Raul Yzaguirre President National Council of La Raza 1725 Eye Street, N.W. Second Floor Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 293-4680

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

May 28, 1981

Francisco Garza Legislative Director

Introduction

Almost everyone knows that the Reagan budget -- with massive cuts in the human services and opportunity-creating programs of importance to Hispanics and community-based organizations -- has passed the House of Representatives and the Senate in the first budget resolution for FY 1982 which begins October 1, 1981. What is not well understood is that the federal budget is far from being completed. Congress has merely established the budget ceiling targets; still to come are the decisions on individual agencies and programs.

This update was prepared to help the National Council of La Raza network take a strong role in the budget and program decisions to be made between now and September. This report will help identify key programs which need Hispanic community action, and suggest where to direct advocacy efforts. Attached to this report is a listing of key Congressional Committee assignments in the House and the Senate.

This report is also designed to briefly review Congressional activity to date on other legislative issues of concern to Hispanics, and provide the necessary information to the NCLR network in anticipation of upcoming crucial votes in the Congress. This report begins with an update on all budget activity in the Congress, and includes discussion on the following key NCLR legislative issues:

- 1. Voting Rights Act Extension
- 2. Developments in Immigration Policy
- 3. Block Grant Legislation
- 4. Reauthorization of the Economic Opportunity Act and the Community Services Administration
- 5. Reauthorization of the Legal Services Corporation

Also attached to this report is the recorded vote in the House on the Reagan Budget. NCLR, thus, begins and will continue to share with its network, a legislative scorecard on recorded votes on all major legislation of importance to Hispanics. In a later report we will be finalizing a format for NCLR issues in the legislative scorecard. Your comments and suggestions are welcome as is other feedback.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

On May 7, 1981, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 253-176, passed the budget blueprint of the Reagan Administration sponsored by Delbert Latta (R-Ohio) and Phil Gramm (D-Texas). Despite budget alternatives advanced by Budget Committee Chairman James Jones, the Congressional Black Caucus, and liberal Democrat David Obey, 63 Democrats, many of whom constitute the conservative forum in the House, joined all House Republicans in passing the Reagan budget plan. All the defeated alternative budgets would have reduced cutbacks in human service and opportunity-creating programs.

As adopted, the First Budget Resolution (H Con Res 115) sets a Fiscal 1982 spending target of \$668.8 billion, projects a \$31 billion deficit, and allows for the \$51.3 billion tax cut requested by Reagan. The resolution also contains reconciliation instructions requiring 16 authorizing committees to make cuts totalling \$36.6 billion by June 15, 1981. The budget resolution follows closely the Reagan budget plan making deep social program cuts, providing a large defense budget, and calling for a tax cut which provides the greatest benefits to high-income taxpayers.

The Second Budget Resolution, which sets the final spending ceilings for FY 1982 must be passed by September 15, 1981. The Second Budget Resolution gives Congress a chance to adjust the First Budget Resolution as economic conditions dictate the need for change.

RECONCILIATION

Perhaps more significant than the budget resolution itself are the reconciliation instructions that were included in the Gramm-Latta budget. These instructions cover cuts in spending for the <u>current</u> fiscal year (FY 1981), which is nearly two-thirds over, as well as specific allocations, by program and agency, for FY 1982. (The Senate had already approved similar reconciliation instructions separate from its First Budget Resolution; the House voted on the two measures jointly.) The reconciliation instructions order the authorizing committees to make spending reductions corresponding to the targets adopted in the budget resolution.

Each authorizing committee that receives reconciliation instructions is free to make the required savings in any way that it sees fit. For example, in the Gramm-Latta budget, the reconciliation instructions order the House Agriculture Committee to report \$24 billion in legislative savings. The Committee must reduce by that amount the programs within its jurisdiction. The reconciliation instructions do not mandate specific changes in the Committee's programs. They do, however, provide the Committee with "suggestions" as to how the required legislative savings can be made. For example, the Gramm-Latta reconciliation recommends as part of its instructions to the Agriculture Committee that the Food Stamp Program be cut by \$1.45 billion. The Committee could, however, cut that \$1.45 billion from other program areas such as dairy or tabacco price supports, or in agribusiness subsidy programs. Thus specific suggestions do not have

to be observed as long as each Committee reports total savings in the amount equal to the reconciliation instructions. However, in practice, the authorizing committees have in the past usually adopted the savings recommendations included in the reconciliation instructions.

Full cooperation by the authorizing committees in carrying out the reconciliation instructions is not necessarily guaranteed. In fact, President Reagan, in lobbying House members to support the Gramm-Latta budget resolution, suggested that disagreement with specific cuts could be addressed and accommodations could be made later in the legislative process.

Having received the reconciliation instructions, the authorizing committees are supposed to submit their reconciliation proposals to the Budget Committees by June 15. It is always possible that some committees will refuse to go along with the size of the reductions specified for their programs. Reconciliation is a relatively new Congressional procedure, having been used with the first budget resolution for the first time last year. It is not clear what will happen if a committee balks at meeting the required reductions. The Budget Committees, under the authority of the Budget Act, could take the issue to the House or Senate floor, but under ordinary circumstances would be reluctant to do so because this would represent an infringement on the authority of the authorizing committees. Thus constituencies that wish to reduce the severity of cuts in critical human services and opportunity-creating programs must make their views known to the authorizing committees before June 15.

Once the various committees have submitted their reconciliation proposals, the Budget Committee will fashion the reconciliation proposals into a package on which the full Congress will then vote.

At virtually the same time that the authorizing committees are taking action, the Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate and their various subcommittees will also be proposing appropriations bills to provide the money necessary to fund specific programs. Thus advocacy needs to be directed at Appropriations Committees (See Attached Committee and Subcommittee List).

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Congress has begun to consider the most important civil rights legis-lation currently before it, the Voting Rights Act which expires in August 1982. The Voting Rights Act, originally passed in 1965, was last extended by Congress in 1975 when the minority language provisions were also incorporated into the Act. The Voting Rights Act is one of the most effective civil rights laws ever passed, sharply increasing registration and voting among minority groups, and responsible for the increase in the number of Hispanic and Black elected officials.

In April of this year, in both the House and the Senate, bills were introduced to extend the Voting Rights Act. These are: S.895 introduced by Senators Mathias (R-Md) and Kennedy (D-Mass) with co-sponsors, and H.R.3112

introduced by Congressman Rodino (D-NJ). The companion bills extended the special provisions of the Voting Rights Act for ten years and the minority language provision for seven years. Also, the bills amend Section Two to clarify standards of evidince in voting discrimination challenges.

Hearings on the extension of the Voting Rights Act have begun by the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights chaired by Congressman Don Edwards (D-Ca), and are scheduled through the month of June. Every effort is being taken to pass this legislation in the House before Congress recesses in October of this year. The major battle will occur in the Republican-controlled Senate where Senator Strom Thurmond (R-SC) is Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and Senator Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) is Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution.

At this time, the Reagan Administration has not yet revealed its position on the extension of the Voting Rights Act. It is generally felt that the White House must be pressured into endorsing extension in order to succeed in this important civil rights battle.

The Voting Rights Act is a key issue for Hispanics, since protection of the right to vote is critical to political empowerment and socioeconomic opportunity. The National Council of La Raza, along with other Hispanic groups, has made the extension of the Voting Rights Act a top legislative priority, and urges its network agencies to adopt official positions supporting this effort and advocate for positive action by the Congress.

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE POLICY

Congress has convened several hearings on revising U.S. Immigration and Refugees Policy now that the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy has completed its work. On April 27-28, Representative Robert Garcia (D-NY), Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Census and Population and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, held hearings on immigration from a Hispanic perspective. In addition, the House and Senate Subcommittees on Immigration, chaired by Congressman Mazzoli (R-Ky) and Senator Simpson (R-Ky), respectively held joint hearings on immigration on May 5-7.

A deluge of legislation on immigration is pending in both the House and Senate. However, every indication points to a holding pattern until the Reagan Administration reveals the White House Immigration Policy Proposals. A Task Force representing various federal departments has been drafting option papers which will form the basis of the Administration's proposals.

NCLR has been advocating in written testimony and otherwise for a legislation program which would adjust the status of many undocumented persons, and for those not qualifying, some means to prevent their deportation and work towards adjusting their status through a variety of mechanisms. NCLR has repeatedly stated that no legalization program will be effective unless INS enforcement is curtailed during the process, and unless Hispanic community and volunteer organizations are involved.

In addition, NCLR is working to defeat two other major proposals which are winning support in the Congress and are expected to be included in the Reagan Administration package. These are employer sanctions against employers hiring illegal aliens, and, proposals which would enact a guest-worker program with Mexico. NCLR is opposed to employer sanctions because of their likely discriminatory impact on Hispanic Americans. NCLR is opposed to a guestworker program because of certain exploitation of these workers similar to that which occurred with the bracero program.

BLOCK GRANT LEGISLATION

In addition to massive cutbacks in spending, the Reagan Administration has also proposed a significant change in the distribution of federal money by allocating funds through block grants to the states. These proposed block grants call for a 25 percent reduction in federal outlay of funds and the repeal of legislation governing some 70 federal programs targeted for block grants. This is the first step towards President Reagan's long-term plans to phase-out federal involvement in the provision of human services and require the states to provide such services, without federal money. These long-term plans include an additional cut of at least 25 percent in funding next year, as well as the institution of possibly ten other block grants in the future.

Under the current proposals, most human services now funded through specific categorical programs would be consolidated under five block grants, including: (1) education, (2) social services, (3) health services/health prevention, (4) energy and emergency assistance, and (5) community development. Federal funds for all programs in a given area would be pooled and each individual state would be given the discretion to determine what types of programs it wished to fund under each of the five categories. For example, a state might decide to use its education block grant monies solely to fund public schools, with no money allocated for special programs such as education for disadvantaged children, migrant education, or handicapped education. There would be few regulations, guidelines or requirements by the federal government for funding or operating programs. These block grant proposals have far-reaching implications and are of utmost concern to social and civil rights advocates for the following reasons:

There would be no requirements for targeting low-income, minority, or special needs populations. State governments could choose to allocate all, or a large part, of each block grant to programs which serve less needy populations, while truly needy populations suffer from lack of services. Of particular concern is the future of programs which serve the migrant populations, as it is doubted that many states will choose to fund programs for individuals not residing in the state year round or, if they are residents, unlikely to be registered voters.

- The distribution of money would be subject to the preferences of state officials and would most likely result in an inequitable distribution of funds, based upon political interests rather than on true needs. Such distribution would have a serious impact on many improverished communities which truly need the services but may lack the political influence necessary to acquire the funds. Also, programs which lack strong political support, such as Community Action Agencies and Legal Services, might not be funded by the state officials. The low voter participation rate for Hispanics also may put them at a disadvantage compared to more powerful constituencies when block grant funds are allocated by the states.
- . There would be few provisions for the enforcement of civil rights or equal employment opportunity requirements. This could lead to increased discrimination, with no way for individuals to challenge inequalities except through individual, expensive, lengthy court battles.
- There could be an increase in fraud, abuse and misuse of funds since there will be few evaluation or accountability requirements.
- . Most citizen participation requirements would be abolished, leaving individuals without means to influence how local programs operate.
- . The quality of programs could easily suffer as few guidelines or stringent requirements for operations would be included and little oversight provided.

These characteristics would be found under all block grants to the states; however, each category of block grants would include different types of programs.

The Education block grant, as proposed, would call for the consolidation of 44 existing elementary and secondary education programs. If enacted, the legislation would become effective during the 1982-83 school year and would be binding for five years with funds totalling approximately \$4.4 billion, which is a 25 percent reduction from current funding levels. Bilingual education, reportedly, would not be included in the block grant proposed by the Administration, due to the success of language minority advocates in convincing federal officials of the seriousness of such action. However, migrant education programs apparently would be included.

The <u>Social Services</u> block grant includes the consolidation of the following existing programs: (1) Title XX Social Services, (2) Title IV-B Child Welfare Services, (3) Title IV-E Foster Care and Adoption Assistance, (4) Rehabilitation Services, (5) most programs of the Community Services Administration, (6) Runaway Youth Program, (7) Development Disabilities Program, and (8) Child Abuse Program. Block grant funds would not be limited to these programs, however, and states would be able to use the money for virtually any social service.

The block grant for Health Services/Health Prevention would consolidate such programs as: (1) Community Health Centers, (2) Migrant Health, (3) Home Health Services, (4) Maternal Health Services, (5) Emergency Medical Services, (6) Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services, as well as 11 other health prevention programs, such as Family Planning Services, Venereal Disease, Immunization Programs, and Adolescent Health Services. It is highly possible that the health programs might be divided into two or three block grants, but nothing has been decided to date.

The <u>Energy and Emergency Assistance</u> block grant would merge two here-tofore unrelated programs, the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program and the Emergency Assistance Program. While under current budget allocations the Emergency Assistance Program receives only three percent of the amount awarded the Energy Assistance Program, under the block grant both would be eligible to receive whatever amount is deemed appropriate by the particular state.

Under the <u>Community Development</u> block grant, the Administration proposes to consolidate the following existing programs: (1) Section 312 Rehabilitation Loans, (2) Section 701 Planning Assistance Programs, (3) Neighborhood Self-Help Development Program, (4) Weatherization Assistance Program, (5) CSA's Community Economic Development Program, (6) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), and (7) Urban Development Action Grants (UDAG).

The issue of block grants will be of major importance during the upcoming months as Congress considers the Administration's proposals. Should such legislation be passed, control of most human services programs would be returned to the states, which in the past have proven insensitive to, and incapable of equitably addressing, the needs of minority and low-income persons. For this reason, it is important for local, state and federal advocates to strongly state their opposition to block grant proposals. If block grants are adopted, the gains achieved during the last decades in assuring federal responsibility for services to minority and low-income Americans may be lost in a single session of Congress.

Current statements of opposition to block grants must be directed to members of the authorizing committees with jurisdiction over a given block grant. These committees include:

- 1. Education Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee and House Education and Labor Committee.
- 2. Social Services Senate Finance Committee (Social Security and Income Maintenance Subcommittee) and Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, and House Ways and Means Committee (Public Assistance Subcommittee) and House Education and Labor Committee.
- 3. <u>Health Services</u> Senate Finance Committee (Health Subcommittee) and Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, and House Energy and Commerce Committee (Health and Environment Subcommittee).

- 4. Energy and Emergency Assistance Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee and Senate Finance Committee (Social Security and Income Maintenance Subcommittee), and House Energy and Commerce Committee (Health and Environment Subcommittee), House Ways and Means Committee (Public Assistance Subcommittee) and House Education and Labor Committee (Human Resources Subcommittee).
- 5. <u>Community Development</u> Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee and House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee.

While this list of committees with jurisdiction over a given block grant is currently correct, it is expected that other committees will want to review a given block grant, resulting in innumerable jurisdictional disputes. This will undoubtedly be confusing for advocates wishing to have impact on the block grant proposals, but also might deter the passage of the proposals in Congress.

Currently, all of the Administration's drafts of block grants bills have gone to Congress, and consequently to the outlined committees. Most Senate committees have held hearing of the proposals and are currently attempting to reach some agreement within the committees before setting dates for markups on the bills. It appears that while many Senators agree with the block grant concept, the logistics of implementation might cause the Senate committees to withhold action on the block grants until internal disputes can be resolved. Most House committees are proceeding with the reauthorization of categorical programs and are not considering the block grant bills. Such diverse actions on the part of the House, as opposed to the Senate, make it difficult to determine exactly what the outcome of the block grant proposals will be. However, the possible effects of block grants cannot be overlooked and for this reason strong opposition must be brought to bear by persons concerned with the future of federal involvement in human services.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT REAUTHORIZATION

The Economic Opportunity Act stands as one of the most important pieces of national social legislation. It is a statement of the federal interest to eradicate poverty in the U.S. by attacking its causes, and to provide social and economic opportunity to all citizens. The Act is due to expire on September 30, 1981. President Reagan's FY 1982 budget does not include funds for the Community Services Administration (CSA). In fact, the Reagan Administration proposes to dismantle CSA and has already put the agency on notice to that effect. In lieu of that event, Representative Ike Andrews (D-NC) introduced H.R.3045, which would extend the Economic Opportunity Act for three years at a funding level on an annual basis, approximately 12 percent below the \$542 million proposed by the Carter administration. The House Committee on Education and Labor met on May 5 to mark-up and report H.R.3045. In a 24-8 voice vote the full committee approved the bill and sent it to the full House for action. It is expected to reach the floor for consideration by the full House in July.

On the Senate side, the Subcommittee on Aging, Family and Human Services has held hearings to determine the impact of the block grant methods for funding of Community Action Agencies. The result of this review was a recommendation that the Community Services Administration be included in S.1089, the Emergency Hardship Assistance Act. This would provide a vehicle for funding of Community Action Agencies through the block grant method.

THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

The Reagan Administration has recommended that the Legal Services Corporation be completely eliminated in FY 82 through a zero level of funding in the FY 82 budget. Administration officials claim that legal services could be continued through funding from the proposed Social Services block grants to the states. However, no money would be earmarked for legal services in these block grants, therefore states would be required to use other program monies to fund the legal assistance programs.

The future of the Legal Services Corporation, however, currently rests with Congress. The Corporation is being considered for reauthorization for FY 82 and both Houses of Congress must take action regarding its future. The full House Judiciary Committee finished making its final recommendations on H.R.3480 on May 13 and the bill will now go before the full House for consideration. This bill was originally introduced by Representative Rodino (D-NJ), Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, but following markup in the Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice, which has jurisdiction over Legal Services, it was co-sponsored by all members of the Subcommittee present at the markup.

In the Senate, Senator Eagleton (D-Mo) and co-sponsors have introduced S.939 to reauthorize the Legal Services Corporation. However, in light of President Reagan's proposals to completely abolish the program, Chairman Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) and Subcommittee Chairman Jeremiah Denton (R-Ala) of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee have refused to hold hearings on the reauthorization. This might force concerned Senatorial backers of Legal Services to attempt to attach the reauthorization of the Legal Services Corporation to another bill which has strong likelihood of passing.

The version accepted by the House Judiciary Committee calls for authorizations for FY 1982 and 1983 of \$260 million annually. This is a 25 percent reduction from the \$347 million recommended by President Carter for FY 1982, and a 20 percent reduction -- not including the inflation factor of over ten percent -- from the Legal Services Corporation's present funding level of \$321.3 million. However, this reflects a major improvement from President Reagan's recommendation which called for elimination of the Legal Services Corporation.

Amendments passed by the full House Committee would have significant impact on the operation of the Legal Services Corporation. These include the following: (1) mandatory state advisory councils; (2) prohibition on

representation in abortion cases; (3) criminal penalties for violation of lobbying restrictions; (4) prohibition of lobbying except when on behalf of an individual client or when formally requested by a governmental body; (5) no class action suits against local, state or federal governments except when in accordance with policies adopted by the Board of the Corporation; (6) requirements of recipients to attempt to negotiate a settlement before filing suit; (7) requirement to further involve the private bar; (8) broadening of prohibition on conducting political-advocacy-type training programs; (9) prohibition of representation of persons known to be illegal aliens; (10) prohibition on involvement in cases seeking to legalize homosexuality; (11) total prohibition of strikes by Legal Services employees; and (12) reduction from ten percent to seven percent the amount of funds available for technical assistance.

These amendments, especially those limiting class action suits and denying services to undocumented aliens, would severally limit the Corporation's effectiveness in serving Hispanics. Attempts to have these amendments defeated in the full House will require the support of many as-of-yet uncommitted Congresspersons. Every member of the House must be contacted and assured of the success and necessity for legal services programs throughout the country, and particularly in his or her own district.

ADDENDUM

CONGRESS WILL BE RECESSING FOR THE FOURTH OF JULY HOLIDAY. THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WILL BE HOME FROM JUNE 27 - JULY 7 AND THE SENATE FROM JUNE 29 - JULY 4. THIS IS AN APPROPRIATE TIME TO MEET OR CONTACT YOUR LEGISLATORS REGARDING THE ISSUES WE HAVE SUMMARIZED IN THIS REPORT. REMEMBER THAT AS CONSTITUENTS YOUR CONGRESSMEMBER IS DIRECTLY ACCOUNTABLE TO YOU. AS ALWAYS PLEASE LET US KNOW OF YOUR CONTACTS.

97th CONGRESS SENATE COMMITTEES

<u>APPROPIATIONS</u>

Republicans

Mark O. Hatfield, OR, Chairman **
Ted Stevens, AK **
Lowell P. Wiecker, CT *, **
James A. McClure, ID
Paul Laxalt, NV *
Jake Garu, UT, Chairman *
Harrison Schmitt, NM, Chairman *, **
Tad Cochran, MS
Mark Andrews, ND **
James Abdnor, SD **
Robert W. Kasten Jr., WI
Alfonse D'Amato, NY *
Mack Mattingly, GA
Arlen Specter, PA
Warren B. Rudman, NH **

Democrats

Daniel K. Inouye, HI **
Ernest F. Hollings, SC **
Thomas F. Eagleton, MO **
J. Bennett Johnston, KY *
Quentin N. Burdick, ND **
Patrick Leahy, VT *
Jim Sasser, TN *
Dennis DeConcini, AR
Dale Bumpers, AK
William Proxmire, WI *
John C. Stennis, MI *
Robert C. Byrd, W.VA

* Subcommittee on HUD - Independent Agencies

^{**} Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies

BUDGET

Republican

Pete Domenici, NM, Chairman Nancy Landon Kassebaum, KA Rudy Boschwitz, MN Orrin G. Hatch, UT Mark Andrews, ND Charles E. Grassley, IA Orrin G. Hatch, UT John Tower, TX Mark Andrews, ND Steven D. Symms, ID Charles E. Grassley, IA Robert W. Kaster Jr., WI Dan Quayle, ID Slade Gorton, WA Steven D. Symms, ID

Democrats

Ernest F. Hollings, SC Lawton Chiles, FL Joseph R. Biden Jr., DE J. Bennett Johnston, LA Jim Sasser, TN Gary Hart, CO Howard M. Metzenbaum, OH Donald W. Riegle Jr., MI Daniel Patrick Moynihan, NY J. James Exon, NB

FINANCE

Republicans |

Rorbert Dole, KS, Chairman *,**
Bob Packwood, OR *
William V. Roth Jr., DE
John C. Danforth, MT **
John H. Chafee, RI
John Heniz, PA *
Malcolm Wallop, WY
David Durenberger, MN, Chairman *,**
William L. Armstrong, CO, Chairman **
Steven D. Symms, ID
Charles E. Grassley, IA

Democrats

Russell B. Long, LA *,**
Harry F. Byrd Jr., VA
Lloyd Bentsen, TX
Spark M. Matsunaga, HI
Daniel Patrick Moynihan, NY **
Max Baucus, MT *
David L. Boren, OK **
Bill Bradley, NJ *
George J. Mitchell, ME

* Subcommittee on Health

^{**} Subcommittee on Social Security and Income Maintenance Programs

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Republicans

William V. Roth, DE, Chairman Charles Percy, IL Ted Stevens, AK Charles McC. Mathias Jr., MD John C. Danforth, MO William S. Cohen, ME David Durenberger, MN, Chairman * Mack Mattingly, GA * Warren Rudman, NH

Democrats

Thomas F. Eagleton, MO
Henry M. Jackson, WA
Lawton Chiles, FL
Sam Nunn, GA *
John Glenn, OH
Jim Sasser, TN *
David Pryor, AR
Carl Levin, MI

JUDICIARY

Republicans

Strom Thurmond, SC, Chairman *,**
Charles McC. Mathias Jr., MD
Paul Laxalt, NV
Orrin G. Hatch, UT, Chairman **
Robert Dole, KS
Alan K. Simpson, WY, Chairman *
Joseph P. East, NC
Charles Grassley, IA *,**
Jeremiah Denton, AL
Arlen Specter, PA

* Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy ** Subcommittee on Constitution

Democrats

Joseph R. Biden Jr., DE Edward M. Kennedy, MA * Robert C. Byrd, WV Howard M. Metzenbaum, OH Dennis DeConcini, AR *,** Patrick J. Leahy, VT ** Max Baucus, MT Howell Heflin, AL

LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Republicans

Orrin G. Hatch, UT, Chairman **
Robert T. Stafford, UT, Chairman *
Dan Quayle, IN, Chairman *,**
Paula Hawkins, FL **
Lowell P. Weicker, CT *
Gordon J. Humphrey, NH
Jeremiah Denton, AL *
John P. East, NC *

* Subcommittee on Education

Democrats

Edward M. Kennedy, MA *,**
Harrison A. Williams Jr., NJ
Jennings Randolph, WV *
Claiborne Pell, RI *,**
Thomas F. Eagleton, MO *
Donald W. Riegle Jr., MI
Howard M. Metzenbaum, OH **

^{**} Subcommittee on Employment and Opportunity

97th CONGRESS HOUSE COMMITTEES

APPROPRIATIONS

Democrats

Jamie P. Boland, MA, Chairman * William H. Natcher, KY, Chairman ** Neal Smith, Iowa ** Joseph P. Addabbo, NY Clarence D. Long, MD Sidney R. Yates, IL David R. Obey, WI ** Edward R. Roybal, CA ** Louis Stokes, OH *,** Tom Bevill, AL Bill Chappell Jr., FL Bill Alexander, AR John P. Murtha, PA Bob Traxles, MI * Joseph D. Early, MA ** Charles Wilson, TX Lindy (Mrs. Hale) Boggs, LA * Adam Benjamin Jr., IN Norman D. Dicks, WA Mathew F. McHugh, NY Bo Ginn, GA William Lehman, FL Jack Hightower, TX Martin Olav Sabo, MI * Julian C. Dixon, CA Vic Fazio, CA W.G. "Bill" Hetner, NC Les AuCoin, OR Daniel K. Akaka, HI Wes Watkins, OK William H. Gray III, PA Bernard J. Dwyer, NJ **

Republicans

Silvio O. Conte, MA ** Joseph M. McDade, PA Jack Edwards, AL J. Kenneth Robinson, VA Clarence E. Miller, OH Lawrence Coughlin, PA * C.W. Bill Young, FL * Jack Kemp, NY Ralph Regula, OH Clair W. Burgener, CA George M. O'Brien, IL ** Virginia Smith, NB Eldon Rudd, AR Carl D. Pursell, MI ** Mickey Edwards, OK Bob Livingston, LA ** S. William Green, NY * Tom Loeffler, TX Jerry Lewis, CA Carroll A. Campbell, SC John Edwards Porter. IL **

^{*} Subcommittee on HUD - Independent Agencies ** Subcommittee on Labor - HHS

HOUSE COMMITTES

BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Democrats

Fernand J. Germain, RI, Chairman * Henry S. Reuss, WI Henry B. Gonzales, TX, Chairman * Joseph G. Minish, NJ Frank Annunzio, IL Parren J. Mitchell, MD * Walter E. Fauntroy, D.C. * Stephen L. Neal, NC Jerry M. Patterson, CA * James J. Blanchard, MI Carroll Hubbard Jr., KY * John S. LaFalce, NY * David W. Evans, IN * Norman E. D'Amours, NH * Stanley N. Lundine, NY * Mary Rose Oakar, OH * Jim Mattox, TX Bruce F. Vento, MN * Doug Barnard Jr., GA Robert Garcia, NY * Mike Lowry, WAS * Charles E. Schumer, NY Barney Frank, MA * Bill Patman, TX William J. Coyne, PA *

Republicans

J. William Stanton, OH * Charlmers P. Wyke, OH * Stewart B. McKinney, CT * George Hansen, ID Henry J. Hyde, IL Jim Leach, IA * Thomas B. Evans Jr., DL Ron Paul, TX Ed Bethure, AK * Norman D. Shumway, CA Jon Hirson, MS * Stan Parris, VA * Ed Weber, OH Bill McCullum, FL * Gregory W. Carman, NY * George C. Wortley, NY * Bill Lowery, CA * Jim Coyne, PA * Marge Roukema, NJ *

^{*} Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development

HOUSE COMMITTEES CONTINUED

BUDGET

Democrats

James R. Jones, OK, Chairman Jim Wright, TX David R. Obey, WI Paul Simon, IL Norman Y. Mineta, CA Jim Mattox, TX Stephen J. Solarz, NY Timothy E. Wirth, CO Leon E. Panetta, CA Richard A. Gephardt, MO Bill Nelson, FL Les Aspin, WI W.G. "Bill" Hefner, NC Thomas J. Downy, NY Adam Benjamin Jr., IN Brian J. Donnelly, MA Beryl Anthony Jr., AK Phil Gramm, TX

Republicans

Delbert L. Latta, OH
Ralph Regula, OH
Bud Shuster, PA
Bill Frenzel, MN
Jack F. Kemp, NY
James G. Martin, NC
Paul S. Trible Jr., VA
Ed Bethune, AR
Lynn Martin, IL
Albert Lee Smith Jr., AL
Eugene Johnston, NC
Bobbi Fiedler, CA

HOUSE COMMITTEES CONTINUED

EDUCATION AND LABOR

Democrats

Carl D. Perkins, KY, Chairman * Augustus F. Hawkins, CA *,**
William D. Ford, MI * Phillip Burton, CA Joseph M. Gaydos, PA Mario Biaggi, NY * Ike F. Andrews, NC * Paul Simon, IL ** George Miller, CA * Austin J. Murphy, PA Ted Weiss, NY ** Baltasar Corrada, PR *,** Dale E. Kildee, MI * Peter A. Peyser, NY Pat Williams, MT * William R. Ratchford, CN * Ray Kogovsek, CO William Clay, PA ** Harold Washington, IL *,** Dennis E. Eckert, OH

Republicans

John M. Ashbrook, OH
John N. Erlenborn, IL
James M. Jeffords, UT *,**
Bill Goodling, PA *
E. Thomas Coleman, MO *
Ken Kramer, CO
Arlen Erdahl, MN *
Thomas E. Petri, WI *,**
Millicent Fenwick, NJ **
Marge Roukema, NJ *
Eugene Johnston, NC
Larry DeNardis, CT *,**
Larry E. Craig, ID *
Wemdall Bailey, MO

*Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education ** Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities

HOUSE COMMITTES CONTINUED

ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Democrats

John D. Dirgell, MI, Chairman James H. Scheuer, NY * Henry A. Waxman, CA, Chairman * Timothy E. Wirth, CO Phil Sharp, IN James J. Florio, NJ * Toby Moffett, CT * Jim Santini, NV * Edward J. Markey, MA Thomas A. Luken, OH * Doug Walgren, PA * Albert Gore Jr., TN Barbara A. Mikulski, MD * Ronald M. Mott, OH Phil Gramm, TX * Richard C. Shelby, AL * Cardiss Collins, IL Mike Synar, OK Mickey Leland, TX * Al Swift, WA W.J. "Billy" Tauzin, LA Ron Wyden, OR * Ralph M. Hall, TX

* Subcommittee on Health and the Environment

Republicans

James T. Broyhill, NC Clarence J. Brown, OH * James M. Collins, TX Norman F. Lent, NY Edward R. Madigan, IL * Carlos Moorhead, CA Matthew S. Rinaldo, NJ Marc L. Marks, PA Tom Corcoran, IL Gary A. Lee, NY William Dannemeyer, CA * Bob Whittaker, KN * Tom Tauke, IO Don Ritter, PA * Harold Rogers, KY Clive Benedict, W.VA * Daniel R. Coats, ID Thomas J. Bliley Jr., VA *

HOUSE COMMITTES CONTINUED

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Democrats

Jack Brooks, TX, Chairman Dante B. Fascell, FL Benjamin S. Rosenthal, NY Don Fugua, FL John Conyers Jr. MI Cardiss Collins, IL John L. Burton, CA Glenn English, OK Elliott H. Levitas, GA * David W. Evans, ID Toby Moffett, CT Henry Waxman, CA Floyd Fithian, IN * Ted Weiss, NY Mike Synar, OK Eugene J. Atkinson, PA Stephen L. Neal, NC * Doug Barnard, GA Peter A. Peyser, NY L.H. Fountain, NC, Chairman * Barney Frank, MA * Harold Washington, IL Tom Lantos, CA

Republicans

Frank Horton, NY John N. Erlenborn, IL Clarence J. Brown, OH * Paul N. McCloskey Jr., CA Thomas N. Kindness, OH Robert S. Walkes, PA M. Caldwell Butler, VA Lyle Williams, OH H. Joel Deckard, ID William F. Clinger Jr., PA Raymond McGrath, NY * Hal Daub, NB John Hiler, ID David Dreier, CA Wendell Bailey, MO Larry DeNardis, CT * Judd Gregg, NH

^{*} Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources

HOUSE COMMITTEES CONTINUED

JUDICIARY

Democrats

Peter Rodino Jr., NJ, Chairman Jack Brooks, TX Robert W. Kastenmeier, WI * Don Edwards, CA, Chairman * John Conyers Jr., MI John F. Seiberling, OH George E. Danielson Romano L. Mazzoli, KY, Chairman ** William J. Hughes, NJ Sam B. Hall Jr., TX ** Mike Synar, OK Patricia Schroedes, CO *,** Billy Lee Evans, GA Dan Glickman, KS Harold Washington, IL * Barney Frank, MA **

Republicans

Robert McClory, IL **
Tom Railsback, IL
Hamilton Fish Jr., NY **
M. Caldwell Butler, VA
Carlos J. Moorhead, CA
John M. Ashbrook, OH
Henry Hyde, IL *
Thomas N. Kindness, OH
Harold S. Sawyer, MI
Dan Lungren, CA *,**
F. James Sensenbrenner, WI *
Bill McCollum, FL

* Subcommittee on Civil and Constitution Rights

^{**} Subcommittee on Immigration, Fefugees and International Law

MEMBER, PARTY AND STATE	Vote Number 1	Vote Number 2	Vote Number 3	
RESULT	Defeated	Defeated	Adopted	
PRO-HISPANIC VOTE	Yes	Yes	No	
ALABAMA				
Edwards - R Dickinson - R Nichols - D Bevill - D Flippo - D Smith - R Shelby - D	- - - - -	- 0 - - -	+ + + + + +	
ALASKA				
Young - R	-	-	+	
ARIZONA				
Rhodes - R Udall - D Stump - D Rudd - R	- - -	- + - -	+ - + +	
ARKANSAS				
Alexander - D Bethune - R Hammerschmidt - R Anthony - D	- - -	- - - -	- + + +	
CALIFORNIA				
Chappie - R Clausen - R Matsui - D Fazio - D Burton, J D Burton, P D Miller - D Dellums - D Stark - D Edwards - D Lantos - D McCloskey - R Mineta - D Shumway - R Coelho - D Panetta - D Pashayan - R Thomas - R Logomarsine - R Goldwater - R Fiedler - R Moorhead - R Beilenson - D Waxman - D Roybal - D Rousselot - R	- 0 + + + + + + - + - +	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	+ + + - + - + + + + + +	
YOURSEIOF - K	-	-	+	

MEMBER, PARTY AND STATE	1	2	3	
CALIFORNIA cont'd Dornan - R Dixon - D Hawkins - D Danielson - D Dymally - D Anderson - D Grisham - R Lungren - R Dreier - R Brown - D Lewis - R Patterson - D Dannemeyer - R Badham - R Lowery - R Hunter - R Burgener - R	- + + - - + - - - -	-++++	+ - - - + + + + + + + +	
COLORADO		0	T	
Schroeder - D Writh - D Kogovsek - D Brown - R Kramer - R	+ - - - -	+ - + - -	- - - + +	
Cotter - D Gejdenson - D DeNardis - R McKinney - R Ratchford - D Moffett - R	0 - - - +	0 + - - + +	0 + + -	
DELAWARE				
Evans - R FLORIDA	-	-	+	
Hutto - D Fuqua - D Bennett - D Chappell - D McCollum - R Young - R Gibbons - D Ireland - D Nelson - D Bafalis - R	- - - - - - -	- - - - - -	+ + + + + + +	

MEMBER, PARTY				
AND	1	2	3	
STATE				
			* .	
FLORIDA cont'd				
Mica - D Shaw - R Lehman - D Pepper - D Fascell - D	- - + +	- - - + -	+ + - -	
GEORGIA				
Ginn - D Hatcher - D Brinkley - D Levitas - D Fowler - D Gingrich - R McDonald - D Evans - D Jenkins - D Barnard - D		- - - + - 0	+ + + - + + +	
<u>HAWAII</u>				
Heftel - D Akaka - D	-	-+	-	
<u>IDAHO</u>				
Craig - R Hansen - R	-	-	+ +	
ILLINOIS				
Washington - D Savage - D Russo - D Derwinski - R Fary - D Hyde - R Collins - D Rostenkowski - D Yates - D Porter - R Annunzio - D Crane, P R McClorey - R Erlenborn - R Corcoran - R Martin - R O'Brien - R Michel - R Railsback - R Findley - R Madigan - R Crane, D R	+ + + +	+ + - + - + - + - - - - -	- - + - + - + + + + + + + + + + +	

	MEMBER, PARTY AND STATE	1,	2	3	
	<u>ILLINOIS</u> cont'd				
	Price - D Simon - D	++	++	-	
	INDIANA				
	Benjamin - D Fithian - D Hiler - R Coats - R Hillis - R Evans - D Meyers - R Deckard - R Hamilton - D Sharp - D Jacobs - D	- - - - - - -	+ 0	- + + + + + + -	
	IOWA				
	Leach - R Tauke - R Evans - R Smith - D Harkin - D Bedell - D	- - - - +	- - - + -	+ + - -	
	KANSAS				
	Roberts - R Jeffries - R Winn - R Glickman - D Wittaker - R	-	- - - -	+ + - +	
	KENTUCKY				
	Hubbard - D Natcher - D Mazzoli - D Synder - R Rogers - R Hopkins - R Perkins - D	-	- - - - +	- + + + +	
	Livingston - R Boggs - D Tauzin - D Roemer - D Huckaby - D Moore - R		-	+ + + +	
300					

MEMBER, PARTY AND STATE	1	2	3		
LOUISIANA cont'd					
Breaux - D Long - D	-	-	+		
MAINE					
Emery - R Snowe - R	-	-	+ +	1	
MARYLAND					
Dyson - D Long - D Mikulski - D Holt - R Vacancy Byron - D Mitchell - D Barnes - D	- - + - 0 + -	- + + - - + +	+ - + -		
MASSACHUSETTS					
Conte - R Boland - D Early - D Frank - D Shannon - D Mavroules - D Markey - D O'Neill - D Moakley - D Heckler - R Donnelly - D Studds - D	- - - + - - - + - +	- + + + + + + +	+ +		
MICHIGAN					
Conyers - D Pursell - R Wolpe - D Siljander - R Sawyer - R Dunn - R Kildee - D Traxler - D Vander Jagt - R Albosta - D Davis - R Bonior - D Crockett - D Hertel - D Ford - D Dingell - D	+ + + + + + + + -	+ + 0 + + +	- + + + + + - - - -		
	>				

		*		
				MEMBER, PARTY
	3	2	1	AND
				STATE
				MICHIGAN cont'd
	-	+	+	Bradhead - D
	+	-	-	Blanchard - D Broomfield - R
				MINNESOTA
	+	-	-	Erdahl - R
	+ +			Hagedorn - R Frenzel - R
	_	+	-	Vento - D
	+	+	+	Sabo - D Weber - R
	+	_	-	Stangeland - R
	-	+	+	Oberstar - D
				MISSISSIPPI
	-	-	-	Whitten - D
	+ +			Bowen - D Montegomery - D
				Vacancy
	+	-	-	Lott - R
				MISSOURI
	_	+	+	Clay - D
	+	-	-	Young - D
	+		_	Gephardt - D Skelton - D
	_	+	+	Bolling - D Coleman - R
	+ +		-	Coleman - R Taylor - R
	+	_	_	Bailey - R Volkmer - D
	+ +	-	-	Volkmer - D Emerson - R
			-	
				MONTANA
	+	+	-	Williams - D Marlenee - R
				NEBRASKA
	+		_	Bereuter - R
	+	-	-	Daub - R
	+	-	-	Smith - R
				NEVADA
	+	-	-	Al Santini - D
	+	-	-	Smith - R NEVADA

MEMBER, PARTY AND	1	2	3	
STATE				
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
D'Amours - D Gregg - R	-	+	+	
NEW JERSEY				
Florio - D Hughes - D Howard - D Smith - R Fenwick - R Forsythe - R Roukema - R Roe - D Hollenbeck - R Rodino - D Minish - D Rinaldo - R Courter - R Guarini - D Dwyer - D	+	+ - - - + + + + +	- - + + + - - + -	
NEW MEXICO				
Lujan - R Skeen - R	-	-	+ +	
NEW YORK				
Carney - R Downey - D Carman - R Lent - R McGrath - R LeBoutillier - R Addabbo - D Rosenthal - D Ferraro - D Biaggi - D Scheuer - D Chisholm - D Solarz - D Richmond - D Zeferetti - D Schumer - D Molinari - R Green - R Rangel - D Weiss - D Garcia - D Bingham - D Peyser - D	+ + + - + + + + +		+ + + + +	

MEMBER, PARTY				
AND	1	2	3	
STATE				
NEW YORK cont'd				
Ottinger - D	+	+	-	
Fish - R Gilman - R	_		+ +	
McHugh - D	-	+	_	
Stratton - D Solomon - R			+	
Martin - R	-	-	+	
Mitchell - R Wortley - R	-		+ +	
Lee - R	-	-	+	
Horton - R Conable - R	-	-	+ +	
LaFalce - D	-	-	-	
Nowak - D	-	-	-+	
Kemp - R Lundine - D		-	-	
NORTH CAROLINA				
Jones - D	0	-	-	
Fountain - D Whitley - D	-	-	+	
Andrews - D	_	_	+	
Neal - D Johnston - D			+	
Rose - D	-		-	
Hefner - D Martin - R		-	+	
Broyhill - R	-	-	+	
Hendon - R	-	-	+	
NORTH DAKOTA				
Al Dorgan - D	-	+	-	
OHIO				
Gradison - R	-	_	+	
Luken - D Hall - D		_	+ +	
Vacancy				
Latta - R McEwen - R		_	+ +	
Brown - R	-	-	+	
Kindness - R Weber - R		-	+ +	
Miller - R	-	-	+	
Stanton - R Shamonsky - D			+	
Pease - D	-	+	-	
Seiberling - D Wylie - R	+	+	- +	
Ny Tie - K				

MEMBER, PARTY					
AND	1	2	3		
STATE					
OHIO cont'd					
Regula - R	-	-	+ +		
Ashbrook - R Applegate - D			-		
Williams - R Oakar - D	+	+	+		
Stokes - D	+	+	-		
Eckart - D Mottl - D	+	+	+		
OKALHOMA					
Jones - D	_				
Synar - D	-	-	-		
Watkins - D McCurdy - D	-				
Edwards - R	-	-	- + +		
English - D		-	+		•
OREGON					
AuCoin - D Smith - R	-	-	+		
Wyden - D	-	+	-		
Weaver - D	-	+	-		
PENNSYLVANIA					
Foglietta - D	+	+	-		
Gray - D Vacancy	+	+			
Daugherty - R Schulze - R	-	-	+		
Yatron - D	-	+	+		
Edgar - D Coyne, J R	+	+	+		
Shuster - R	-		+		
McDade - R Nelligan - R	_		+ +		
Murtha - D	-	-	-+		
Coughlin - R Coyne, W D	+	+	- +		
Ritter - R Walker - R	-	-	+	1	
Ertel - D	-	_	-		
Walgren - D Goodling - R	_		+		
Gaydos - D	-	+	-		
Bailey - D Murphy - D	-	+			
Clinger - R	-	-	+ +		
Marks - R Atkinson - D	-		+		

	MEMBER, PARTY				
	AND	1	2	3	
	STATE				
-					
	RHODE ISLAND				
	St. Germain - D Schneider - R	+	-	- +	
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
	Hartnett - R Spence - R Derrick - D Campbell - R Holland - D Napier - R	- - - -		+ + + + +	
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
	Daschle - D Roberts - R	-	-	- +	
	TENNESSEE				
	Quillen - R Duncan - R Bouquard - D Gore - D Boner - D Beard - R Jones - D Ford - D	- - - - - - +	- - + - - -	+ + - - + +	
	TEXAS				
This is a second or a second of the second o	Hall, S D Wilson - D Collins - R Hall, R D Mattox - D Gramm - D Archer - R Fields - R Brooks - D Pickle - D Leath - D Wright - D Hightower - D Patman - D de la Garza - D White - D Stenholm - D Leland - D Hance - D Gonzalez - D Loeffler - R Paul - R Kazen - D Frost - D			++++-++-++-+	

			 	
MEMBER, PARTY AND STATE	1	2	3	
UTAH				
Hansen - R Marriott - R	-	-	++	
VERMONT				
Al Jeffords - R	-	+	+ .	
VIRGINIA				
Trible - R Whitehurst - R Bliley - R Daniel, R R Daniel, D D Butler - R Robinson - R Parris - R Wampler - R Wolf - R	- - - - - - -	- - - - - - -	+ + + + + + +	
WASHINGTON				
Pritchard - R Swift - D Bonker - D Morrison - R Foley - D Dicks - D Lowry - D	- - - - - -	- - - - - +	+ - - + - -	
WEST VIRGINIA				
Mollohan - D Benedict - R Staton - R Rahall - D	- - - +	+ - - +	- + +	
WISCONSIN				
Aspin - D Kastenmeier - D Gunderson - R Zablocki - D Reuss - D Petri - R Obey - D Roth - R Sensenbrenner - R	- + - - + - + -	+ + - + + - -	- + - + - + +	

MEMBER, PARTY AND STATE	1	2	3	
WYOMING				
Al Chenney - R	-	-	+	

1. Fiscal 1982 Budget Targets - H Con Res 115. Substitute amendment by Fauntroy (D-DC), or the Congressional Black Caucus substitute amendment to the budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee setting federal outlays at \$721.1 billion, revenues at \$667.6 billion for a deficit of \$43.5 billion. The Black Caucus alternative budget would have preserved many social programs while reducing waste and mismanagement. Defeated 69-356, May 6, 1981. A vote for is a "+".

KEY:

- + = Vote Favoring Hispanic Comnunity-based Organization Interests
- = Vote Not Favoring
- 0 = Did Not Vote
- 2. Fiscal 1982 Budget Targets H Con Res 115. Substitute amendment by Obey (D-Wis.), to the resolution reported by the Budget Committee increasing budget authority by \$6 billion, outlays by \$2 billion and revenues by \$28.1 billion. The Obey Amendment would have preserved many social programs while decreasing outlays for Defense. Defeated 119-303, May 6, 1981. A vote for is a "+".
- 3. Fiscal 1982 Budget Targets H Con Res 115. Substitute amendment by Gramm (D-Tx), and Latta (R-Ohio) to the resolution as reported by the Budget Committee to decrease budget authority by \$231.1 billion, outlays by \$25.7 billion and revenues by \$31.1 billion resulting in a \$31 billion deficit for Fiscal 1982. The Gramm-Latta Amendment basically incorporates the Reagan Administration's Budget Plan. Adopted 253-176, May 7, 1981. A vote against is a "+".

LEGISLATIVE REPORT - WASHINGTON 1981

PRO HISPANIC VOTING RECORD 97 TH CONGRESS