this form of "encouragement" is anything but a "voluntary" conversion, as authorized in the Metric Study

Act of 1968 and the Metric Conversion Act of 1975, constituting rather a duress and an involuntary forcing of such conversion upon the educational systems of the United States of America and is a further product of the unauthorized activities of defendants herein as set forth earlier.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, plaintiffs pray that they have and recover judgment of and from the defendants as follows:

1. Enjoining the defendants from any further use of public funds, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of producing, printing, or causing to be printed or produced and printed, written documents, pamphlets, books, kits or devices, specifically including the study report of July 1971 to Congress, encouraging or sponsoring the conversion to the metric system of weights and measures or distributing the same in Oklahoma or elsewhere in the United States of America.

2. Enjoining the defendants from forwarding any such items to the United States Metric Board for its use and reproduction.

3. Enjoining the defendants from any further action with regards to any Bureaus or Agencies of the United States Government, encouraging or requiring such Boards or Agencies to exert pressure or influence of any nature upon citizens of the United States of America or their representatives to convert to the exclusive use of the metric system of weights and measurements.

4. To such other and further relief as to the Court may seem just and equitable.

[From the Oklahoma Journal, Mar. 10, 1979]

NEW SYSTEM 'SHOVED DOWN THROATS'— KRAKEL FILES SUIT OVER METRICS

(By Gene Triplett)

Claiming the metric system is being "shoved down the throats" of an unwilling public, two men filed suit in Oklahoma City federal court Friday charging the National Bureau of Standards has illegally used public funds to promote the change.

Dean Krakel of Oklahoma City and Jasper D. Ackerman of Colorado Springs filed the complaint—said to be the first court challenge of metric conversion—against the Bureau of Standards and its director, Ernest Ambler.

Krakel, executive vice president of the Cowboy Hall of Fame, has been an outspoken opponent of metrics for several years. Ackerman is a board member and past chairman of the Cowboy Hall.

"The metric system will erase much of our heritage," Krakel said. "We all came west by the inch, the foot and the mile, we settled on land by the acre and milked our cows by the quart and the gallon."

He said the Bureau of Standards produced a fraudulent study which "misrepresents" the wishes of the public.

"I've personally polled hundreds of people and 90 percent oppose metric in any form," he said. "Only about two percent knew how much they weighed in kilograms, how tall they were in centimeters."

Krakel said the conversion would work a "hardship" on his family and others who would have to learn the new system.

"It's big business and international bankers who want it," he said. "There's money to be made in changing every sign and yardstick."

"This would be America's final facelift. If we change to the metric there'll be no difference between this country and any other country."

"Basically, we're saying that the silent majority is not happy with the way this is being thrust down our throats," said R. C. Jopling Jr., attorney for the two men.

"Mr. Krakel and Mr. Ackerman have talked about this for a long time. They just feel that the public—especially around this part of the

country—is tired of all this subterfuge and pressure from the government to do something they don't want to do."

A law was passed by Congress in August 1968 authorizing a study of the desirability of increasing the use of metric weights and measures in the U.S. The Department of Commerce was authorized an amount "not to exceed \$500,000" to conduct the study, the complaint states.

Jopling said some \$50 million has been spent on promotion since 1974.

Responsibility for the study was assigned to the Bureau of Standards, which "historically had been an instrument and headquarters for the promotion of metric propaganda for more than 50 years," the suit charges.

The bureau's subsequent report in July 1971 which favored metric conversion was falsely labeled as being based on a survey of citizens "in every walk of life," the suit claims.

The complaint says that some 700 consumer groups, labor unions, guilds and associations were invited to six public hearings in Washington in 1970, along with several representatives of various government bureaus and departments.

"No individuals, private citizens or families were contacted, interviewed or questioned," the complaint states.

Although the Survey Research Center Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan conducted a survey of some 1,400 citizens that year, the suit claims 60 percent of those responding did not favor changing to the metric standard.

Ackerman and Krakel charge that records of the study have been mysteriously destroyed and the bureau has purposely covered up the true facts of the study.

The "cover-up allegedly has resulted in a 'fraud being perpetrated on the Congress of the United States and the American people.'"

The suit notes the metric system has been a legally optional system of measurement in this country since 1866, but claims the public is against a mandatory conversion from the conventional (English) system.

The two men charge that the Metric Study Law did not authorize the Bureau of Standards to spend public funds on "propagandizing for metric conversion."

At taxpayers' expense, the suit says, the Bureau has printed an abundance of pamphlets, books and plastic rulers in an attempt to convert the entire country to metrics by 1980.

The suit claims that the U.S. Metric Board, created in January 1978, will continue to use the Bureau as a propaganda agent and continue the "same unlawful expenditure" of public funds "to deceive Congress and the American people."

The suit stresses that the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 is voluntary rather than compulsory.

But Ackerman and Krakel charge the Bureau of Standards will attempt to "coerce" the public into metric conversion through threat of withdrawal of funds and federal aid from other governmental agencies.

The suit seeks an injunction barring further spending on promotion of metric conversion, and halting alleged "pressure or influence on the American public to convert to metrics."

ST. ELIZABETH MEDICAL CENTER CELEBRATES DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 75th anniversary of the founding of St. Elizabeth Medical Center in Granite City, Ill.

For 75 years St. Elizabeth's staff has provided quality health care to the Granite City area and surrounding communities. No one, I believe, can tell the story better than those who were intimately connected with the history of the hospital and the following short history tells it best.

I would just like to add my personal congratulations on this milestone and wish the staff of St. Elizabeth's many more years of continued success.

For three-quarters of a century, St. Elizabeth Medical Center, Granite City, Ill., has been serving the metro-east area (the metropolitan area across the Mississippi River from St. Louis, Mo., with quality health care. St. Elizabeth employs over 1,100 people and has 421 licensed acute care beds. In short, it is a busy place. When viewing construction now in progress, as well as that which has already been completed, it is hard to imagine just how close Granite City came to not having a hospital at all. It is an interesting story, and one that begins even before the hospital was constructed because to examine the history of St. Elizabeth Hospital, it is necessary to look at the history of Granite City as well.

In 1904, as the World's Fair was opening in St. Louis, industry was shaping Granite City. Factories, which had sprung up around St. Louis, had spread eastward across the Mississippi to a fertile area of Illinois bottomland which had been known only as 6-mile prairie, because the small settlement of cabins there was 6 miles from St. Louis.

Granite City's heritage was a bit different from most other towns. It was, in fact, an "instant city" created through the efforts of two brothers, William and Frederick Niedringhaus. They were the owners of what was, in the late 1800's, the St. Louis Stamping Co., a prosperous kitchen utensil business. While vacationing in Germany, William Niedringhaus came across a metal shop producing pots and pans with a satinlike sheen, unlike anything available in the United States. Niedringhaus paid the shop owner \$5,000 to show him the process, which involved ground granite, and returned to the United States to acquire a patent. Soon the Niedringhaus brothers had a booming business in what they called Graniteware.

To produce Graniteware, they built the granite iron rolling mill in St. Louis, not far from the St. Louis Stamping Co. But by 1890, demand for their products had grown so large that the brothers had to look for a new place to expand their factories. Rather than add on to existing facilities in St. Louis, they decided to build a new plant in less-expensive Illinois. Six-mile prairie was the place.

In 1894, after careful planning, workers arrived in the fields of "old 6-mile," and an entire city was born. Factories, streets, and homes simultaneously rose out of what had been, only a few years earlier, farmland. When deciding on a

name, the Niedringhaus brothers chose to pay homage to what had made them the successful industrialists they were—Graniteware. The result—Granite City.

Heavy industries were constructed in the new city, including Granite City Steel Co. and the St. Louis Stamping Works. Railroads crisscrossed the area to bring supplies to the mills. An unfortunate reality of heavy industry at the turn of the century was, however, injuries. It was not long before a hospital was needed for Granite City.

Dr. Ralph Niedringhaus, grand nephew of William Niedringhaus, was one of the prime movers on the hospital project. In 1904, construction began on what was to be called Granite City Hospital. When the hospital was finished in 1905, it opened under the auspices of the Lutheran Hospital Association.

Rev. A. H. Almstedt was named president of the hospital, which included a nurses' training school. Dr. Robert Binney, for whom the present Binney Wing is named, was the first doctor to practice at Granite City Hospital, performing the first operation and delivering the first baby.

Although hopes were high for quality health care in Granite City, it did not take long before problems appeared. Most of the factory workers who came for treatment were poor, so much of the treatment given by Granite City Hospital was charitable—a noble tradition, perhaps, but unfortunately one that could not last forever. Financial difficulties mounted quickly, so quickly that the hospital faced bankruptcy in 1910 and was forced to close—only 5 years after opening. It seemed as though dreams of a hospital in Granite City vanished almost overnight. All was not lost, however.

Some years later, in 1896, a Catholic priest, Father Peter Kaenders, had opened a small hospital in Venice, Ill., just south of what later became Granite City. A man of boundless energy, Father Kaenders was also pastor of St. Mark's Church in Venice. When heavy industry came to the metro-east, many residents left Venice and moved to Granite City. Father Kaenders' hospital, which he had named St. Elizabeth, had to close, but he did not lose his desire to found a hospital. When Granite City Hospital closed in 1910, he saw a golden opportunity to reopen it and give his own dream of a Catholic hospital another chance.

It took Father Kaenders a year to raise enough money to buy the hospital in May 1911. The following October, it was rededicated and renamed St. Elizabeth Hospital. But new ownership did not mean an end to financial hardship. For the next 10 years, until 1921, Father Kaenders saw St. Elizabeth alternate between years of relative prosperity and abject poverty.

Father Kaenders fought almost single-handedly to keep the hospital open until 1921, when the Sisters of Divine Providence came to Granite City after learning of St. Elizabeth's distress; 1921 was barely 3 days old when they arrived to

make still another attempt to get the hospital back on its feet.

The Sisters of Divine Providence bought the hospital from Father Kaenders in 1921, before actually arriving in Granite City. They had a massive cleanup job waiting for them when they got here, as well as an incredible lack of equipment and materials. There were no linens and no X-ray machine, and lots of bills remained unpaid.

By scrimping, saving and doing a lot of work themselves instead of hiring others, the sisters slowly began to turn things around. By the end of 1921, almost 600 patients had been admitted, but it was not until October 1922, that the hospital was in the black, with a positive balance of \$8.76. Even after that, the hospital's finances continued to be rocky until 1923, when things settled down.

In September of 1921, 10 months after the Sisters of Divine Providence came to Granite City, Father Kaenders died. In March, he had retired as pastor of St. Mark's and had taken up permanent residence in the hospital. In the end, age and the years of struggling to keep the hospital open caught up with him. He had the satisfaction, at least, of knowing that St. Elizabeth Hospital was going to make it.

Since then, the hospital has grown, with new additions in 1931, 1944, 1958, and 1969. St. Elizabeth Medical Center is still growing, but buildings are not all that has expanded—community services have, too, to the extent that the term "hospital" does not adequately describe all the community-oriented programs in which the center is involved. Community activities currently include immunization clinics, prenatal classes, a mobile meals program (providing hot meals for Granite City residents unable to prepare their own) and an alcoholic rehabilitation program. That is why in 1979, the hospital's Diamond Jubilee year, its name has been changed to St. Elizabeth Medical Center.

Granite City Hospital, St. Elizabeth Hospital, and St. Elizabeth Medical Center. Different names, perhaps, but a common goal, quality health care for the metro-east. After 75 years, the future is bright. ●

WHAT WE MUST DO TO MEET OUR ENERGY PROBLEMS

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, philosophers and other students of prehistory have remarked on the unfortunate position of prehistoric man who was subject to the acute risk of freezing to death while unknowingly standing on top, or even alongside, of abundant supplies of energy fuels. "If only he knew better," is the commonly expressed judgment these days on the situation affecting our ancient ancestor.

Contrast our energy problem today. Supposedly, we know more. But are we wiser? We stand in danger of a very

serious deficiency of available, reasonably reliable, practical energy sources—threatening our general welfare and national security—though we are quite aware of our enormous coal reserves and our once unique and still strong capability in the peaceful use of the atom as an energy source. Prehistoric man was wise enough to survive, by using available resources he knew about. We, in this country, have not yet shown that we can match this wisdom. It is imperative that we confront our energy problem by immediate, effective use of our resources and talents. The measure I am introducing lays the foundation for this resolve. Let us get on with doing what we have to do, as effectively as we know how.

Quite simply and directly, we are long overdue in the effective use of our domestically available basic energy sources. We have not productively harnessed our intellectual and physical resources to reduce our dependence on petroleum fuels. From the standpoint of my own direct experience and involvement in energy matters, I believe we are at least 10 years behind in facing up to our energy situation. Actually, it was as long ago as 1962 that an excellent study of our future energy needs was completed. This study was initiated by the old Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the late 1950's because the committee wanted to find out if nuclear energy would be needed in the civilian sector. What we found, in a few words, was that this country would require supplemental energy sources in the near future, and the only practical alternative was nuclear energy—specifically fission.

It is interesting what the study found about our petroleum fuels: Petroleum fuels were found to be one of our minor domestic fuels over the long range and, in fact, production rates were expected to peak out in about 1970 and decrease thereafter. As we now know this is exactly what happened and we can continue to expect our domestic production to decrease.

Unfortunately, we have not acted on the basis of the findings in the old report. We have not increased our use of coal, our largest available chemical source of energy. One reason for this is that we did not foresee the development of extreme views, in certain quarters, that coal should not be used for environmental reasons.

In 1973, I had the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy make a study of what our foreign dependence on energy sources would be under various conditions relating to the utilization of more coal, nuclear energy, feasible use of solar energy, et cetera. One startling finding of the evaluation came to my mind when I read the data on last year's imports of petroleum which equaled nearly 9 million barrels per day. The 1973 evaluation predicted imports of 10 million barrels per day by 1980 if we did absolutely nothing to offset dependence on foreign supplies.

In other words, we have been directly on the do-nothing road to minimize our dependence on foreign sources. Adding

to the frightening impact of our recent history is the recollection that in 1973 our imports were on the order of 7 million barrels and the President's goal was to decrease our imports to something like 6 million barrels. We are going in the opposite direction.

What we must do at the present time are the same things we identified nearly two decades ago. The concurrent resolution I propose urges unambiguous and forthright Executive attention to the critical need to use our coal and nuclear resources.

To eliminate any possible misunderstanding on the part of advocates of other potential energy sources, I want to state unequivocally that I also continue to advocate development work on nuclear fusion, solar, and other longer range, potentially useful sources. But we must face the facts as they now exist. We have a "bird in the hand"—large resources of coal and a once unique but still viable nuclear energy capability. We must move out smartly and use these energy sources as our present requirements dictate. Of course, we will have to contend with the leadtime problem to turn our present situation around. Developing new coal mines, getting the additional miners, and building the transportation and utilizing facilities will probably take at least a decade before really substantial additional resources are available. The leadtime for nuclear energy sources may also be significant since we must improve the terribly time-consuming administrative procedure now used in licensing and regulation. But these things can and must be done since no other actions can solve the dilemma we face notwithstanding every reasonable effort of conservation or more efficient use of energy. Every day we delay in doing what is necessary increases the likelihood that the not too distant future will bring us to a crisis of high danger and intolerable alternatives. From the strongest convictions I have in connection with our national well-being, I urge your support for the resolution I am introducing.

The resolution follows:

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Whereas five years after the Arab Oil Embargo, the United States has increased its dependence on the importation of foreign petroleum to the detriment of both national security and the nation's economy;

Whereas conservation, despite government policies encouraging and mandating such action, has not been able to keep pace with expanding energy needs and reduce our unacceptably high, from the standpoint of our national security and economy, requirements for imported petroleum;

Whereas other basic sources of energy are available domestically which could be utilized in place of a significant portion of our present use of the various petroleum fuels;

Whereas there are two such basic energy resources which possess all of the characteristics—magnitude of potential contribution, developed and demonstrated technology and the industrial capability—needed to increase their utilization without delay, except for bureaucratic interference and conflicting policies;

Whereas those two sources are coal and nuclear-fueled energy systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States of America is hereby encouraged to adopt and aggressively carry out a policy for the accelerated utilization of coal and nuclear energy on the basis of the highest national priority in order to obtain the maximum contribution to our national security and economy.●

AUTO REPORT AVAILABLE

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the automobile transportation system is a central feature of our society. It has given us an unparalleled degree of mobility and access to jobs, essential services, and recreation. It has shaped the development of our cities. The automobile, highway, and fuel industries provide employment for millions. On the other hand, our reliance on the automobile also creates concern about energy consumption, environmental pollution, safety, and consumer cost—especially for the future when petroleum supply will become increasingly scarce and more costly.

The Office of Technology Assessment recently sent each Member a report, "Changes in the Future Use and Characteristics of the Automobile Transportation System," which examines changes that may be needed either to assure the continued benefits of the automobile or to alleviate problems created by widespread and intensive automobile use. It also analyzes Government initiatives that could be taken to direct and facilitate further technological development.

I hope each Member takes the time to examine this valuable information source.●

THE NATION DESERVES STRONG ALASKA LAND LEGISLATION

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, by a one vote margin, adopted a weak and inadequate version of the legislation dealing with public lands in Alaska which so many of our colleagues joined in sponsoring at the start of this session.

As a result, those of us who joined in support of the original bill (H.R. 39) put forward by Chairman UDALL are opposed to the version to be reported by the Interior Committee. Our opposition is based on our conviction that the reported version unduly sacrifices the protection already afforded to the American people's land treasures in Alaska by the wise and courageous actions of President Carter and Secretaries Andrus and Bergland.

Mr. Speaker, we are not alone in that conviction, or in our opposition to the reported version. Newspapers across the country have expressed a similar view,

as have all of the major conservation organizations and many others with a particular concern for this issue—which has rightly been characterized as the most important conservation decision of our generation.

Mr. Speaker, the reported version of H.R. 39 falls far short of what the Nation and the American people deserve from the Congress, and why, as the New York Times has rightly put it, Congress should "either strengthen the pending bill or take no action at all." In due course, this House will have an opportunity to do that.

Meanwhile, I am here including for the benefit of all our colleagues a number of editorials dealing with this subject.

[From the New York Times, March 22, 1979]

DRAWING THE LINE IN ALASKA

Congress is once again taking up the Alaska lands issue, the most important conservation decision of the present generation. The Federal Government, which once owned the entire state, is already transferring 40 percent of the land to the state government and its native peoples, the largest such land grant in the nation's history. The question now is what to do with the residual Federal lands.

The House of Representatives approved a good conservation bill by a 9-1 margin last year, but Alaska's senators blocked its passage. Mr. Carter and Interior Secretary Andrus thereupon stepped in and, by administrative action, wisely protected much of the land from hasty exploitation. But legislation is still desirable—to insure that decisions affecting this last great frontier have a broad base of support and provide the most vulnerable lands with a degree of protection that the President alone cannot decree.

Several bills have been introduced to preserve almost half of the remaining land, roughly a quarter of the entire state, in pristine condition, free from economic development. Unfortunately, the House is off to a bad start. The Interior Committee, whose composition has changed since last year, has approved a bill that yields too much to development interests. Mr. Andrus was right to call the committee's final version "totally unacceptable." It would whittle down the amount of land that the Administration rightly wants protected and, more important, greatly weaken the degree of protection afforded to most of it.

Drawing the line between development and conservation in Alaska is difficult because the state is believed to have vast untapped natural resources. Yet their exploitation could destroy areas of spectacular beauty and fragile wildlife. Developers want easy access to potential mineral deposits, oil and gas reserves and vast tracts of timber. Conservationists want to set aside much of the area as wilderness, national parks and wildlife refuges.

Most of Alaska's promising oil, gas and mineral lands are already open for development. The remaining lands ought to be left undisturbed, with only a modest level of exploration permitted to assess resources—but that ought to be done without endangering wildlife or scarring the land.

There will be two opportunities to produce a better House bill. The Merchant Marine Committee will soon vote on proposals covering areas in its jurisdiction, and the full House will probably be offered a more protective bill from the floor. We hope that Congress will either strengthen the pending bill or take no action at all. It would

be better to leave these incomparable lands under administrative protection than to legislate still weaker safeguards.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 1979]

THE ALASKAN LANDS BILL

Secretary of the Interior Cecil D. Andrus is telling anyone who asks that the Alaskan Lands Bill approved last week by the House Interior Committee is "totally unacceptable" to the administration. It ought to be. The bill repudiates much of what Mr. Andrus and President Carter have been fighting for. It would open to unneeded development and exploitation hundreds of thousands of acres of federal land that should be preserved for later generations.

It is not clear why the House committee caved in totally to those Alaskans who want to use so much of that state's resources now. To do it, the committee had to reverse its positions of just a year ago on dozens of critical issues. It also had to turn its back on the version of the bill that the full House passed overwhelmingly last spring. Interestingly enough, every Republican on the committee voted to reduce the national parks, wildlife areas and other protected lands while the Democrats voted, 20 to 7, against that action.

Without much doubt, the problem of carving up the remaining federal lands in Alaska is one of the most intricate facing Congress. The areas involved are vast. They are rich in resources, from fish and game to timber and oil and gas. The pressures on Congress from both the development interests and the conservationists are extremely heavy. Those Alaskans who want the fewest possible federal restrictions left on the land see this bill as their last chance to gain access to the resources they think are necessary to make Alaska economically strong. Conservationists see the bill as the last chance to preserve huge sections of the United States in a pristine state where wildlife and nature remain undisturbed.

No one is sure precisely where the balance should be struck between these interests, particularly when the factors to be weighted vary as dramatically as they do between the timber lands of the southeast and the arctic wastes of the far north. In striking that balance, it is better to err on the side of preserving too much than preserving too little. If too many resources and too much land are kept intact, future generations of legislators can reverse that judgment and open the land to development. But once oil wells are drilled, timber is cut and watersheds are altered, a Congress of the future cannot reverse a wrong decision.

The bill that passed the House a year ago seemed to us to be within the realm of reasonable compromise. The one the Interior Committee has reported out this year is not, particularly in light of the sentiment in the Senate to open up too much of Alaska to development. The House should have no qualms about rejecting the work of this committee and passing again the legislation it approved last spring. If it does not do so, the chances are not good for congressional agreement on an Alaskan lands bill that President Carter can sign—and remain faithful to what he has said in the past.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

"PROTECTION"

Congress ought to quickly back up the actions taken by President Carter, Agriculture Secretary Bergland and Interior Secretary Andrus late last year to protect vast areas of irreplaceable wilderness in Alaska. The executive action became necessary when the Senate failed—because of a filibuster threat in its closing days—to act on the Alaska Public Interest Lands Bill, a strong

version of which had been passed by the House. Thus, the deadline for Congress lapsed and the protection that had been set up under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act was reduced.

The Alaskan opposition to federal control of some land there was built around a scare theme of "locking up" the state's resources. However, the administration was very careful to take into consideration the legitimate needs of the state, to leave open most areas of known mineral wealth and to make ample provision for sport and subsistence hunting. Notwithstanding these good-faith demonstrations of restraint on the part of the federal government, the state of Alaska filed for takeover of 41 million acres relatively soon after Congress adjourned. The problem with the state's action was not the amount of land wanted—the state will get more than twice that amount when the division is complete—but rather was that 10 million of the acres the state wanted for development were included by the House and the administration in the lands to be preserved.

Secretaries Andrus and Bergland used what powers they had to preserve temporarily all lands that would have been covered by the bills in Congress, but this type of action is largely untested in the courts and the amount of protection actually given is questionable. Hence, President Carter selected 56 million acres that are especially scenic or important to wildlife and designated the areas national monuments. Such a use of the 1906 Antiquities Act occurred previously when Theodore Roosevelt set aside the Grand Canyon for preservation, and it ought to withstand any challenges. Many more acres than the 56 million need definite protection, however; and congressional support ought to be given for the president's action. The lands that can be preserved are unique, and Congress needs to ensure that they remain unspoiled.●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LEHMAN (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT) for today on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT) for today on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. STEWART for indefinite period on account of illness of his son.

To Mr. THOMPSON (at his own request) from March 29, 1979.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOPKINS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOLDWATER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCKINNEY, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. BOB WILSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CORCORAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GILMAN, for 60 minutes, on April 3.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RATCHFORD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. AU COIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. THOMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. UDALL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WEAVER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. OTTINGER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KOSTMAYER, for 5 minutes, on March 29.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. RUDD, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$965.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOPKINS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SAWYER.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
Mr. FORSYTHE.
Mr. RUDD.
Mr. ARCHER.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO.
Mr. WHITEHURST.
Mr. BEREUTER in two instances.
Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.
Mr. COLLINS of Texas in two instances.
Mr. TAYLOR.
Mr. CORCORAN.
Mr. SYMMS.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
Mr. MCCLORY.
Mr. HANSEN.
Mr. DERWINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RATCHFORD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KOSTMAYER in two instances.
Mr. MAVROULES.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. GORE.
Mr. TRAXLER.
Mr. BINGHAM in 10 instances.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. FASCELL.
Mr. MATSUI.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. MOAKLEY.
Mr. SLACK.
Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. MCKAY.
Mr. ROSENTHAL.
Mr. DRINAN in two instances.
Mr. PREYER.
Mr. HEFTEL.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. SHANNON.
Mr. AU COIN.
Mr. MATHIS.
Mr. CONYERS.
Mr. DASCHLE.
Mr. OTTINGER.
Mr. FITHIAN.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee has examined and

found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2439. An act to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (H. Doc. 96-46), transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 27, 1979, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2301. To amend the Federal District Court Organization Act of 1978 with respect to certain administrative matters arising from the redrawing of the Federal judicial districts in the State of Illinois.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 29, 1979, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1103. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a report on the agency's progress in promoting contracting with minority business enterprises, pursuant to section 133 of Public Law 95-88; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1104. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting notice of a delay in the submission of the report on timber scheduling alternatives in the Six Rivers National Forest, required to be submitted by March 27, 1979, under the provisions of section 102 (c) of Public Law 95-250; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1105. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the statutory provisions governing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's civil penalty authority; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1106. A letter from the Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, transmitting the Office's quarterly report on private grievances and redress, pursuant to section 21(c) of Public Law 93-275; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1107. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 43d annual report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, pursuant to sections 4 and 3(w) of the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1108. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 during fiscal years 1980, 1981, and 1982; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1109. A letter from the Secretary of Com-

merce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the appropriation authorization for the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1110. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the National Sea Grant College Program Act for fiscal years 1981 and 1982 at such sums as may be necessary; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1111. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere Act of 1977 to authorize appropriations to carry out the provisions of such act for fiscal years 1980 and 1981, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1112. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the number of full-time permanent employees hired and promoted by the Commission during the first quarter of fiscal year 1979, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1113. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the Commission's review of the selection and training process for Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel members, pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 95-601; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1114. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 10 of the National Ocean Pollution Research and Development and Monitoring Planning Act of 1978 to extend the authorization of appropriations for fiscal years 1980 and 1981; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Science and Technology.

1115. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to amend sections 204 and 304 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, to extend the authorizations for appropriations for fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Science and Technology.

1116. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 13, United States Code, to exempt the Bureau of the Census from the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Public Works and Transportation.

1117. A letter from the Federal Co-Chairman, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Agriculture, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. BOLLING: Committee on Rules.

House Resolution 183. Resolution concurring in Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 2534) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes

(Rept. No. 96-75). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DODD: Committee on Rules.

House Resolution 184. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3173. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to authorize international security assistance programs for fiscal years 1980 and 1981, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 96-76). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Committee on Rules.

House Resolution 185. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 595. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to dispose of 35,000 long tons of tin in the national and supplemental stockpiles, and to provide for the deposit of moneys received from the sale of such tin (Rept. No. 96-77). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 3282. A bill to establish a program for the inspection of schools to detect the presence of hazardous asbestos materials, to provide loans to local educational agencies to contain or remove hazardous asbestos materials from schools and to replace such materials with other suitable building materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ATKINSON:

H.R. 3283. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to prevent certain nuclear reactor repair costs and increased costs of substitute power from being passed through to an electric utility's consumers when the generation of electric energy by any nuclear powerplant is suspended or terminated for a safety-related reason, to provide a Federal fund for the payment of these costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BONER of Tennessee:

H.R. 3284. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend and clarify the authority of the General Services Administration with respect to the protection of buildings and areas owned and occupied by the United States and under the charge and control of the Administrator of General Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H.R. 3285. A bill to provide for the completion of the Natchez Trace Parkway from Natchez, Miss., to Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAVANAUGH:

H.R. 3286. A bill to repeal the carryover basis provisions added by the Tax Reform Act of 1976; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 3287. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to increase the authorization for the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia from \$300 million to \$317 million; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 3288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to decrease the limitation on deductions for medical expenses to 2 percent of adjusted gross income, to eliminate

the 1-percent limitation on deductions for deduction for medical insurance within the 2-percent limitation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3289. A bill to exempt the Tellico Dam and Reservoir project in Tennessee from the provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 3290. A bill to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 relating to increases in the target prices of the 1979 crops of wheat, corn, and other crops under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLIPPO:

H.R. 3291. A bill to amend section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that expenditures for pollution control facilities will be credited against required power investment return payments and repayments; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FORSYTHE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. BONKER, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. WYATT, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LENT, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WINN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. GUDGER):

H.R. 3292. A bill to assist the States in developing fish and wildlife conservation plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 3293. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to eliminate certain binding for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 3294. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to eliminate certain printing and binding; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 3295. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to reduce the gratuitous distribution of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mr. LOTT):

H.R. 3296. A bill to authorize adjustment of the retired pay of certain former members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HILLIS, and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 3297. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to revise the provisions of such title relating to the construction and alteration of, and acquisition of land for, veterans' cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

H.R. 3298. A bill to provide for the timely and safe disposal of radioactive ores, minerals, and mill tailings as well as physical facilities and material wastes of all types which are produced as a result of the use of nuclear energy; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Science and Technology.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3299. A bill to designate certain lands in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Calif., as the Mount Shasta Wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DODD:

H.R. 3300. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to establish an Office of Economic Diversification in the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce, to

establish a program to encourage and assist certain defense dependent areas in diversifying their economies, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Public Works and Transportation, and Rules.

By Mr. McKINNEY:

H.R. 3301. A bill to extend and strengthen subsection (1) of section 2403 of 50 U.S.C. App. (the McKinney amendment to the Export Administration Amendments of 1977); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIS:

H.R. 3302. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to improve the nuclear siting and licensing process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3303. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of carrying out the activities of the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABO (for himself, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. MOTTI, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ROE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 3304. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States to establish flexible income contribution and resource standards for couples in which one spouse is in a nursing home; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 3305. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to reduce the amount of the reserve requirement on insured accounts in Federal savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (by request):

H.R. 3306. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to permit Federal savings and loan associations to raise additional capital through the issuance of mutual capital certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 3307. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the imposition of countervailing duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKELTON:

H.R. 3308. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize additional Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarships for cadets at military junior colleges, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to provide that cadets awarded such scholarships may serve their obligated period of service in the Army Reserve or Army National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SOLARZ:

H.R. 3309. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the duration-of-marriage requirements (and other special requirements) which are presently applicable in determining whether a person is the widow or widower of an insured individual for benefit purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3310. A bill to provide for the exclusion of industrially funded personnel in computing the total number of civilian personnel authorized by law for the Department of Defense in any fiscal year; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STENHOLM:

H.R. 3311. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain benefits to

former employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WOLFE, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 3312. A bill to incorporate the American Council of Learned Societies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 3313. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to exempt incorporated or unincorporated associations of health professions from the Federal Trade Commission Act and the anti-trust laws; jointly, to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 3314. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain changes in the survivor benefit plan established under chapter 73 of such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. RHODES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. YATRON, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BONKER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MICA, Mr. BARNES, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. FITZHIAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WINN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. QUAYLE, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution reaffirming the U.S. commitment to the North Atlantic Alliance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of September 2, 1979, as "Working Mothers' Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution to declare a National Energy Policy; jointly to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATRON:

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution commending the Air Force Academy on its 25th anniversary; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H. Res. 186. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. AU-COIN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. LONG, of Louisiana, and Mr. NOLAN):

H. Res. 187. Resolution expressing the sense of the House opposing the transfer of the Forest Service and the Farmers Home Administration business and industry programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to exempting Hawaiian banks from the reserve requirements for Federal

Reserve membership; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

99. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to revenue sharing; to the Committee on Government Operations.

100. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to assistance to railroads linking agricultural areas and urban market areas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

101. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to metric conversion; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 3315. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell five obsolete vessels to the Inter-Ocean Management Co., a California corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLINGER:

H.R. 3316. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liwayway T. Alojipan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 3317. A bill for the relief of Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 3318. A bill for the relief of Bobby R. Prince; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 3319. A bill for the relief of Jose Quintana Dominguez Sendijas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 3320. A bill for the relief of Eileen Ferraren Fair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3321. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. Grauf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3322. A bill for the relief of Claretia Bessick and Fredericka Athena Clark Eng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 3323. A bill for the relief of Calvin L. Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee:

H. Res. 188. Resolution noting the retirement of Joel W. Solomon, and expressing gratitude for his contributions as a public servant; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 55: Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. ERLNBORN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LENT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. TRENN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WINN, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 170: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LOWRY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WOLFF.

H.R. 192: Mr. BRINKLEY, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 248: Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands.
H.R. 259: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 605: Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. RINALDO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. CARR, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 958: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 997: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1041: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1290: Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1524: Mr. ATKINSON, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 1958: Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. SLACK, Mr. LUKE, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. LUJAN.

H.R. 2342: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 2482: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. CORRADA, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 2612: Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. PASHAYAN,

Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLAUSEN, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 2798: Mr. AMBRO, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. WOLFF.

H.R. 2843: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 2975: Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. JENNETTE, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 3111: Mr. CORRADA, Mr. LOTT, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. WYATT.

H.J. Res. 229: Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. EMERY, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HANCE, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. NEAL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr.

STOCKMAN, Mr. TREEN, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. NOWAK.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

94. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Waterbury Lithuanian-American Council and the Waterbury Lithuanian-American Community, Waterbury, Conn., relative to the colonial status of the Baltic States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3173

By Mr. RITTER:

On page 20, immediately after line 19, insert the following new section:

MIDDLE EAST PEACE DEVELOPMENT FUND

SEC. 21. It is the sense of the Congress that the President take all appropriate steps to negotiate with other industrial nations an agreement for the creation of a Peace Development Fund whose purpose would be to underwrite the costs of implementing a Middle East peace with all the industrial nations contributing to the fund in general proportion to the oil they purchase from the Middle East.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESS MUST HEED CALL FOR BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1979

● Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to share with my colleagues the following testimony I am submitting today to the Monopolies and Commercial Law Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee which has begun hearings on proposed constitutional amendments to require a balanced Federal budget.

Given the attention being focused on this timely issue throughout the Nation, it is particularly important that all of us who serve in the House of Representatives act expeditiously and responsibly in examining the various alternative approaches such an amendment might take in arriving at the one which will best achieve our intended goals.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN BILL ARCHER

Mr. Chairman: I sincerely appreciate this opportunity to submit testimony to this Subcommittee on the subject of a proposed Constitutional Amendment requiring a balanced federal budget.

As the initiator of the letter cosigned by 147 of my colleagues requesting these hearings for the past several months, I am very hopeful that this two-day period is only the beginning of far more extensive consideration of this important subject. Anything less than a totally sincere and thorough look at

the budget balancing alternatives that have been recommended would be a gross injustice.

Since 1961, the federal budget has been balanced only once—and following the winding down of the Vietnam War machine the growth of astronomical deficits has been accompanied by intolerable levels of inflation and unemployment.

Understandably, the American people are laying a major share of the blame on the federal government. Federal spending is totally out of control. The Congress has dismally failed to restrain its spending habits, and has instead continually taken the politically expedient tack of turning to deficit financing of its programs so it will not have to say "no" to anyone.

Not surprisingly, 81 percent of our people, according to a Gallup poll taken last summer, now favor a Constitutional Amendment requiring a balanced federal budget—a clear indication that they no longer trust the Congress to impose fiscal self-restraint.

Existing Congressional budget procedures just are not getting the job done. They have failed to control spending—or even to bring spending into line with what the Congress has the courage to raise honestly through taxes.

Yes, a Constitutional Amendment is an extraordinary step to take—and certainly we must take care to build sufficient flexibility into such an amendment to respond to extraordinary circumstances—but it is the only way the Congress will ever put an end to the inflationary open-ended credit card approach to spending that exists today.

Inflation is now running at well over 10 percent a year—and with the "borrow and spend now" psychology that exists here in the Congress now filtering throughout our society—the subject cannot be ignored any longer. The people are saying "Stop!" They are fed up with the lack of leadership which

has so characterized federal budgetary procedures.

We are in a sad state indeed—and the people know it—when a President can get away with calling an inflationary deficit of over \$29 billion "lean and austere" and when our total indebtedness will soon reach the astronomical level of \$830 billion. For Fiscal Year 1980, our payment for interest on the national debt alone is going to be about \$46 billion! As a matter of fact, even the President's low estimate of the deficit is now projected to be some \$11 billion on the short side once the Congress pushes it up to a predicted \$40 billion or more.

Federal spending is indeed out of control—and it is not going to get back under control without a Constitutional mandate. The Congress and Administration have the tools available—but will not impose the necessary self-discipline.

That imposition of discipline is the most important single force behind the growing national demand for a Constitutional Amendment to require a balanced budget.

Certainly such a requirement would force the Congress to finally judge all federal programs, old and new, according to proven need—in line with the priorities set by the taxpayers who would be paying the bills. Perhaps some programs would finally have to be redrawn to eliminate the massive waste that now exists in order to free tax dollars for other worthy uses.

The federal government would be prevented by law from undertaking programs which the people are unwilling to support through their taxes. The Congress in its collective judgment would have to decide which programs are most deserving of federal funding—and among those selected, which should receive priority funding.

That might well mean a slowing of the trend in recent years toward greater centralization of government functions in Washing-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.