

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the effort of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BURKE) to make sure that the concurrent resolution brought before the House would not embody any financial burden on the Treasury.

I compliment her on her willingness to write this House concurrent resolution in such a manner so that it would not place an extra burden on the already overloaded taxpayers.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution was reported unanimously from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The concurrent resolution does not carry with it any authorization of appropriations. If that were to occur, it would have to be done by other action of the committee.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, anything that could come to the House unanimously out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce must have something right about it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is an outgrowth of House Concurrent Resolution 318, which was introduced with a host of co-sponsors on July 29. The U.S. Olympic Committee, on September 25, selected the city of Los Angeles to be the American nominee before the International Olympic Committee for the right to host the 1984 summer Olympic games.

This resolution expresses the hope of the Congress that the United States will be selected as the site for the games, and pledges the cooperation and support of the Congress toward the successful fulfillment of the games. A resolution of this kind is required under International Olympic Committee rules which state that "every candidature must be supported by the government of the country in which the (host) city is located."

The difference between House Concurrent Resolution 368 and House Concurrent Resolution 318 is that the earlier resolution called for Federal financial assistance and did not specify the American bid city. House Concurrent Resolution 368 pledges the "cooperation and support" of the Congress and reflects the selection of Los Angeles as the bid city.

Each resolution was referred jointly to the Committee on International Relations and to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Concurrent Resolution 318 was reported favorably by the Commerce Subcommittee on Transportation and Commerce chaired by Mr. ROONEY. On September 27 the full Commerce Committee reported the resolution favorably by voice vote.

I wish to thank Committee Chairman STAGGERS and Subcommittee Chairman ROONEY for their time and effort in considering the resolution.

In the International Relations Committee, House Concurrent Resolution 318 was referred to Chairman FRASER'S Subcommittee on International Organizations, which held 2 days of hearings. Although the resolution was neither an authorization nor an appropriation, Mr. ROSENTHAL of the subcommittee objected to the words "appropriate financial assistance." The words "cooperation and support" therefore were substituted.

However, as the hearing record makes clear, no member of the subcommittee would object to Federal financial assistance for the 1984 summer Olympic games if the need for such assistance is shown and if the request for assistance is subject to the regular procedure for authorization and appropriation.

Although this resolution in no way bypasses any step in the appropriation process, Chairman ROONEY of the Commerce Subcommittee on Transportation and Commerce indicated that when a request comes before his subcommittee, he will give every consideration to the financial needs of the 1984 summer Olympic games.

The Department of State, in an executive comment to Chairman ZABLOCKI of the International Relations Committee, expressed its support for the resolution and indicated that the Office of Management and Budget had no objection to the resolution.

I wish to thank Mr. ZABLOCKI and Mr. FRASER for their assistance and time in considering the resolution.

In order to accommodate Mr. ROSENTHAL'S request in the International Relations Subcommittee, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 368 on October 4. It was reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In order to expedite passage of the resolution, Mr. ZABLOCKI stated in a letter to Mr. STAGGERS that the International Relations Committee would have no objection to the consideration on the House Floor of the resolution as reported by the Commerce Committee.

I would like to thank Mr. STAGGERS for his further assistance and for his consent in allowing me, in his absence, to bring up this request for unanimous consent.

The United States has not hosted the summer Olympics since 1932 in Los Angeles, and there is a feeling worldwide that it is our turn.

It should be pointed out that there are recent precedents for Federal support of international athletic events. Congress appropriated funds for the 1960 Winter Olympics in Squaw Valley, Calif., for the 1979 Pan-Am Games in San Juan, Puerto Rico; and for the 1980 Winter Olympics in Lake Placid, N.Y.

Labor, business, and industry all would benefit directly from the staging of the 1984 summer Olympic games. The benefits are not restricted to the host city, since the prestige of the entire Nation would be enhanced. Athletes from every State participate in the games, and for the first time in 52 years would enjoy the

advantage of competing in their own country.

The 1980 games will be held in Moscow and promise to be spectacular. If the United States is selected as the site of the 1984 Olympics, world attention will focus on our efforts to stage the games. The time is approaching when only countries with existing Olympic facilities will be permitted to act as hosts, and in the future the games may be rotated among the five or six existing international sites.

The International Olympic Committee is considering such a decision in order to expedite the staging of future Olympics. As a result, 1984 may be our last chance to be the host country.

I hope we can take advantage of this chance.

I urge Congress to favorably consider House Concurrent Resolution 368.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4297, MARINE PROTECTION, RESEARCH, AND SANCTUARIES ACT OF 1972 AUTHORIZATION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 798 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 798

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to 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. 4297) to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 to authorize appropriations to carry out the provisions of such Act for fiscal year 1978. 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 Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against the amendment recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI 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 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. Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes for the minority to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Anderson), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 798 provides for the consideration of H.R. 4297, a bill to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 to authorize appropriations to carry out the provisions of this act for fiscal year 1978. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided between the majority and minority.

H.R. 4297 is a simple 1-year extension of authorization, with one exception.

Title I of the act provides for mandatory regulation of the dumping of harmful wastes into the ocean. The authorization provides \$4.8 million in fiscal year 1978 for this purpose.

Title II of the act provides for research by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration into the long term effects of ocean pollution. The bill authorizes \$6 million for this purpose in fiscal year 1978.

Title III, the Marine Sanctuaries program administered by NOAA "NO-AH" is authorized at \$500,000 for fiscal year 1978.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries added an amendment to the 1-year authorization provisions of H.R. 4297. This amendment adopted by the committee could possibly be construed as nongermane to a 1-year authorization extension because it requires the termination of dumping municipal sewage sludge into ocean waters as soon as possible but no later than December 31, 1981. The Committee on Rules granted a waiver of points of order against this committee amendment on the basis of nongermaneness.

Mr. Speaker. It is most important that we protect our Nation's vital ocean and coastal resources from contamination. I therefore urge the adoption of House Resolution 798 so that the House may take up this important bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is a 1-hour, open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4297, a bill authorizing fiscal year 1978 appropriations for the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI, the germaneness rule.

H.R. 4297 was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and later was sequentially referred to the Committee on Science and Technology. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee version authorizes a total of \$11,300,000 for fiscal year 1978 to carry out the provisions of the Marine

Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act. In addition, the legislation provides that the dumping into ocean waters of municipal sewage sludge which may unreasonably degrade the marine environment be ended as soon as possible, and in no case be continued beyond December 31, 1981.

The Science and Technology Committee amended the bill to increase from \$6,000,000 to \$6,500,000 the amount to be used for research. The total figure authorized by that committee's version of the measure is \$11,800,000.

To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to the rule; and I urge its adoption at this time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 2, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 635]

YEAS—388

Abdnor	Butler	Evans, Colo.
Addabbo	Byron	Evans, Del.
Akaka	Caputo	Evans, Ga.
Alexander	Carney	Evans, Ind.
Allen	Carr	Fary
Ammerman	Carter	Penwick
Anderson,	Cavanaugh	Findley
Calif.	Cederberg	Fish
Anderson, Ill.	Chappell	Fisher
Andrews, N.C.	Chisholm	Fithian
Andrews,	Clausen,	Filippo
N. Dak.	Don H.	Florio
Annunzio	Clay	Flowers
Applegate	Cleveland	Flynt
Archer	Cochran	Foley
Armstrong	Cohen	Ford, Mich.
Ashbrook	Coleman	Ford, Tenn.
Aspin	Collins, Ill.	Forsythe
AuCoin	Collins, Tex.	Fountain
Badham	Conable	Fowler
Badillo	Conce	Fraser
Bafalls	Corcoran	Frenzel
Baldus	Corman	Frey
Barnard	Cornell	Fuqua
Baucus	Cornwell	Gammage
Bauman	Coughlin	Gaydos
Beard, R.I.	Crane	Gephart
Bedell	Cunningham	Gialmo
Benjamin	D'Amours	Gibbons
Bennett	Daniel, Dan	Ginn
Bevill	Daniel, R. W.	Gonzalez
Biaggi	Danielson	Goodling
Blouin	Davis	de la Garza
Boggs	de la Garza	Grassley
Boland	Delaney	Gudger
Bolling	Dellums	Guyer
Bonior	Derrick	Hagedorn
Bonker	Derwinski	Hall
Bowen	Devine	Hamilton
Brademas	Dickinson	Hammer-
Breaux	Dicks	schmidt
Breckinridge	Diggs	Hanley
Brinkley	Dingell	Hannaford
Brodhead	Dodd	Hansen
Brooks	Dornan	Harkin
Broomfield	Downey	Harrington
Brown, Calif.	Drinan	Harris
Brown, Mich.	Duncan, Oreg.	Hawkins
Broyhill	Duncan, Tenn.	Hackler
Buchanan	Early	Hefner
Burgener	Eckhardt	Heftel
Burke, Calif.	Edwards, Ala.	Hightower
Burke, Fla.	Edwards, Calif.	Hillis
Burke, Mass.	Edwards, Okla.	Holland
Burleson, Tex.	Emery	Hollenbeck
Burlison, Mo.	English	Holt
Burton, John	Erlenborn	Horton
Burton, Phillip	Ertel	Howard

Hubbard	Minish	Santini
Huckaby	Mitchell, Md.	Sarasin
Hughes	Mitchell, N.Y.	Satterfield
Hyde	Moakley	Savory
Ichord	Moffett	Schroeder
Ireland	Mollohan	Schulze
Jacobs	Montgomery	Sebelius
Jeffords	Moore	Seiberling
Jenkins	Moorhead,	Sharp
Jenrette	Calif.	Shiple
Johnson, Colo.	Moorhead, Pa.	Shuster
Jones, N.C.	Moss	Sikes
Jones, Okla.	Motti	Simon
Jones, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.	Skelton
Jordan	Murphy, N.Y.	Skubitz
Kasten	Murphy, Pa.	Slack
Kastenmeyer	Murtha	Smith, Iowa
Kazen	Myers, Gary	Smith, Nebr.
Kelly	Myers, John	Snyder
Kemp	Myers, Michael	Spence
Ketchum	Natcher	St Germain
Kew	Neal	Stangeland
Kildee	Nedzi	Stanton
Kindness	Nichols	Stark
Kostmayer	Nix	Steed
Krueger	Nolan	Stiers
LaFalce	Nowak	Steiger
Lagomarsino	O'Brien	Stockman
Latta	Oakar	Stratton
Le Fante	Oberstar	Studds
Leach	Obey	Stump
Lederer	Oettinger	Symms
Leggett	Panetta	Taylor
Lent	Patten	Teague
Livingston	Patterson	Thompson
Lloyd, Calif.	Pattison	Thone
Lloyd, Tenn.	Pease	Thornton
Long, La.	Pepper	Traxler
Long, Md.	Perkins	Treen
Lujan	Pickle	Trible
Luken	Pike	Tsongas
Lundine	Poage	Tucker
McClary	Pressler	Udall
McCloskey	Preyer	Ullman
McCormack	Price	Van Derlin
McDade	Pritchard	Vanik
McDonald	Pursell	Vento
McEwen	Quayle	Volkmer
McFall	Quie	Waggoner
McHugh	Quillen	Walgren
McKay	Rahall	Walker
McKinney	Rallsback	Walsh
Madigan	Rangel	Wampler
Maguire	Regula	Watkins
Mahon	Ross	Weaver
Mann	Rhodes	White
Markey	Rinaldo	Whitehurst
Marriott	Risenhoover	Whitely
Martin	Roberts	Whitten
Mathis	Robinson	Wilson, Bob
Mattox	Rodino	Wilson, C. H.
Mazzoli	Roe	Winn
Meeds	Rogers	Wirth
Metcalfe	Rooney	Wright
Meyner	Rose	Wyder
Micheli	Rostenkowski	Wylie
Mikulski	Rousslet	Yatron
Mikva	Rudd	Young, Fla.
Milford	Ruppe	Young, Mo.
Miller, Calif.	Russo	Young, Tex.
Miller, Ohio	Ryan	Zablocki
Mineta		Zeretti

NAYS—2

Roncallo

Runnels

NOT VOTING—44

Ambro	Gradison
Ashley	Harsha
Beard, Tenn.	Holtzman
Bellenson	Johnson, Calif.
Bingham	Koch
Blanchard	Krebs
Clawson, Del	Lehman
Conyers	Levitas
Cotter	Lott
Dent	Marks
Ellberg	Marlenee
Fascell	Richmond
Gilman	Rosenthal
Glickman	Royal
Goldwater	Scheuer

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Beard of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Stokes with Mr. Gradison.  
 Mr. Cotter with Mr. Whalen.  
 Ms. Holtzman with Mr. Bellenson.  
 Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Del Clawson.  
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. Gilman.  
 Mr. Richmond with Mr. Lott.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Harsha.  
 Mr. Wolf with Mr. Marlenee.  
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Glickman.  
 Mr. Koch with Mr. Krebs.  
 Mr. Ambro with Mr. Johnson of California.  
 Mr. Fasel with Mr. Goldwater.  
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Lehman.  
 Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Levitas.  
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Sisk.  
 Mr. Conyers with Mr. Vander Jagt.  
 Mr. Weiss with Mr. Ashley.  
 Mr. Waxman with Mr. Blanchard.  
 Mrs. Spellman with Mr. Marks.  
 Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Wiggins.  
 Mr. Solarz with Mr. Young of Alaska.

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

So the resolution was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3, MEDICARE-MEDICAID ANTI-FRAUD AND ABUSE AMENDMENTS**

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3) to strengthen the capability of the Government to detect, prosecute, and punish fraudulent activities under the medicare and medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIELSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? There was no objection.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 9005, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1978**

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9005) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman explain to us what this is all about?

Mr. NATCHER. The request, Mr. Speaker, is to send the District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 1978 to conference. The bill, as the gentleman from California knows, has passed the House. It passed the Senate this week. We are now ready to go to conference.

The conference will be held after the recess, and sometime after Tuesday of next week. The Senate has requested a conference. That is the purpose of the request this morning, to send it to conference.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Why is it necessary to send this bill to conference by unani-

mous-consent request instead of asking for an appropriate rule?

Mr. NATCHER. That is the usual procedure in all matters where we send bills to conference.

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

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that I had considered the possibility of offering a motion to instruct the conferees against the funding of the D.C. Civic Center, but in view of the decision of the other body overwhelmingly rejecting the funding by a wide margin, I see no point in doing that. I would suggest that the request is proper.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. NATCHER, GHALMO, CHARLES WILSON of Texas, MCKAY, MRS. BURKE of California, Messrs. BENJAMIN, MAHON, BURGNER, KEMP, and CEDERBERG.

There was no objection.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8309, NAVIGATION DEVELOPMENT ACT**

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 776 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 776

*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. 8309) authorizing certain public works on rivers for navigation, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Public Works and Transportation now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, said substitute shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI are hereby waived. No amendment to title II of said substitute, and no amendment in the nature of a substitute changing title II of said substitute shall be in order, except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. 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 New York (Mr. DELANEY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 776 provides for the consideration of H.R. 8309, the Navigation Development Act.

This is a modified, open rule, allowing amendments to titles I and III of the bill and prohibiting amendments to title II except by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Two hours is to be granted for general debate. The time is to be divided equally between the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the Committee on Ways and Means with majority and minority allotted time in the usual manner. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The bill is to be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule by title rather than by section. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and now printed in the bill as an original bill for purposes of amendment. No amendment to title II including an amendment in the nature of a substitute would be in order except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and such amendments would not be subject to amendment.

The resolution waives points of order under clause 7, rule XVI, relating to germaneness, for the amendment in the nature of a substitute. This is necessary because H.R. 8309 as introduced did not contain the provisions of title II which are included in the substitute.

The resolution further provides for a waiver of section 402(a) of the Budget and Impoundment Act so that the bill might be considered. This waiver is necessary because the bill contains an authorization for fiscal year 1978. The Congressional Budget Act would prohibit the consideration of any authorization for fiscal year 1978 which had not been reported on or before May 15, 1977. The bill H.R. 8309 was reported on July 28, 1977. Due to the unusual circumstances surrounding the consideration of this measure, the Budget Committee recommended and the Committee on Rules granted a waiver of section 402(a) of the Budget Act.

The specific budget violation in H.R. 8309 pertains to an authorization of \$432 million for the construction of a new Locks and Dam 26 on the Mississippi River. Previously, H.R. 5885, a bill containing an authorization identical to that found in H.R. 8309, was passed by the House on May 17, 1977. In the Senate this bill was amended on June 22, 1977, to provide for certain waterway