

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Technical Amendments (1983-1984)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts
and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996)

2-21-1984

Technical Amendments (1983-1984): Report 05

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_72

Recommended Citation

"Technical Amendments (1983-1984): Report 05" (1984). *Technical Amendments (1983-1984)*. Paper 4.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_72/4https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_72/4

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Technical Amendments (1983-1984) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

piece of legislation that comes on this floor. We had one up in the Rules Committee this morning, a good program, because it dealt with foreign languages. We need it. The gentleman from Illinois was up there testifying on it. We need it, but the question is whether or not it ought to be back with the States where it rightfully belongs, or whether we ought to take it on down here in Washington and add to our deficits.

We could certainly do it in Ohio, where they have increased our income taxes under the Celeste administration, with a Democratic-controlled House and Senate back there by 90 percent. They have got the money. We do not have the money here in Washington to do it. It is a question of where the responsibility adequately belongs.

We cannot do everything down here for everybody. We cannot do everything that Fritz Mondale is telling the American people to get those votes. We cannot do everything for everybody, just like the President of the United

States cannot do it. I heard that guff far too often. We have to sit down on that and try to come up with a budget that will get all support and save this country economically while we have the time to do it.

□ 1300

That is what we are talking about and hopefully that will come about.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman from Ohio to know that it has been my great pleasure to sit over here for the last 20 minutes and hear his articulate and erudite discussion of the fiscal affairs of this Nation. If we have no more speakers over there, 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE HENRY A. WAXMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 13, 1984.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to inform you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that my district office was served with a deposition subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of California. I will, in consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk of the House, make the determinations required by Rule L(50).

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House of the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

February 10, 1984.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. I will, in consultation with my General Counsel, make the determinations required by Rule L(50).

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 351 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2751.

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. 2751, to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes, with Mr. GLICKMAN 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 Illinois (Mr. SIMON) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON).

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

(Mr. SIMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Chairman, what we are doing here is basically making some technical changes. We are bringing up the authorization to the levels that are more realistic, that comply with appropriations and comply at least in a small part with need.

The reality is that arts are a help to the economy of this country. The reality is we are going to be remembered as a civilization someday not for the bombers we build or the tanks we make or the ribbons of concrete with which we sometimes brutalize the landscape. We are going to be remembered for other things, and this touches on those other things.

We as a Nation on a per capita basis spend much less than the other democracies. I am pleased to say I be-

lieve this bill is noncontroversial and passed out of committee unanimously.

I rise in support of H.R. 2751, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1983.

H.R. 2751 has two purposes. First, the bill makes technical amendments to the Museum Services Act of 1976 and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965. These amendments will transfer the Institute of Museum Services from the Department of Education to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. Although the de facto transfer was accomplished in the fiscal year 1982 and fiscal year 1983 Interior Appropriations bills, the authorization legislation has not been amended. Without these changes, the Director of IMS is required to report to the Secretary of Education as if the Institute were still within the Department. Also without these changes, the Director of the Institute is not eligible to serve on the Advisory Panel for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. H.R. 2751 amends the enabling statutes of both the Institute and the Foundation to recognize the transfer of IMS.

H.R. 2751 also amends the 1980 amendments to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and the Museum Services Acts to provide higher authorizations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985. The authorizations for all three agencies within the Foundation have been held level for the past two fiscal years. At the same time, the 1981 Reconciliation Act and the 1982 and 1983 Interior Appropriations have exceeded authorization levels. H.R. 2751 recognizes the support the Endowments and IMS have received from Congress during the past two years and raises the authorizations to more closely conform to actual appropriations.

Cultural support is an investment, returning far more to local economics than it costs. For example, for every \$1 spent on cultural activities, at least \$4 is spent on related activities such as transportation, lodging, and restaurants. A February 1983 study of the New York area credited the arts with over 110,000 jobs and an infusion of \$5.6 billion into the local economy. Funding for the arts is good business and it is important to our spirit as a Nation.

The administration has informed us that they have no objection to H.R. 2751. I urge you to vote for this bill.

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

Mr. SIMON. I am pleased to yield to the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. First I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON)

who has spent so much time in bringing this bill to the floor and working out a much better program than we have had in the past. It has been my privilege to support the legislation from day one and observe these improvements throughout the years.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2751, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act Amendments of 1983. The major purposes of the bill are:

To recognize the transfer from the Department of Education of the Institute for Museum Services as an independent agency within the Foundation; and

To provide funding authorizations for 1984 and 1985 for the Foundation programs.

The transfer of the Institute for Museum Services was accomplished in fact by fiscal years 1982 and 1983 Interior appropriation bills, but conforming changes in the original statutes for the Institute and the National Foundation are needed to recognize the transfer of the Institute from the Department of Education to the Foundation as a member agency.

H.R. 2751 raises the authorization ceilings for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute of Museum Services to more closely conform to the actual appropriations provided by the Congress. This bill recognizes the additional support the Endowments and the Institute for Museum Services have received from Congress during the last 2 years.

Established in 1965, the National Endowment for the Arts has provided funds and services to local nonprofit groups and individuals in such fields as folk art, literature, media art, dance, theatre, opera, and visual arts. Also, created in 1965 was the National Endowment for the Humanities to provide similar support in such fields as history, philosophy, languages, linguistics, archeology, and certain aspects of the social sciences. The newcomer to the Foundation, the Institute for Museum Services, authorized in 1976, provides matching grants to museums, botanical gardens, aquariums, and zoos. I have supported these programs from their inception, and I continue to support them as one important means of improving the quality of the arts and humanities and sharing these treasures with more and more Americans, especially the youth of this country.

It is important for all of us to realize the tremendous value of the arts, humanities and museum services, not only in deepening our understanding of our culture and history and enhancing the quality of life for our citizens, but to recognize the value of the economic impact these programs have on the local community. While these dollar amounts are usually small, their impact on the local community is not.

Cultural support is a wise investment of Government dollars for a

number of reasons. Witnesses have testified before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, chaired by my distinguished colleague Representative PAUL SIMON, that dollars spent on the arts generate nonart dollars in businesses such as restaurants, lodging, and transportation at a rate of at least \$4 for every \$1 spent on cultural activities. Also the impact of cultural activity on the tourism industry is significant, and tourism is an important source of revenues for the States. The jobs and increased revenues stimulated by the arts activities are returned to the Treasury in taxes, more than returning Government's original investment. It is a good program, that works well and makes sense.

The National Endowments work to preserve art forms that are typically American from all parts of the Nation. In my own State of Kentucky the National Endowment for the Arts has provided grants to the Appleshop Crafts program where Kentucky craftspeople are provided with living, working, and exhibition space. Appleshop provides the means for the continuation of Kentucky crafts, the protection of our cultural history, and the opportunity for sharing our American heritage.

The National Endowment for the Arts also provides grants to the Louisville New Playwrights, a theatre organization devoted to producing plays by unknown talents, giving them a place to begin their artistic careers. If the appreciative audiences, and fine critical reviews are not enough to show the success of the program, the Pulitzer Prize winning works should be. The future generation of theatregoers will be provided with quality works, because the funds are available from the Government to encourage these young artists now.

These two programs in Kentucky are an indication of how the Foundation and Institute can exemplify both the past and the future of artistic achievement, and programs of this type are being nurtured and developed with support from the NEA, NEH, and IMS in every State in the Union.

On May 19 the full Committee on Education and Labor, which I am privileged to chair, marked up H.R. 2751 and reported the bill by voice vote. In doing so, the committee renewed and reaffirmed our national commitment to the survival of the arts, the humanities, and museum services for our Nation. H.R. 2751 strengthens the National Foundation and Institute in several ways, but most importantly by increasing the authorization to keep pace with the Appropriations Committee. This is an important step toward acknowledging the value of the arts, humanities, and museums in our society. However, even with the proposed increases the United States is far behind many other countries in terms of support for the arts and humanities and museums. We have tremendous talent in the

United States that needs to be encouraged and nourished, not slighted by a shortsighted policy.

I am pleased that H.R. 2751 is before the House today and that we have the opportunity to take a leadership role in acknowledging that not only is it appropriate for Government to provide the means to stimulate cultural growth and greatness, it is a necessary and proper role. I urge all of you to join the Committee on Education and Labor in passing this beneficial legislation for the preservation of our cultural heritage, as well as to provide opportunities for our continued growth in artistic development.

Mr. SIMON. I thank the chairman of the full committee.

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

Mr. SIMON. At this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON) for his extensive and committed work in this area. But for his leadership and commitment, I am not so sure that the National Endowment for the Arts would fare as well.

I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, I had intended to offer two related amendments to this bill aimed at combating the use of National Endowment Funds for programs or projects which promote stereotyping or in any way serve to denigrate any ethnic, racial, religious, or minority group.

My amendments were prompted by a recent disclosure that the endowment had provided some \$40,000 to the Virginia Opera Association which included funds for a modern production of "Rigoletto" which contained an advertisement campaign patently offensive to the Italian-American community.

It was also prompted by a second disclosure that the Endowment is also providing some \$850,000 in funds to assist the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City's Lincoln Center conduct its current season. Included in their schedule is another modern version of "Rigoletto" to be produced by the English National Opera Company. Here again the change in theme from the 15th century to Little Italy in the 1950's and words such as *las-cosa nostra* are introduced into the lyrics.

I have called upon the Chairman of the Endowment to take steps to combat this problem but as of yet without success yet I consider the issue to be worthy of further investigation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in recognition of the substantive and serious impact of these amendments on Endowment activities I would be willing

not to offer them with an assurance that you will authorize a hearing of your subcommittee as soon as possible to investigate these and other known cases of Endowment Funds being inappropriately used for these purposes as well as to explore ways to avert future incidents.

I will be happy to yield to the chairman who hopefully will provide me with that assurance.

Mr. SIMON. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I am pleased to give him that assurance. It is a sensitive, delicate area.

Clearly the gentleman does not want and I do not want censorship, and that is not what you are asking for. At the same time, we want to make sure that Federal funds are not used to denigrate any nationality, race, any creed, and that is what the gentleman is interested in and what I am interested in.

I have had a brief discussion with the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts about this problem and we will hold hearings. I can assure the gentleman from New York, to see if there is not some way, without having Federal censorship or anything like that, that we can send a signal to all who receive any funds that we do not want these funds to be used in any way to in any way put down any nationality, any race, any creed, any group of people.

Mr. BIAGGI. I want to thank the chairman for that assurance. I am not surprised by his response because it is consistent with his whole philosophy of life, and we are grateful to him for that assurance. His point about censorship is well taken. It has never been my intention to invoke any form of Federal censorship. However, I maintain in the strongest possible terms that it is a blatant misuse of Federal tax dollars if it serves to offend any group of citizens from our great Nation.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

(Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2751, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act Amendments of 1983.

Mr. Chairman, this bill makes technical amendments to effect the transfer of the Institute of Museum Services (IMS) from the Department of Education to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, increases the authorization levels for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the IMS to be consistent with fiscal year 1984 appropriations.

Also, I am offering an amendment to H.R. 2751 to establish a national medal of arts. The national medal of arts would be awarded by the President to no more than 12 individuals or

groups a year who make outstanding contributions to the arts in the United States. The National Council on the Arts, a congressionally mandated body within NEA, would select the recipients of the medal, and all costs would be borne by NEA. Recipients of the award could be artists or patrons. The idea of the national medal of arts was conceived by the President's Task Force on the Arts and Humanities after being charged by the President with finding a way to reward contributions to the arts by performing artists and supporters.

The costs associated with this medal are to be borne by the NEA from its administrative budget. To have the medals made by a private firm—which is less costly than by the U.S. Mint—and to account for administrative time on the part of the National Council members, will cost, according to NEA, less than \$25,000 the first year, and less than \$16,000 each following year.

This national medal of arts will be a small way of saying thanks to our American artists and to patrons of the arts.

The administration has indicated its support of this bill, and the inclusion of the amendment establishing a national medal of arts was a direct request of the NEA Chairman and the President.

I want to thank my good friend from Illinois, Mr. SIMON, for his willingness to work with this side of the aisle on this bill and for his support of the national medal of arts. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2751.

□ 1310

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORRADA).

(Mr. CORRADA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2751, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act.

The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and the Institute for Museum Services have been charged with encouraging and supporting national progress and scholarship in the humanities and in the arts, recognizing that while this is primarily an activity of the private sector, there remains a role for the Federal Government in its advancement.

H.R. 2751 would provide authority for the continuation of these programs through fiscal year 1985, and would make technical amendments to the existing act to reflect the 1982 transfer of the Institute of Museum Services to the National Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments are not controversial. Members on both sides of the aisle recognize the value of our investment in arts and humanities programs, which return \$4 in spending for each dollar invested in a cultural event. In most instances, only a small portion of even that

dollar investment comes from Federal sources, as these grants attract private contributions in ratios of up to \$6 private for each public dollar.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this simple, technical extension of the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities and to vote in favor of passage of the bill.

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

In addition to being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and an influential member of this body, he also chairs the Congressional Caucus on the Arts.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2751 and congratulate both the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) for the work they have done. I also want to pay special recognition to the gentleman from Illinois who serves as an executive board member as well of the Arts Caucus and is known throughout this country for his unique and valuable contributions to the arts in America.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to serve now as caucus chairman for almost 2 years and it is with excitement and pleasure that I report to you on the tremendous increase in artistic activity in this country as a result of the money that this Government has set aside for the arts since 1965. There is just no question that the imprimatur of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Arts serves to stimulate more private money, more corporate money for the arts. And with the help of Mr. SIMON and Mr. YATES, the subcommittee chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations, we have managed, this Congress has, to provide the necessary fuel for the artistic fire in this country. There is just no doubt that as we age as a society we begin to recognize the value of arts and science to this society.

Where would we be without the thriving dance communities that we have; the orchestral groups; things like "Hall Walls" in Buffalo that encourage young artists to participate and show their works? All of this is a response to the role that the National Government has played.

Again, I want to add my strong words of support to the work the gentleman from Illinois has done and to make sure my colleagues recognize the critical role the Endowment on Humanities and Museum Services has played to the cultural and social development of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2751, legislation sponsored by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, who is also a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus Executive Board.

Since 1965, the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities have maintained strong bipartisan

support throughout all Republican and Democratic administrations. In 1981, these agencies even received a stamp of approval from the Reagan administration's Task Force on the Arts and Humanities. That report stated that the endowments "are sound and should remain as originally conceived." But, in each budget proposed by the Reagan administration, NEA and NEH were slated for funding cuts—and the Institute of Museum Services was proposed to be eliminated. Furthermore, in the Reconciliation Act of 1981 the authorization levels of all three agencies were drastically lowered.

Congress, however, led by Mr. YATES, his subcommittee, and a growing number of Arts Caucus members, fought to hold appropriations for NEA, NEH, and IMS to levels which allow the agencies to maintain their leadership in America's artistic community.

Consequently, for the past several years, appropriations for NEA, NEH, and IMS have been higher than their authorization levels. H.R. 2751 merely brings past legislation in line with current congressional decisions. In addition, the bill transfers the IMS from the Education Department to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities—a more appropriate administrative position for the third important partner in our Federal support program for our Nation's cultural activities.

I urge approval of the bill and commend Mr. SIMON for his outstanding work on behalf of the arts and humanities in America.

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2751, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act Amendments of 1983. This bill renews a commitment by the Federal Government to continue its important role in promoting and protecting our Nation's cultural and artistic resources.

Specifically, the bill would authorize an increase in funding for the current fiscal year for programs in the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute for Museum Services. This increase is approximately 16 percent higher than the amount provided for the programs in the preceding 2 years. In addition, the bill would transfer the Institute of Museum Services from the Department of Education to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities which will facilitate the coordination and communication among the three agencies.

The endowments were established in 1965, and between 1965 and 1980 our Nation experienced a virtual explosion of the arts and humanities. Within the short span of 15 years, professional symphony orchestras increased sixfold; professional theater groups grew tenfold; and the number of dance companies expanded from 30 to 400. For the first time, we as a nation have

come closer to insuring that access to our Nation's vast cultural resources are not determined by economic or geographic circumstances.

In the glow of this enormously successful and relatively inexpensive Federal venture, President Reagan initiated deep cuts in 1981, through the Gramm-Latta Reconciliation Act. These cuts reduced by almost half the authorization level that was established for the arts and humanities programs by the 1980 reauthorization bill. The higher authorization levels, established by the 1980 reauthorization, had been overwhelmingly adopted in the House by voice vote. Actual funding for the programs has exceeded these low levels, but has remained constant for the past 2 years. In effect, this is a reduction in funding given the impact of inflation.

We cannot afford to reduce Federal support for these programs and weaken their effectiveness. We have been enriched through the creative energies of our most talented individuals, and through their works we are provided a clearer vision of ourselves and of our Nation. No less important, the arts and humanities stimulate and strengthen economic growth in our communities. For every dollar spent on cultural activities, a minimum of \$4 more is spent on related activities such as transportation, lodging, and restaurants that will bolster local economies. The Federal share is only a small fraction of the total amount spent on the arts. "Seed" money provided by the Federal Government can be the single catalyst needed to revitalize an entire urban area. My own State, Michigan, still in the process of recovering from the worst economic crisis experienced since the Great Depression, needs these programs more than ever to help rekindle its spirit and foster economic growth.

H.R. 2751 would unequivocally reaffirm support for the arts and humanities. It would rescind the legislation which enacted cuts in 1981 and would authorize funding for the current fiscal year at levels more in line with the amounts already appropriated. I am very pleased that this bill has bipartisan support and hope for its early enactment.

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, the purposes of H.R. 2751 are wonderful. I am pleased that all the amendments have been worked out in advance.

I have supported the National Endowment for the Arts since I came to this House. I still do. But increases of the amount contemplated in H.R. 2751 should not be passed, at a time when most Members are lecturing each other, and their constituents, about the deficit.

No element of our budget should be increased by the huge percentages called for in H.R. 2751.

Passage of this bill will merely reinforce what the people have always known. The Congress will never tight-

en the budget belt for any of its past programs.

I have no objection to increasing the authorization for the National Endowment for the Arts by the amount that the entire budget is increased. I have no such similar affection for the Endowment for the Humanities, a program which delivers little of use to the people.

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2751, the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities Amendments. This legislation authorizes funding for the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities, and it transfers the Institute of Museum Services to the jurisdiction of the Foundation. In doing so, H.R. 2751 further legitimizes the Foundation as an institution crucial to the growth of arts and humanities in America.

Since this body created the Foundation as an independent executive agency in 1965, it has played an important role in the expansion of arts and humanities throughout communities across this Nation. The Foundation provides leadership to all those involved in the arts and humanities by serving as their advocate and as a source of information.

Because the Foundation is a catalyst for private activity, it is especially successful in promoting American cultural endeavors. Through matching and challenge grants, apprenticeships, and fellowships, the Foundation encourages private citizens to study and enjoy all aspects of American culture.

By transferring the Institute of Museum Services from the Education Department to the jurisdiction of the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities, this legislation insures the coordination necessary to effectively promote activity in this field.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I must reiterate my strong support for the adoption of this bill. The Foundation must continue to provide opportunity for artists, intellectuals, and audiences to expand their creativity and enjoyment throughout America.

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion to express my strong support of H.R. 2751 to increase the authorization levels for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the Institute for Museum Services (IMS). The measure simply brings the authorization levels in line with the appropriations that have been enacted for fiscal year 1984.

When the existing authorization levels were set in the Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Gramm-Latta II), the administration argued that the private sector would more than make up for cuts in the arts and humanities. But corporations and foundations soon found themselves swamped with demands from many social service groups that were also suffering from Federal cutbacks. The small proportion of private sector giving that goes

to the arts has tended to focus on large, well-established institutions. And State and local governments have been unable to stretch their limited resources to provide greater funding of the arts.

Moreover, struggles by arts groups to become more financially independent often prove counterproductive. Strenuous fundraising diverts energy from creative efforts. Higher admissions prices shut out the people on limited budgets, undermining one of the NEA's original purposes—to open the arts to a wider audience.

The fact is that arts organizations have no place else to turn. If we are going to encourage and strengthen our Nation's artistic and cultural life, then we absolutely must support strong Federal funding for the arts.

H.R. 2751 is one more step in the effort to restore the Federal commitment to the arts and to help the arts community recover from the recession and earlier budget cuts.

It clearly merits the support of this House.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if there is no other time to be taken by the majority, the minority would yield back the balance of its time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2751

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act Amendments of 1983".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

SEC. 2. The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 951 et seq.) is amended by striking out the first section thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE I—ENDOWMENTS FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This title may be cited as the 'National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965'."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 951) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively, and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) that museums are vital to the preservation of our cultural heritage and should be supported in their role as curator of our national consciousness";

ENTITIES WITHIN FOUNDATION

SEC. 4. (a) Section 4(a) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 953(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and a Federal Council" and inserting in lieu thereof "A Federal Council"; and

(2) by inserting "and an Institute of Museum Services" before "(hereinafter established)".

(b) Section 4(b) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 953(b)) is amended by inserting "and for institutions which preserve the cultural heritage of the United States" after "United States".

CONTINUITY OF MEMBERSHIP OF NATIONAL COUNCILS

SEC. 5. (a) Section 6(c) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(c)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, a member shall serve after the expiration of his term until his successor takes office."

(b) Section 8(c) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 957(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provisions of this subsection, a member shall serve after the expiration of his term until his successor takes office."

MEMBERSHIP OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SEC. 6. (a) Section 9(b) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 958(b)) is amended by inserting "the Director of the Institute of Museum Services," after "Humanities."

(b) Section 9(c)(4) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 958(c)(4)) is amended by striking out "and the Institute of Museum Services".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Section 11(a) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 960(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—
(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking out "\$154,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and \$170,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$128,500,000 for fiscal year 1984, and such sums as may be necessary"; and
(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking out "\$152,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and \$167,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$127,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and such sums as may be necessary";

(2) in paragraph (2)—
(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking out "\$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and \$22,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and such sums as may be necessary";
(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking out "\$16,500,000 for fiscal year 1984, and \$18,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$11,500,000 for fiscal year 1984, and such sums as may be necessary"; and
(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking out "\$38,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and \$40,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$28,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and such sums as may be necessary"; and
(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking out "\$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and \$44,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and such sums as may be necessary";

(b) Section 11(d) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 960(d)) is amended by inserting "under this title" after "made".

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 8. With funds made available to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts

and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts shall exercise the Chairman's authority under such Act to make grants, in an aggregate amount of not less than \$500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1984 and 1985, to groups in the District of Columbia which are of national significance and which receive no funds under any program administered by the Secretary of the Interior or by any entity established within the Department of the Interior.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM SERVICES

SEC. 9. Section 203 of the Museum Services Act (20 U.S.C. 962) is amended by striking out "within the Department of Education" and inserting in lieu thereof "within the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities".

NATIONAL MUSEUM SERVICES BOARD

SEC. 10. (a) Section 204(a)(2) of the Museum Services Act (20 U.S.C. 963(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—
(A) in clause (iii) by inserting "and" at the end thereof;

(B) in clause (iv) by striking out "and" and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and
(C) by striking out clause (v), and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking out "clause (v)" and inserting in lieu thereof "clause (iv)".

(b) Section 204(b) of the Museum Services Act (20 U.S.C. 963(b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, a member shall serve after the expiration of his term of office until his successor takes office."

(c) Section 204(c) of the Museum Services Act (20 U.S.C. 963(c)) is amended by striking out "Eight" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in subsection (d)(2), eight".

(d) Section 204(d)(2) of the Museum Services Act (20 U.S.C. 963(d)(2)) is amended by striking out "eight" and inserting in lieu thereof "seven".

CONFORMING AMENDMENT

SEC. 11. Section 205(a)(2) of the Museum Services Act (20 U.S.C. 964(a)(2)) is amended by striking out the first sentence.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. Section 209(a) of the Museum Services Act (20 U.S.C. 967(a)) is amended by striking out "\$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, and \$45,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$13,490,000 for fiscal year 1984, and such sums as may be necessary."

REPEALERS

SEC. 13. Sections 521, 523, and 524 of subtitle A of the Omnibus Education Reconciliation Act of 1981 are repealed.

Mr. SIMON. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIMON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMON: Page 6, strike out lines 4 through 15 (and redesignate succeeding sections accordingly).

Page 8, line 5, strike out "\$13,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,150,000".

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, this basically has two portions.

First, it changes the museum authorization to conform to actual appropriations.

Second, it strikes, on page 6, a section that has some opposition from the administration. I had discussed this with my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. YATES, who was on the floor just a few minutes ago, who has provided just exceptional leadership in this whole field of the arts and humanities and all of us in Congress and in the Nation are indebted to him for his leadership. But I think we can work out some problems that do exist for the Washington Performing Arts Society and some other groups when it comes up to appropriations. As far as I know, there is no controversy on this amendment.

I move its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLEMAN OF MISSOURI

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri: Page 8, after line 10, insert the following new section:

NATIONAL MEDAL OF ARTS

Sec. 14. (a) There is hereby established a National Medal of Arts, which shall be a medal of such design as is deemed appropriate by the President, on the basis of recommendations submitted by the National Council on the Arts, and which shall be awarded as provided in subsection (b).

(b)(1) The President shall from time to time award the National Medal of Arts, on the basis of recommendations from the National Council on the Arts, to individuals or groups who in the President's judgment are deserving of special recognition by reason of their outstanding contributions to the excellence, growth, support, and availability of the arts in the United States.

(2) Not more than twelve of such medals may be awarded in any calendar year.

(3) An individual may be awarded the National Medal of Arts only if at the time such award is made such individual—

(A) is a citizen or other national of the United States; or

(B) is an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence who (i) has filed an application or petition for naturalization in the manner prescribed by section 334 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and (ii) is not permanently ineligible to become a citizen of the United States.

(4) A group may be awarded the National Medal of Arts only if such group is organized or incorporated in the United States.

(5) The presentation of the National Medal of Arts shall be made by the President with such ceremonies as the President may deem proper, including attendance by appropriate Members of Congress.

(c) Funds made available to the National Endowment for the Arts shall be used to carry out this section.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent

that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. This is the amendment I discussed in my opening statement. It would create a National Medal of the Arts, to be given by the President on the recommendation of the National Council on Arts, to give to patrons and artists in this country recognition for their contributions to the arts. I do not think it is controversial. It has the support of the administration.

Mr. SIMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman. I commend the gentleman from Missouri for this amendment. It does not add any increased authorization to the bill, no increased cost to the bill. I think it is a very worthy thing and I am pleased to urge support of it.

□ 1320

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDEE: Page 8, after line 10, insert the following new section:

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS

Sec. 15. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) enter into a long-term agreement with the College of Santa Fe, Santa Fe, New Mexico, to provide educational facilities for the use of, and to develop cooperative educational/arts programs to be carried out with the postsecondary fine arts and museum services programs of, the Institute of American Indian Arts administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs,

(2) conduct such activities as are necessary to improve the facilities used by the Institute of American Indian Arts at Santa Fe College, and

(3) provide museum facilities in Santa Fe, New Mexico, for the benefit of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

(b) Subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1984.

Mr. KILDEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a long-term agreement with the College of Santa Fe in Santa Fe, N. Mex., to provide educational facilities for the use of the Institute of American Indian Arts administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The Secretary is also directed to upgrade the facilities used by the Insti-

tute, particularly studio and museum facilities, and to develop cooperative educational arts programs. This would also allow for the transfer of remaining Institute programs which are presently located on the campus of the Santa Fe Indian School operated by the All Indian Pueblo Council.

This amendment is not a new authorization or program. It simply stabilizes the existing arrangement whereby the Institute of American Indian Arts leases facilities on a year-by-year basis. Authority for the funds for the Institute already exist, as this is an ongoing program. Facility plans also currently exist including plans for a museum facility, which will be submitted in the course of the Bureau of Indian Affairs budget request. This is not an entitlement and any funds would be subjected to an appropriation.

The existing relationship with the College of Santa Fe has proved extremely beneficial to the Institute, which has been given the full use of library, gymnasium, and support facilities. Furthermore, the students of both schools have benefited greatly by a liberal program exchange policy, which has allowed Indian students to take academic courses to augment their artistic training. The amendment has the backing of both institutions and is in conformance with the goals of the Board of Directors of the Institute. In addition, when implemented, the amendment will help insure the proper maintenance and preservation of one of our Nation's primary collections of Native American art, a collection whose current condition and housing is a national disgrace.

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

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support. It seems to me this is a sensible amendment. It also calls attention to an area where, frankly, we, as a Nation, have not done what we could in the way of doing more than just keeping native Americans in almost a welfare state.

I appreciate the work that my colleague from Michigan and my colleague from Missouri did on the tribally controlled college bill.

We have made some steps forward—and this is another step forward. I commend the gentleman. I think it is an excellent amendment.

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

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment to H.R. 2751, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1983, offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr.

KILDEE), to make permanent the current cooperative relationship between the College of Santa Fe in my district in New Mexico and the Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA).

The College of Santa Fe and the IAIA are in the third year of a contract agreement that permits the IAIA to share a number of facilities with the College of Santa Fe. The IAIA was forced to vacate their previous site to make room for a new Indian school. The IAIA provides a unique, rich, and historically significant artistic contribution to an already culturally diverse campus. Santa Fe College students are given the opportunity to take art courses taught by IAIA instructors. Conversely, IAIA students take a number of the outstanding humanities courses that are offered at the College of Santa Fe. This cultural and educational exchange has proven to be extremely beneficial for the College of Santa Fe, the IAIA, as well as the entire Santa Fe community. Strong support for a continuing relationship between these two fine institutions is shared by both schools and the community.

Mr. Chairman, not only does the IAIA benefit from being located in an academic setting, the institute benefits financially as well. Possible alternative sites for the IAIA have been thoroughly explored over the past few years and each alternative would be more costly and logistically impractical for the institute.

The Santa Fe Indian School, which currently houses the IAIA museum and a couple of IAIA studios, strongly supports making the arrangement between the College of Santa Fe and the IAIA permanent provided that other programs at the Santa Fe Indian School are left intact.

Finally, a permanent relationship between the college and the institute would allow for long-term planning. Presently, the college has available land for the construction and eventual expansion of an IAIA art museum. However, without the knowledge of a permanent relationship, no substantive planning for the building of the museum is feasible.

Mr. Chairman, as the old saying goes, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." The current relationship between the College of Santa Fe and the Institute of American Indian Arts works well and to the benefit of all those involved. It only makes sense to make this relationship permanent so that the two institutions can begin to plan for the future and build on their current success.

I urge Members to vote for this amendment and for final passage of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act. I want to again take this opportunity to thank my colleague from Michigan for offering this amendment and to commend him for his outstanding work and leadership on issues affecting native American education.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2751.

Federal support for the arts and humanities is not a frill. It is essential for maintaining our country's rich cultural life and fostering creativity and imagination among our citizens. And on a purely economic level, Federal dollars spent on the arts represent one of the best investments Government can make.

Every dollar given to the arts community by the National Endowment for the Arts, the primary vehicle for Federal support for the arts, has been matched by \$1 to \$3 of private support of earned income. In turn, every \$1 spent by the arts community returns between \$7 and \$12 in income to the community in the form of direct income, such as employment, and through the process that economists call the "multiplier effect"—the development of stores and restaurants, tourism, and neighborhood revitalization sparked by artistic activity.

In my district, performances at the newly renovated Shubert Theater in New Haven, Stratford's American Shakespeare Theater, the Yale Repertory Theater, the New Haven Symphony, and Long Wharf attract audiences from all over the Northeast. New Haven's Audubon Street renovation has encouraged new restaurants and stores and has provided the community with a center of cultural activity. These kinds of artistic endeavor have a direct impact on Connecticut's economy. In 1979, the most recent year for which I have seen statistics, audiences attending Connecticut cultural events spent \$25 million on goods and services other than admissions, resulting in a total economic impact of \$72 million. For 87 percent of those in the audiences, the cultural event was the primary reason for their being in the area—and 17 percent came from outside New England to attend.

Overall, in Connecticut, the nonprofit arts industry has an economic impact of over \$331 million. It provides more than 8,500 jobs. It spent a total of \$41.1 million (in 1978, the most recent year for which statistics are available), which led to a total economic of \$96.5 million within the State, and returned \$1.9 million in Federal income taxes and \$154,230 in State taxes.

This Congress has made it clear that we are not willing to accept the massive cutbacks that the administration has proposed since 1981. Last year, our appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

was substantially higher than the authorization level set by the Gramm-Latta Reconciliation Act of 1981. It is time that we established authorization levels that are more in line with what we have demonstrated we are willing to invest in the arts and humanities.

Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned about the Federal deficit, but the amounts we are talking about here are tiny fractions of 1 percent of the Federal budget. Eliminating Federal support for the arts entirely would have no noticeable impact on balancing the budget, but would have a tremendous cost in terms of lost jobs, development, and taxes.

My district contains the seventh poorest city in the country, New Haven. Bringing diverse kinds of people into the center city is essential for improving its economic health. We have seen that a strong Federal support for the arts can play a major role in stimulating economic revitalization in New Haven, elsewhere in the third Connecticut District, and in our Nation as a whole.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that there was not going to be any voting today, so I was not on the floor at the time the consideration of the request for the money for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act Amendments of 1983 was made in the House. The majority whip, Mr. Foley, assured us on February 9, page H691, that "we do not intend to schedule any legislation at this juncture."

As a result, I am not as well prepared to express my views on this legislation as I would like to be. But let me state the case as I see it. I am opposed to this legislation because the National Foundation on the Arts is an elitist organization. They are not interested in the efforts of small communities. The city of Schenectady, my home, for example, has conducted a very outstanding program for reviving art and music productions in the old Proctor's Theater. The community has raised over \$1 million for this purpose. Yet every time a list of grants and supporting funds come out from the Foundation, it is only the large cities, like New York or Philadelphia, or the world-famous Metropolitan Opera Company who get any attention. I think this is totally out of line. Previous administrations did not ignore small communities. If Congress is to authorize all this money then certainly there ought to be encouragement for the smaller communities, particularly in areas where funds are hard to come by.

If this record of elitism continues, I intend to oppose any appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, both in the House and in the other body. It is in the smaller communities of America where Federal funds can do the most good. We do not need to spend our tax dollars to make the rich richer. We need

to help those less renowned areas who are making herculean efforts to see that their people have a reasonable opportunity to see great artistic productions, just as can be done by the people of the city of New York.

I hope the conference committee will take this point into consideration.

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 pro tempore (Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut) having assumed the chair, Mr. GLICKMAN, 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. 2751), to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 351, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any 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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2751, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

IS THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REALLY GOING ABOUT THE NATION'S BUSINESS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I take a little time here today to call the attention of Members of the House to the fact that we are at 1:30 in the afternoon and have completed our legislative schedule again for today.

I raise this again, as I have on several previous occasions, to ask whether or not we are really going about the Nation's business.

Now, whatever your views are on the National Foundation on the Arts and

the Humanities Act that we had before us today, I think you do have to raise the question as to whether or not that is the single most important item that could have been brought to the House floor on a day back from recess; and, even if it was among the more important items that could have been brought before us, whether or not this was the only item that should have been considered in the House of Representatives. In fact, that is the only item that we considered here today after being home for a full week on recess.

I would suggest that the rest of the schedule for this week hardly is one that is going to cause the Members a great deal of difficulty in leaving early each day.

We have a bill up tomorrow to create a hunger committee, which I doubt will be very controversial, and we are likely to be finished early tomorrow soon after we go into session at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Later on in the week we have the Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act, it again being very doubtful that we are going to spend a lot of time on that particular bill either.

That is the entire schedule for this week.

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

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

Mr. SILJANDER. I am amazed that I got up at 4-something this morning to rush on a Red-Eye flight to come to Washington, D.C. I was informed that we may have something substantive to do, to vote on and to talk about. And rather than communicating with constituents, you and I are sitting on the floor here today, an empty Chamber, no votes having been taken, nothing productive done.

May I say that I did do one thing that I feel might be somewhat relevant to this whole effort of getting up early in the morning and flying here for virtually nothing. There is discharge petition, I would like to inform the Members and those listening, No. 7. It deals with H.R. 1176. H.R. 1176 unlike other bills, is an important bill. It has 334 cosponsors, not one or two, not just Democrats or Republicans, but 332 liberals, conservatives, and moderate Republicans and Democrats.

The bill deals with mortgage revenue bonds, an issue to assist and to help the homeowner who is suffering from high prime interest rates. And I have offered a discharge petition because the bill is bottled up. Now, is it bottled up because it is not important? I do not think there is a Member of Congress who feels that opportunities for home mortgages for the American people is not an important issue. But it is bottled up for one reason: Politics.

It is bottled up because they are holding it hostage for tax increase bills, as happened last year, or for some other type of bill.

On behalf of 334 of us of all forms of ideology on both sides of the aisle, I

call upon the leadership who has control of the bill to please release the bill, please let a bill out of committee that the vast majority of Members of this body support. And if they will not, will the 334, at least 218 of you, courageously stand up, walk down to the well and please sign Discharge Petition No. 7 so that we can say that we did something this week instead of absolutely nothing, and did something positive for the taxpayers of America.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman suggesting that, with 334 cosponsors, that might have been something that we could have taken up on the floor today, since we finished at 1:30 in the afternoon, and we have got at least, under a normal working man's day, 4 hours left?

Of course, too often around here we do not regard ourselves in the same class as normal working people in this country. We quit early in the afternoon. But the fact is that here we are, and we could have been doing something.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Michigan for bringing up the fact that there has been a discharge petition filed on the mortgage revenue bond extension.

During my conversations with people back in my district, they have informed me unanimously that mortgage revenue bonds are extremely vital to keep the recovery going in our home construction and real estate industries.

I think that feeling is shared by most of the Members of Congress in cosponsoring the bill that has been offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan.

However, as we know around here, merely cosponsoring a piece of legislation does not mean that we are pushing that legislation unless we decide to do something like signing a discharge petition to get that legislation out of committee and moving on the floor of the House of Representatives.

One of the reasons why the omnibus tax increase bill put together by the Ways and Means Committee did not even get a rule approved on the floor of the House last November was because the Ways and Means Committee deliberately obstructed an extension of the Mortgage Revenue Bond Act and did not include that in that omnibus bill.

Now, I understand that the Ways and Means Committee has not had a change of heart. That is not unusual, considering the record of that committee, because I remember during my first session here 4½ years ago there were 290-some cosponsors on an accelerated business depreciation bill, over two-thirds of the House of Representatives, and then Chairman Ulman