

trary to the letter and spirit of U.N. Resolution 242.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has always opposed annexation of territory by force of arms. It is a sound and revered principle from which the State of Israel should not be exempt. I hope and trust that the U.S. Government will demand that Prime Minister Begin drop the idea.

A PLEA FOR SUPPORT OF THE FARM BILL CONFERENCE REPORT

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

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the conference report on the farm bill. As a Member from an agricultural district, I can assure you that I realize that the farm bill is not the best possible bill for our Nation's diminishing farm community. Nonetheless the record of the conference deliberations shows that this bill is the best bill that could have been achieved under the circumstances. If this conference report is defeated, next year's outcome could well be worse.

What disturbs me is that opponents of the sugar provisions of the farm bill have reduced debate on the farm bill to a debate on sugar. This is an injustice to sugar, and an injustice to the other commodities that have an important stake in the farm bill. Despite the unsubstantiated figures predicting a dramatic price rise in sugar that appeared in Saturday's Washington Post, the fact remains that the sugar loan program in the farm bill is modest by any measure. The sugar program offers the consumer what he desires most—long-term insulation from the effects of rapid and dramatic price fluctuations.

If we examine the support levels provided for the major commodities—wheat, corn, peanuts, dairy, cotton, rice, and sugar—in this farm bill compared to the levels provided for in the 1977 farm bill, we find that the increase in the support level for sugar is by far the lowest. Furthermore, the sugar loan program will require no Government expenditure and thus, no cost to the taxpayer.

I want to remind my colleagues that this bill also authorizes the food stamp program which will benefit the needy of our Nation. You will recall that the authorization provided for food stamps in the continuing resolution will only extend until March 31, whereas the authorization provided in the farm bill will extend for 4 years. I hope my urban colleagues will keep this in mind as they consider their support for the bill.

APPROVAL OF 1981 FARM BILL IS NEEDED

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, it has been asserted that passage of the 1981 farm bill is not necessary for carrying out the food stamp program through the 1982 fiscal year. I am quite concerned, because that simply is not the case. The level of funding authorized for the food stamp program by the farm bill for the 1982 fiscal year is \$11.3 billion. That figure was arrived at on a bipartisan basis with the approval of the administration. The continuing resolution would fund the program only through August 15 at a level of \$10.3 billion. A reauthorization and supplemental appropriation would be required to fund the program for the balance of the year. In the current climate, with unemployment rising and continued suggestions emanating from the administration for further cuts in the program, those who believe in an effective food stamp program would be ill advised to rely on the continuing resolution and then some further possible action by Congress as an adequate safeguard for the program. The farm bill guarantees the program against any further cuts for the balance of the year and a very important proviso protects energy assistance benefits for the poor located in cold weather areas of the country. Further, the farm bill contains a series of provisions fashioned on a bipartisan basis to protect the program from fraud and abuse, particularly on the part of organized crime and through other large-scale illegal activities, which go well beyond recipient fraud.

The farm bill will go far toward protecting the program from those who would rob it, while insuring continued food assistance for those who truly need it. The continuing resolution would, of course, not achieve these worthy objectives.

MARINE PROTECTION, RESEARCH, AND SANCTUARIES ACT OF 1972 AMENDMENTS

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1003) to amend title III of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, to authorize appropriations for such title for fiscal years 1982 and 1983, with a Senate amendment to the House amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, of the House engrossed amendment to the text of the bill, strike out "such sums as may be necessary" and insert "not to exceed \$2,235,000".

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment to the House amendments be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I would like to have the chairman of the committee explain the bill, and I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1003 contains authorizations of \$2,235 million for each of fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the implementation of title III of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.

Title III of the act creates the national marine sanctuaries program which requires the Secretary of Commerce, with the President's approval, to designate a marine sanctuary. Specific characteristics such as conservation, recreational, ecological or esthetic value, must be evident in the area. Often these areas are a popular recreation spot or harbor valuable fisheries and oil and gas resources; consequently, a designated sanctuary site can benefit greatly from a well-balanced and integrated management program of research, monitoring, education, recreation, resource exploitation, long-term planning, and regulation. There are presently six such sanctuaries designated which protect unique habitats such as coral reefs, delicate bay and island communities, and a historic Civil War vessel.

On July 13, S. 1003 was amended by the House to provide \$2,235 million for fiscal year 1982 and such sums that may be necessary for fiscal year 1983. On Friday, December 11, the Senate amended S. 1003 with the current authorization figures I am presenting today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this authorization in order that the national marine sanctuaries program may continue its efforts for the balanced protection of the marine environment.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the committee chairman.

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

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1003, as passed by the Senate with an amendment.

This bill would reauthorize title III of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 at a level of \$2.235 million.

The marine sanctuaries program, administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—establishes a process for designating unique marine areas which deserve varying degrees and types of protection as marine sanctuaries. Two of the early marine sanctuaries designated off the coast of the United States include, first, the U.S.S. *Monitor* site; and, second, the Key Largo Coral Reef Sanctuary. More recently, four additional sanctuaries have been designated.

There has been considerable confusion between the two bodies in efforts to resolve the difference between the two versions of this legislation. The House-passed version contained "such sums as may be necessary" for fiscal year 1983, while the Senate version contained level funding at \$2.235 million for fiscal year 1983.

During attempts to resolve this difference, some of the Republican Members have been alleged to be holding up the bill, while this is really not the case. It was Mr. PRITCHARD who offered the compromise amendment which included the "such sums" language during our committee's consideration of the bill. However, to my knowledge, none of the Republicans have objected to level funding this program.

There has, however, been a considerable range of differences between the majority members of our committee. Several would prefer a higher level for the outyear funding. Others would have preferred lower funds for the outyear, and this has led to considerable delay in reaching a compromise on this bill.

I would like to reiterate that I have no problem whatsoever with level funding for this program, and I would support this reauthorization at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1003, as amended by the other body. This bill would reauthorize the title III of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 at a level of \$2.235 million. The House had originally authorized the program for \$2.235 million for fiscal year 1982 and for such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1983. However, recently officials within OMB have indicated

that they support level funding for the marine sanctuaries program for fiscal year 1983. Therefore, I see no problem in concurring with the other body's amendment which would level fund this program for 2 fiscal years.

The marine sanctuaries program provides a mechanism for the designation of unique marine areas which require certain types of protection based on an areawide focus. To some extent, the concept of designating marine sanctuaries for the protection and management of unique marine areas could be compared to our system for the designation of national parks on land.

Examples of marine sanctuaries which have been designated include the Key Largo Coral Reef Sanctuary, a sanctuary for the protection of the U.S.S. *Monitor* site, Looe Key, Grays Reef off Georgia, and the two most recent marine sanctuaries whose regulations are still pending including the Point Reyes and the Channel Islands marine sanctuary off California.

Mr. Speaker, this has been an effective marine resource management program which deserves to be continued at level funding. There may be some additional sites considered for marine sanctuary designation in the future, but I do not believe that this program should get too carried away in designating vast areas of the ocean as marine sanctuaries, as was envisioned during one period of the prior administration. This is an important program for the protection of unique marine characteristics and resources, once a clear need for their protection has been established. Also, it is required by statute that the activities which are to be regulated pursuant to the marine sanctuary designation be spelled out clearly in advance of the actual designation.

Mr. Speaker, if administered wisely, this is an important program which should be reauthorized at this time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members who wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill, S. 1003.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1315

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4209, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1982

Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4209), making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 13, 1981.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BENJAMIN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we present to the House the conference report on H.R. 4029, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for 1982. Because of the action of the House on the continuing resolution, I will offer a motion which will conform the amounts recommended in our conference agreement to those contained in the OMB substitute offered by Mr. CONTE and passed by the House.

While I did not vote for this substitute bill Thursday, I agree with the statements made by both our full committee chairman, Mr. WHITEN, and our ranking minority member, Mr. CONTE, that we should pass the regular appropriation bills rather than operate under a continuing resolution. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support this conference agreement and the motions which will conform this agreement to the OMB substitute continuing resolution.

I include a summary table: