

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, there will be no morning business tomorrow. At 9:30 a.m., under the previous order, the Senate will take up the Schlesinger nomination.

If the orders for the recognition of Senators should be consummated prior to 9:30 a.m., it is hoped that the Senate can move to the consideration of the Schlesinger nomination earlier than 9:30 a.m. A ye-a-and-nay vote will occur on the nomination, but that vote will not occur before 12:30 p.m.

It is not implied that the debate on the nomination will last from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Following the close of debate on the Schlesinger nomination, it is intended to take up the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, H.R. 8619.

I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senate to proceed, following debate on the nomination, to the consideration of H.R. 8619.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Upon the disposition of the agriculture appropriation bill, the Senate will proceed to the con-

sideration of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, H.R. 8152.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes action on the agricultural appropriation bill it proceed to the consideration of the omnibus crime bill, H.R. 8152.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, there will be several ye-a-and-nay votes tomorrow. The first vote will occur on the Schlesinger nomination at 12:30 p.m.

It is anticipated that any ye-a-and-nay votes in relation to the agricultural appropriation bill will occur after the vote on the Schlesinger nomination. There will be several ye-a-and-nay votes tomorrow.

RECESS TO 8:30 A.M.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 8:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 11:01 p.m., the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 1973, at 8:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 27 (legislative day of June 25), 1973:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Alberto Faustino Trevino, Jr., of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Community Development Corporation, vice Samuel C. Jackson, resigned.

THE JUDICIARY

Prentice H. Marshall, of Illinois, to be a U.S. district judge to the northern district of Illinois vice Alexander J. Napoli, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27 (legislative day of June 25), 1973:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Clarence M. Kelley, of Missouri, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Sidney L. Jones, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 27, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

According to the riches of His glory, may God grant you to be strengthened with might through His spirit in the inner man.—Ephesians 3:16.

Eternal God, the source of all that is good and true and beautiful in human life, once more we turn to Thee, worried, seeking Thy peace, weak, needing Thy strength and tired, desiring rest in Thee. We have tried to content ourselves with little things of minor importance but Thou art calling us to greater things of major importance. Restless we are until we find rest in Thee. Help us to respond to Thee, to be strengthened by Thy spirit in the inner man that we may do our work this day with Thy cause in our hearts.

O spirit of the living God, send us forth to serve Thee and our country with clear minds, clean hearts, and courageous spirits.

In the spirit of Christ—pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 296]

Addabbo	Dickinson	Pepper
Alexander	Diggs	Powell, Ohio
Ashbrook	Dingell	Pritchard
Badillo	Dorn	Reld
Blatnik	Fisher	Robison, N.Y.
Boggs	Ford	Roncallo, Wyo.
Breaux	William D.	Rooney, N.Y.
Broyhill, N.C.	Fountain	Sandman
Byron	Gude	Seiberling
Chisholm	Hébert	Stark
Clark	Hinshaw	Steed
Clay	Jones, Ala.	Stokes
Conte	Macdonald	Sullivan
Cronin	Metcalfe	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	Mills	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Ga.	Murphy, N.Y.	Thornton
Dellums	O'Neill	Vessey
Derwinski	Parris	Young, Tex.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 380 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INCREASED DAIRY IMPORTS

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the administration has continued its backdoor efforts to increase dairy imports without first consulting Congress.

I am talking about regulations, published in the Federal Register last week, which say that when countries fail to fill their import quotas for dairy products the Secretary of Agriculture may reas-

sign the unfilled portion of these quotas to other countries.

What is really happening is that the administration is implementing by fiat the recommendations of the Flanigan report.

When Members of Congress were finally able to blast the confidential Flanigan report out of the USDA, we found out that the report advised the President "not to approach the Congress until after negotiations" on agriculture trade policies were concluded.

The administration's action in this recent case is bad enough, but the general attitude behind it is even more disturbing.

Changes in agriculture policy have a significant effect on both farmers and consumers, and should not be determined unilaterally by the executive branch.

Yet that is what is happening. Three times this year the administration has recommended increased quotas for foreign dairy products. Twice the dairy products were already here before the Tariff Commission met to see if they ought to be allowed into the country.

Mr. Speaker, we know that dairy products imported from other countries do not meet the same sanitation standards which our own products meet. Consumers in this country should find these regulations on import quotas published last week quite disturbing.

FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1973

(Mrs. HOLT asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control for their re-

port entitled "America Burning," and to express my support for the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1973.

The National Commission report represents a 2-year investigation of fire prevention and control. A number of specific recommendations of the Commission have been incorporated in this act including the establishment of a U.S. Fire Administration within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Fire Administration would be comprised of a National Fire Academy, a national fire data system, a research and development division, and a State and local programs division.

The magnitude of human and economic losses from fires in America is almost beyond comprehension. It is indeed appalling that a country of our resources and wealth leads all the major industrialized countries in per capita deaths and property loss from fires. The National Commission has estimated that fires take an annual toll of 12,000 lives, 300,000 injured, and over \$11 billion in wasted resources each year. These grisly statistics will continue to rise in the future unless immediate steps are taken to stem this tide.

The National Commission has estimated that enactment of its recommendations will result in annual reduction of fire losses of 5 percent until such losses are halved in 14 years. If we can achieve this objective, the savings afforded through the reduction of losses will more than offset the costs of the program.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to cosponsor the Fire Prevention and Control Act and I urge swift action on this necessary legislation.

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES V. SMITH OF CHICKASHA, OKLA.

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of sadness that I recently learned of the tragic and untimely death of our former colleague and friend, James V. Smith, of Chickasha, Okla.

During his service in the House of Representatives, Jim Smith earned the deep respect of all his colleagues. He proved himself to be an able legislator who won the friendship and admiration of Members on both sides of the aisle.

When President Nixon appointed Jim as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, his choice was applauded as an excellent one. Jim's innovative programs initiated during his tenure as Administrator led the FHA to some of its greatest achievements. As a Representative from a rural congressional district, I can attest to the responsiveness of the FHA to the needs and problems of rural America. Programs of this fine agency have had a widespread impact in North Carolina and have assisted a number of my constituents.

When Jim retired to his farm in Chickasha, Okla., his many friends in Wash-

ington paid tribute to his many accomplishments and wished him well.

Today, we are all saddened by his tragic loss. Jim was an unusual man who combined the abilities of a legislator and administrator with a deep concern for the well-being of his fellow man.

He will be missed.

EXTENSION OF EXISTING SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN ISTLE

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2261) to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I ask the gentleman from Oregon to give us an explanation of this legislation.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2261 is to continue for 3 years from September 5, 1972, the suspension of duty on imports of processed istle fiber.

Crude istle fiber has always been afforded duty-free entry under the Tariff Act of 1930. However, the processed fiber has been dutiable under the act at the rate of 20 percent ad valorem. Beginning in 1957 successive 3-year extensions have continued the suspension of the duty applicable to the processed fiber until the close of September 5, 1972.

Istle fiber is derived from several species of the agave plant which is indigenous to Mexico. Its principal use in the United States is in the manufacture of brushes.

There is no domestic production of the raw istle fiber. Domestic production of the processed fiber from imported raw fiber has been long insignificant. The original purpose of the suspension of the duty in 1957 was to reduce the burden of higher prices on domestic users of the fibers and of the finished products. The committee is informed that conditions continue to warrant the suspension of this duty.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2261 continues the suspension for another 3 years from September 5, 1972. The bill also carries provisions to obviate any possible confusion concerning the liquidation or reliquidation of entries after this last-mentioned date and before the date of enactment.

No objection to H.R. 2261 was received from the interested department and agencies. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of this bill.

I urge that the House approve H.R. 2261.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2261, which would continue for 3 years the suspension of duty on processed istle fiber.

Istle fiber is derived from a plant which is indigenous to Mexico. Its main use in the United States is in the manufacture of brushes and brooms.

The duty on this fiber initially was suspended 15 years ago, and the suspension has been continued every 3 years since then. The most recent suspension expired on September 5 last year.

When Public Law 85-284, which provided the initial suspension of processed istle fiber, was enacted in 1957, no raw istle fiber was being produced in the United States and very little production of processed fiber from imported raw fiber was taking place. The main purpose of the suspension was to reduce the burden of higher prices on domestic users of the fibers and of the finished products. The committee has been advised that the conditions which occasioned the original and subsequent suspensions of istle fiber continue to exist and, accordingly, it warrants continued suspension.

As previously indicated, all the imports of istle fiber come from Mexico and their value was \$3.4 million in 1970, \$3.0 million in 1971 and \$2.7 million in 1972. The Department of Labor advised the committee that the importation of istle fiber as a raw material helps to maintain employment in the domestic broom and brush industry.

Mr. Speaker, the committee reported H.R. 2261 unanimously after being informed that there were no objections to the extension of this suspension. I recommend its enactment by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to say to the gentleman from Oregon that I am not going to object to the bill he is bringing up, nor will I object to any of the bills he will be bringing up under the unanimous-consent procedure today. I believe the bills he is bringing up today are in a lot of ways much better than other bills that have been brought up under unanimous consent previously.

I believe there is still an awful lot about the procedure which ought to be improved. The reports ought to be better. We ought to know exactly who benefits from these bills and the details of revenue aspects of these bills. But I believe these bills are not the tax loopholes that other bills have been which were brought up under the unanimous-consent procedure.

The procedure itself is something we ought to have. I believe it has been abused in the past, but I do not believe it is being abused today.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Oregon.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2261

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That item 903.90 of the Appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "9/5/72" and inserting in lieu thereof "9/5/75".

SEC. 2. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Upon request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(1) which was made after September 5, 1972, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which there would have been no duty if the amendment made by the first section of this Act applied to such entry or withdrawal,

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as through such entry or withdrawal had been made on the date of the enactment of this Act.

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.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CERTAIN FORMS OF COPPER

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2323) to continue until the close of June 30, 1974, the suspension of duties on certain forms of copper, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so for the purpose of having the gentleman from Oregon explain the bill.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2323, as reported, is to suspend the duty on certain forms of copper during the period July 1, 1973, to July 1, 1974.

The duty on imports of unwrought copper (except nickel copper), copper waste and scrap, copper articles imported to be used in remanufacture by smelting, and on the copper content of certain copper-bearing ores and materials was suspended from February 1966 to June 30, 1972.

These previous suspensions of duty were enacted to relieve the tight supply situation in the United States and world markets. Although the supply situation

has improved since 1970 when the last suspension of duty was enacted, the supply situation has tightened since mid-December 1972, and both domestic and foreign prices have risen sharply. On April 9, domestic and foreign prices were at 60 cents per pound and 74 cents per pound, respectively. In 1966 the domestic price of copper was 36.2 cents per pound and the foreign price was 69 cents per pound.

Mr. Speaker, while the domestic producing interests which opposed the extension of the duty suspension last year have removed their opposition to this bill, H.R. 2323, they have continued to express concern with increasing foreign capacity and rising domestic costs including cost of meeting air quality control standards for copper smelters.

In recognition of this concern and in view of the increases in the prices of copper since 1966, the Departments of Interior and Commerce suggested, and the committee agreed to, amendment of the Tariff Schedules to provide that the proposed suspension of duty on imports of copper be set aside at such times as the domestic price of copper declines to 51 cents per pound. Previous suspensions of duties on copper had been subject to a "peril point" as provided in the Tariff Schedules, under which the suspension of duty became inapplicable during any period in which the prices of electrolytic copper in styles, shapes, and sizes delivered Connecticut Valley, fell below 36 cents per pound. The committee amendment provides that this "peril point" be adjusted to 51 cents per pound.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in reporting H.R. 2323, and I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2323, which would extend through June of 1974 the suspension of duties on certain forms of copper. In addition to extending these suspensions, the bill would also increase the "peril point" from 36 cents per pound to 51 cents per pound. The "peril point" is the U.S. domestic price at or below which the duty becomes automatically reinstated. The change in the "peril point" was recommended by the Department of Interior to reflect the domestic price and cost trends which have developed since 1966 when the 36 cents "peril point" was established. The committee agreed to this change.

The items covered in the existing suspension which is extended by this bill are unwrought copper, copper waste and scrap, copper for remanufacture by smelting, and copper contained in certain ores and materials. The initial suspension was enacted in 1966, when there was an extremely tight situation worldwide with respect to this valuable and necessary metal. Demand was outstripping supply, and prices were high and rising.

Several steps were taken domestically to deal with this situation, including the release of stockpiled copper and congressional enactment of a suspension of duties for 2 years. The Congress has

acted twice since then to extend the suspension.

In its consideration of this latest proposal to continue the suspension, the committee was informed that the copper situation has improved in the 7 years since duties were initially suspended. Domestic production has increased and supply is not as tight, while imports have declined, both in absolute terms and as a proportion of domestic consumption.

The committee also was told that over the long run the United States will continue to be dependent to some extent on foreign sources of supply. Additionally, foreign and domestic prices have increased since mid-December 1972, due to a tighter supply situation. It is felt that the duty suspension will lower prices of imported copper without adversely affecting the domestic industry. For these reasons, the committee amended the bill, as introduced, to provide for a 1-year rather than a 2-year extension of the present suspension of duty.

In light of this information, and inasmuch as the interested executive branch agencies—registered no objections to the proposal, the committee unanimously reported H.R. 2323, as amended and recommends its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw by reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2323

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That items 911.10 (relating to copper waste and scrap), 911.11 (relating to articles of copper), 911.13 (relating to copper bearing ores and materials), 911.14 (relating to cement copper and copper copper precipitates), 911.15 (relating to black copper, blister copper, and anode copper), and 911.16 (relating to other unwrought copper) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) are each amended by striking out "6/30/72" and inserting in lieu thereof "6/30/74".

SEC. 2. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Upon request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(1) which was made after June 30, 1972, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which there would have been no duty if the amendment made by the first section of this Act applied to such entry or withdrawal, shall notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "That" insert "(a)".

Page 2, strike out line 1 and all that follows thereafter down through line 17 and insert the following:

(b) Headnote 3 of subpart B of part 1 of the Appendix to such Schedules is amended by striking out "36" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "51".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 1, 1973.

The committee amendments were 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.

EXTENSION OF EXISTING SUSPENSION OF DUTIES FOR METAL SCRAP

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2324) to continue until the close of June 30, 1975, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only for the purpose of permitting the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) to explain the bill.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN).

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2324, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to continue to the close of June 30, 1975, the existing suspension of duties on certain metal waste scrap, provided by item 911.12 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

Legislation for the temporary suspension of the duties on metal scrap was first enacted in 1942. With various changes the suspension was continued from time to time depending upon the scarcity of the particular metals at the time.

H.R. 2324 would continue for another 2 years, until July 1, 1975, the temporary suspension of the duties on such metal scrap as iron and steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, and nickel alloys. As before, the bill would not suspend the duties applicable to waste and scrap of lead, lead alloy, zinc, zinc alloy, tungsten, or tungsten alloy, nor would it suspend the duties applicable to articles of lead, lead alloy, zinc, zinc alloy, tungsten or tungsten alloy.

The Committee on Ways and Means has received no information which would indicate any opposition to the legislation. Moreover, the committee is informed that the conditions which prompted the initial suspension of duty on metal scrap and the continuations thereof to the present time have not materially changed.

The committee is unanimous in reporting H.R. 2324, and I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2324, which continues until June 30, 1975, the existing suspension of duties on certain metal waste scrap which expires on the 30th of this month.

There has been legislation on the books since 1942, with varying changes depending on the prevailing supply of the particular metal, suspending the duty on various metal scrap. Under present law, the duty is suspended for certain metal scrap, primarily scrap from iron and steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, and nickel alloys, until June 30 of this year. With that date close at hand, the Committee on Ways and Means has unanimously voted to continue the existing suspension for the period ending June 30, 1975.

Metal scrap is an important source of metal supply and is often considered raw material in the same sense as metal ores. Since many independent smelters in America depend on imports of metal scrap, to reimpose the duty now would reduce these imports and result in a reduction in our mineral resource base.

As before, this bill would not suspend the duties applicable to waste and scrap of lead, lead alloy, zinc, zinc alloy, tungsten or tungsten alloy, nor the duties applicable to articles of lead, lead alloy, zinc, zinc alloy, tungsten, or tungsten alloy.

The committee was advised that the conditions justifying the suspension of duty on these metals through the years continue to prevail. The committee received no objections to the legislation from the interested departments and was unanimous in recommending enactment of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2324

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) item 911.12 (relating to articles other than copper waste and scrap and articles of copper) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202 is amended by striking out "6/30/73" and inserting in lieu thereof "6/30/75").

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after June 30, 1973.

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.

EXTENSION OF EXISTING SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN DYEING AND TANNING MATERIALS

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate con-

sideration of the bill (H.R. 3630) to extend for 3 years the period during which certain dyeing and tanning materials may be imported free of duty which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so once again for the purpose of permitting the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) to explain the bill.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) yield?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN).

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3630, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to suspend temporarily, until the close of September 30, 1975, duties on imports of certain dyeing and tanning materials.

Legislation for the temporary suspension of duties on certain dyeing and tanning extracts was first enacted in 1957. With various changes, including the addition of other dyeing and tanning extracts, the suspension of duties has been extended on a number of occasions. The last such extension terminated on September 30, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, the only vegetable tanning material which has been produced in the United States in significant quantity is chestnut tanning extract. With the continued decline in the availability of chestnut trees, domestic firms producing tanning extracts have been unable to secure raw materials. Thus, the domestic availability of tanning extracts has steadily declined, and imported vegetable tanning materials are needed by U.S. tanning and leather industries to convert raw hides and skins into leather. Also certain of the materials are used by the oil well drilling industry as a thinner for fluids used in rotary drilling operations. Because of the continued lack of domestic availability of dyeing and tanning materials, the suspension of duties as provided in H.R. 3630, as amended, is warranted.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the last suspension of duty terminated on September 30, 1972, the bill has been amended by the committee to provide that the suspension will only apply to entries made on or after the date of enactment of the act, and to entries made after September 30, 1972, and before the date of enactment the liquidations of which have not become final on such date of enactment.

No objection has been received by the committee on this bill, and it was unanimously reported by the committee. I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3630, which would extend for a 3-year period—until September 30, 1975—the duty-free treatment of certain dyes and tanning materials.

In the past, we have provided for the

temporary suspension of duties on dyes and tanning products which were found to be in short supply in the United States. The last such suspension terminated on September 30 of last year, and the committee amended this bill to provide that the suspension of duties will apply only to entries made on or after the date of enactment of the act and to entries made between September 30, 1972, and the date of enactment where the liquidation of the article has not become final on the date of enactment.

The materials covered by this legislation include certain dyeing and tanning products of canaigre, chestnut, curupay, divi-divi, eucalyptus, and others which are provided for in the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

As I previously indicated, the supply of vegetable tanning materials in the United States has been declining with the result that it is necessary for us to import the materials needed by the leather industry to convert raw hides and skins into leather. Also, certain of the materials are utilized by the oil well drilling industry as a thinner for fluids used in rotary drilling operations.

In view of these requirements, it is important that we continue to provide for the duty-free treatment of the materials included in the legislation for another 3-year period.

The committee has been advised that the conditions which led to the original suspension of duties on dyeing and tanning materials continue to exist and believes that the continuation of these suspensions is warranted. The committee unanimously reported the bill and I urge its approval.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6394

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That item 907.80 of the appendix to the Tariff Schedule of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "9/30/72" and inserting in lieu thereof "9/30/75".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to (1) articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and (2) to any article covered by an entry or withdrawal (A) which was made after September 30, 1972, and before such date of enactment, and (B) the liquidation of which has not become final on such date of enactment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CXIX—1373—Part 17

time, and passed, an a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CAPROLACTAM MONOMER IN WATER SOLUTION

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6394) to suspend the duty on caprolactam monomer in water solution until the close of December 31, 1973, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) to explain the bill.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI) yield?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN).

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 6394, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to extend from December 31, 1972, to December 31, 1973, the temporary suspension of duty on imports of caprolactam monomer in water solution.

Caprolactam monomer, a benzenoid chemical, is principally used as an intermediate in the preparation of Nylon 6, which in turn is used in the manufacture of synthetic fibers, moulding resins, and nonwoven fibers.

Under Public Law 92-587, the duty on imports of caprolactam monomer was suspended from August 16, 1972, to December 31, 1972. This temporary duty suspension was in response to the short supply situation in the United States. The severe short supply of caprolactam monomer has been due in large measure to the fact that a new plant designed to add 100 million pounds to the U.S. production capacity has not come on-stream as planned because of technical difficulties. In order to supply the needs of its customers, the domestic producer is importing unrefined caprolactam to be further processed in units of its new plant that are operational. The two remaining domestic sources cannot supply the additional unrefined caprolactam required by the customers of the firm importing caprolactam.

The Committee on Ways and Means is satisfied that the conditions supporting the original suspension of duties have continued and that the extension of the duty suspension for 1 year from December 31, 1972, is warranted. Favorable reports on H.R. 6394 were received from interested executive branch agencies and an informative report was received from the U.S. Tariff Commission.

In view of the termination of the suspension of duty on December 31, 1972, the bill also provides that the entry or

withdrawal of any articles which was made after December 31, 1972, and before the date of enactment of H.R. 6394 may be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the date of enactment. Such liquidation or reliquidation of any entry or withdrawal is subject to a request being filed therewith with the customs officer concerned on or before the 90th day after the date of enactment.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in reporting this measure, and I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6394, which provides for the suspension of duty on caprolactam monomer in water solution, until December 31, 1973.

Caprolactam monomer, a benzenoid chemical, is used in the preparation of Nylon 6 which, in turn, is used in the manufacture of synthetic fibers, molding resins, and nonwoven fabrics. A small amount of caprolactam is used in floor polishes, in specialty coatings, and adhesives.

The United States has been importing caprolactam for some time and our imports have been rising while our exports of caprolactam have decreased. In the 92d Congress, we enacted legislation suspending the duty on caprolactam monomer in water solution. Under this legislation, the duty was suspended from August 16, 1972, through December 31 of last year. The bill before the House would continue the duty-free importation of this substance from last December 31 through December 31 of this year.

The severe shortage of caprolactam monomer has been due to the delay in construction of a new plant facility designed to greatly increase U.S. production capacity of one of the three domestic producers. The domestic producers are currently unable to supply the existing demand. Since the construction of new facilities will have an impact on supply, the extension of duty-free treatment is only through December 31 of this year.

Caprolactam in water solution has been used in increasing amounts in America and the committee is satisfied that the conditions which occasioned the original suspension of duty have continued and that the extension of duty suspension for 1 year is warranted.

I urge the enactment of H.R. 6394.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6394

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart B of part 1 of the appendix of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting immediately after item 907.45 the following new item:

"907.50.....Caprolactam monomer in water solution Free.....No change.....On or before December 31, 1972".
(provided for in item 403.70, part 1B, schedule 4).

SEC. 2. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Upon request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(1) which was made after January 1, 1973 and before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which there would have been no duty if the amendment made by the first section of this Act applied to such entry or withdrawal,

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "907.45" and insert "905.31".

Page 1, in the matter immediately following line 6, strike out "December 31, 1972," and insert "12/31/73".

Page 2, line 9, strike out "January 1, 1973" and insert "December 31, 1972".

The committee amendments were 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.

DUTYABLE STATUS OF MANGANESE ORE

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6676) relating to the dutyable status of manganese ore, including ferruginous manganese ore, and manganiferous iron ore, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman to explain this legislation.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 6676, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to continue for a 3-year period, through June 30, 1976, the existing suspension of duty on certain manganese ores.

Mr. Speaker, there is little production of manganese ore in the United States. In recent years, domestic ore has accounted for less than 1 percent of the manganese ore consumed in this country. Thus the preponderant share of domestic consumption of manganese ore is supplied by imports principally from Brazil, Gabon, Congo, Ghana, India, and the Union of South Africa.

The principal use of manganese ore

is for metallurgical purposes in the production of steel. Much smaller amounts are consumed in the production of dry cell batteries and in the manufacture of manganese chemicals. Consumers of manganese ore in the United States are principally producers of manganese ferroalloys, primarily ferromanganese, and to a lesser extent silicomanganese. Continued suspension of duty, as provided in H.R. 6676 will aid in reducing costs to these processors and in enhancing the competitive position of domestically produced alloys.

The Committee on Ways and Means is convinced that the continued suspension of duty on manganese ore provided in H.R. 6676 as reported is fully justified and warranted. As originally introduced, H.R. 6676 would have suspended the duty on manganese permanently. At the suggestion of the Department of State, the committee amended the bill to extend the suspension temporarily for a period of 3 years.

No objection to the extension of duty suspension was received from the interested Federal agencies, and the committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of the bill. I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6676, which will continue for a 3-year period the existing suspension of duty on certain manganese ores. If this legislation is enacted, suspension on these manganese ores will be extended from June 30 of this month until the close of June 30, 1976.

Most of the manganese ore used in the United States has been and no doubt will continue to be imported. In fact, in recent years, only about 1 percent of the manganese ore consumed here has been produced domestically. The remaining share has been supplied by Brazil, Gabon, Congo, Ghana, India, and South Africa. It is anticipated that the situation vis-a-vis the need to import most of the manganese ore for domestic use will continue for the indefinite future.

As a result, H.R. 6676, as introduced, would have suspended permanently the duty on manganese. However, at the suggestion of the Department of State, the committee decided to limit the suspension to an additional 3-year period.

Manganese ore is used primarily for metallurgical purposes in the production of steel and secondarily in the production of dry cell batteries and the manufacture of manganese chemicals. The principal consumers of manganese ore are producers of manganese ferroalloys, and the enactment of this legislation will, in the view of the committee, be helpful to these producers.

The committee is satisfied that the conditions which prompted the past suspension of duties on manganese ore still prevail. The committee unanimously reported this legislation, and I urge its approval.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 6676

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) are amended as follows:

(1) Item 601.27 (relating to manganese ore) is amended by striking out "0.12¢ per lb. on manganese content" and inserting in lieu thereof "Free".

(2) Effective July 1, 1973, item 911.07 (relating to manganese ore) is repealed.

(b) The rate of duty for item 601.27 in rate column numbered 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, as amended by subsection (a), shall (1) be treated as not having the status of statutory provision enacted by the Congress, but as having been proclaimed by the President as being required or appropriate to carrying out foreign trade agreements to which the United States is a party, and (2) supersede the staged rates of duty provided for such items in annex III to Proclamation 3822, dated December 16, 1967 (32 Fed. Reg., Numbered 244, part II, page 19037).

(c) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after July 1, 1973.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That (a) item 911.07 (relating to manganese ore, including ferruginous manganese ore and manganiferous iron ore) of Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "6/30/73" and inserting in lieu thereof "6/30/76".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after June 30, 1973.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue until July 1, 1976, the existing suspension of duty on manganese ore."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON COPYING SHOE LATHES

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8215) to provide for the suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes until the close of June 30, 1976, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman to explain the bill.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8215, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to provide for the suspension of duty until the close of June 30, 1976, on copying lathes used for making rough or finished shoe lasts from models of shoe lasts and capable of producing more than one size shoe from a single size model of shoe last.

The duty on copying shoe lathes has been temporarily suspended on a successive basis, beginning in 1956, for 2- and 3-year periods. The suspension of duty on these lathes was initially made and has been continued in order to make available to domestic shoe-last manufacturers highly specialized and expensive copying lathes on a duty-free basis. The Committee on Ways and Means is advised that such lathes can only be obtained from foreign sources. The duty suspension as provided in H.R. 8215, therefore, will continue to benefit the shoe-last manufacturing industry in the United States without detriment to any domestic interests.

In view of the termination of the suspension of duty on June 30, 1972, H.R. 8215 also provides that the entry or withdrawal of any articles which was made after June 30, 1972, and on or before the date of enactment of H.R. 8215, may be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made after the date of enactment.

No objection to the enactment of this suspension has been received, and the committee is unanimous in recommending its approval by the House.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8215, a bill to continue until June 30, 1976, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes. The duty applicable to these lathes has been suspended for 2- and 3-year periods since 1956.

The copying shoe lathes involved are not produced in America. Throughout the years, our domestic shoe industry has requested suspension of the duty on these items which are used for making rough or finished shoe lasts from a single-size shoe last model. The Congress has granted these extensions in the past on the ground that the lasts could not be purchased in this country. The exemptions benefit domestic shoe manufacturers, their workers, and consumers without damaging any domestic interests. No objection has been received to the extension of the present suspension of duty on these items.

The suspension of the duty on these copying shoe lathes terminated last June 30. As a result, the bill provides that entry or withdrawal of any articles made after that date and on or before the date of enactment of H.R. 8215 may be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made after the date of enactment. This liquidation or reliquidation of any withdrawal or entry as subject to a request being filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the 120th day after the date of enactment of this legislation.

The committee is informed that continuation of the suspension of these

copying shoe lathes is warranted and unanimously reported the bill. Therefore, I urge its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 8215

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That item 911.70 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "On or before June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "On or before June 30, 1976."

SEC. 2. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Upon request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the one hundred and twentieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(1) which was made after June 30, 1972, and on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which the amount of duty would be smaller if the amendment made by the first section of this Act applied to such entry or withdrawal,

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "On" and all that follows thereafter down through line 6 and insert the following: "6/30/72" and inserting in lieu thereof "6/30/76".

On page 2, lines 6 and 7, strike out "the amount of duty would be smaller" and insert the following: "there would have been no duty".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—403

Abdnor	Arends	Biaggi
Abzug	Armstrong	Biester
Adams	Ashley	Bingham
Addabbo	Aspin	Blackburn
Alexander	Bafalis	Boggs
Anderson,	Baker	Boiland
Calif.	Barrett	Bolling
Andrews, N.C.	Beard	Bowen
Andrews,	Bell	Brademas
N. Dak.	Bennett	Brasco
Annunzio	Bergland	Bray
Archer	Bevill	Breckinridge

Brinkley	Gibbons	Mathias, Calif.
Brooks	Gilman	Mathis, Ga.
Broomfield	Ginn	Matsuunaga
Brotzman	Goldwater	Mayne
Brown, Calif.	Gonzalez	Mazzoli
Brown, Mich.	Goodling	Meeds
Brown, Ohio	Grasso	Meicher
Broyhill, N.C.	Green, Oreg.	Metcalfe
Broyhill, Va.	Green, Pa.	Mezvisinsky
Buchanan	Griffiths	Michel
Burgener	Gross	Millford
Burke, Calif.	Grover	Miller
Burke, Fla.	Gubser	Minish
Burke, Mass.	Gude	Mink
Burleson, Tex.	Gunter	Minshall, Ohio
Burlison, Mo.	Guyer	Mitchell, Md.
Burton	Haley	Mitchell, N.Y.
Butler	Hamilton	Mizell
Byron	Hammer-	Moakley
Camp	schmidt	Mollohan
Carey, N.Y.	Hanley	Montgomery
Carney, Ohio	Hanna	Moorhead,
Carter	Hanrahan	Calif.
Casey, Tex.	Hansen, Idaho	Moorhead, Pa.
Cederberg	Hansen, Wash.	Morgan
Chamberlain	Harrington	Mosher
Chappell	Harsba	Moss
Clancy	Harvey	Murphy, Ill.
Clark	Hastings	Myers
Clausen,	Hawkins	Natcher
Don H.	Hays	Nedzi
Clawson, Del.	Hechler, W. Va.	Nelsen
Cleveland	Heckler, Mass.	Nichols
Cochran	Heinz	Nix
Cohen	Helstoski	Obey
Collier	Henderson	O'Brien
Collins, Ill.	Hicks	O'Hara
Collins, Tex.	Hillis	O'Neill
Conable	Hinsshaw	Owens
Conlan	Hogan	Passman
Conte	Holifield	Patten
Conyers	Holt	Perkins
Corman	Holtzman	Pettis
Cotter	Horton	Peyser
Coughlin	Hosmer	Pickle
Crane	Howard	Pike
Culver	Huber	Poage
Daniel, Dan	Hudnut	Podell
Daniel, Robert	Hungate	Powell, Ohio
W. Jr.	Hunt	Preyer
Daniels,	Hutchinson	Price, Ill.
Dominick V.	Ichord	Price, Tex.
Davis, S.C.	Jarman	Pritchard
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Quile
de la Garza	Johnson, Colo.	Quillen
Delaney	Johnson, Pa.	Rallsback
Dellenback	Jones, Ala.	Randall
Dellums	Jones, N.C.	Rangel
Denholm	Jones, Okla.	Rarick
Dennis	Jones, Tenn.	Rees
Dent	Jordan	Regula
Devine	Karth	Reid
Dickinson	Kastenmeyer	Reuss
Diggs	Kazen	Rhodes
Dingell	Keating	Riegle
Donohue	Kemp	Rinaldo
Downing	Ketchum	Roberts
Drinan	King	Robinson, Va.
Dulski	Kluczynski	Rodino
Duncan	Koch	Roe
du Pont	Kuykendall	Rogers
Eckhardt	Kyros	Roncalio, Wyo.
Edwards, Calif.	Landgrebe	Roncalio, N.Y.
Ellberg	Landrum	Rooney, Pa.
Erlenborn	Latta	Rose
Esch	Lehman	Rosenthal
Eshleman	Litton	Rostenkowski
Evans, Colo.	Long, La.	Roush
Evins, Tenn.	Long, Md.	Rousselot
Fascell	Lott	Roy
Findley	Lujan	Roybal
Fish	McClory	Runnels
Flood	McCloskey	Ruppe
Flowers	McCollister	Ruth
Flynt	McCormack	Ryan
Foley	McDade	St Germain
Ford, Gerald R.	McEwen	Sarasin
Ford,	McFall	Sarbanes
William D.	McKay	Satterfield
Forsythe	McKinney	Saylor
Fountain	McSpadden	Scherie
Fraser	Maconald	Schneebell
Frelinghuysen	Madden	Schroeder
Frenzel	Madigan	Sebellus
Frey	Mahon	Seiberling
Fruehlich	Mailliard	Shibley
Fulton	Mallory	Shoup
Fuqua	Mann	Shriver
Gaydos	Maraziti	Shuster
Gettys	Martin, Nebr.	Sikes
Gialmo	Martin, N.C.	Sisk

Skubitz	Taylor, Mo.	Williams
Slack	Taylor, N.C.	Wilson, Bob
Smith, Iowa	Teague, Calif.	Wilson,
Smith, N.Y.	Thomson, Wis.	Charles H.,
Snyder	Thone	Calif.
Spence	Thornton	Wilson,
Staggers	Tiernan	Charles, Tex.
Stanton,	Towell, Nev.	
J. William	Treen	Winn
Stanton,	Udall	Wolf
James V.	Ullman	Wright
Stark	Van Deerlin	Wyatt
Steele	Vander Jagt	Wydler
Steelman	Vanik	Wylie
Steiger, Ariz.	Veysey	Wyman
Steiger, Wis.	Vigorito	Yates
Stephens	Waggonner	Yatron
Stokes	Walsh	Young, Alaska
Stratton	Wampler	Young, Fla.
Stubblefield	Ware	Young, Ga.
Stuckey	White	Young, Ill.
Sudds	Whitehurst	Young, S.C.
Sullivan	Whitten	Young, Tex.
Symington	Widnall	Zablocki
Symms	Wiggins	Zion
Talcott		Zwach

NAYS—0

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cronin

NOT VOTING—29

Anderson, Ill.	Dorn	Patman
Ashbrook	Edwards, Ala.	Pepper
Badillo	Fisher	Robison, N.Y.
Blatnik	Gray	Rooney, N.Y.
Breaux	Hébert	Sandman
Chisholm	Leggett	Steed
Clay	Lent	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	Mills, Ark.	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Ga.	Murphy, N.Y.	Whalen
Derwinski	Parris	

So the committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Sandman.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Lent.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Robison of New York.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Badillo.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Parris.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Danielson with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Pepper.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Whalen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 297, I was recorded as voting "present." I intended to vote "yea."

TAX TREATMENT OF SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLANS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of the bill (H.R. 4200) to amend section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could I ask the gentleman from Oregon to explain the bill briefly?

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 4200, amends the tax laws to continue the same tax treatment for servicemen, and former servicemen, of the United States under the recently enacted survivor benefit plan as was formerly available for them under the retired serviceman's family protection plan in the case of survivor annuities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is necessary because of legislation enacted in the 92d Congress which changed the method by which servicemen or former servicemen choose to participate in a survivor's benefit program. Until recently, a serviceman or former serviceman could provide survivor benefits for his dependents only by electing to participate in the retired serviceman's family protection plan. If he made the election under this plan, he would receive a reduced amount of retired or retainer pay in order to finance survivor benefits for his dependents. Under the present tax law, when this election is made, the funds used to finance these survivor benefits need not be included in his gross income. However, the recently enacted legislation, Public Law 92-425, revised the program for survivor benefits to provide these benefits automatically unless the serviceman, or former serviceman, elects not to provide them.

Since the present tax law is cast in terms of an election into the survivor benefit program and since the new survivor benefit program is provided automatically unless a serviceman, or former serviceman, elects out of the program, it is necessary to change the tax law to continue excluding from current tax the funds used to provide these survivor benefits.

As a result, the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 4200, excludes from current tax the funds used to provide the survivor benefits without regard to the election requirement of prior law. Similar conforming amendments are also made to other provisions of the tax laws.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will not change present revenues and has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. The Treasury Department recommends its enactment. I urge that the bill be adopted.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4200, which would conform the Internal Revenue Code to changes in the survivors benefit program for servicemen resulting

from the enactment recently of Public Law 92-425, the survivor benefit plan.

This legislation amends the Internal Revenue Code in several instances to provide the same tax treatment for servicemen and former servicemen as existed prior to the enactment of Public Law 92-425. Under the prior law—the retired serviceman's family protection plan—a serviceman could elect to provide an annuity for his surviving spouse and certain child beneficiaries by having a certain amount subtracted from his monthly annuity. That amount under existing tax law was excluded from his gross income.

Under Public Law 92-425, the survivor benefit plan, the retired serviceman is covered by the plan unless he elects not to be included. Since the existing tax law which provides an exclusion for the amount of this deduction is cast in terms of an election to participate and since that election is no longer available to the serviceman under the new law, it is necessary to change certain provisions of the tax law if the serviceman is to continue to be able to exclude the amount he monthly deducts for the annuity for his survivors. Similar conforming amendments are also made to other provisions of the tax law.

It is important to note that the adoption of this legislation will not create a new benefit to any military retiree but simply allow a continuation of the treatment which presently exists with respect to exclusions under survivor benefit plans of military retirees.

The survivor benefit plan legislation was reported by the House Armed Services Committee late in the last session of the 92d Congress. That committee would normally have referred the legislation to the Ways and Means Committee in order that the appropriate changes in the tax law could have been included in the bill. However, due to the lateness of the session and the desire of the Armed Services Committee to obtain passage of the survivor benefit plan provisions in that session, they decided not to further delay the bill by referral to the Committee on Ways and Means. Similarly, the Ways and Means Committee could not act on the matter until the Armed Services Committee had decided upon the full provisions of that legislation. As a result, in October of last year, our committee reported legislation similar to H.R. 4200. However, again due to the lateness of the session, it was not brought to the floor for action. Accordingly, in order to correct the inequity previously described, we have reported the bill before us.

The treatment afforded by this bill is the same as that which is applied to the survivor annuity program administered by the Civil Service Commission for civilian employees of the United States. It seems clear that we should allow the military retirees to continue to be on an equal par with their civilian counterparts as far as this particular exclusion provision is concerned. For these reasons, I urge the House to approve this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4200

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 122(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain reduced uniform services retirement pay) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a member or former member of the uniformed services of the United States, gross income does not include the amount of any reduction in his retired or retainer pay pursuant to the provisions of chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code."

(b) Section 122(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking out "section 1438" in subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1438 or 1452(a)".

(c) Section 72(o) of such Code is amended by inserting after "PLAN" in the heading of such section "OR SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN".

(d) Section 101(b)(2)(D) of such Code is amended by striking out "if the individual who made the election under such chapter" and inserting in lieu thereof "if the member or former member of the uniformed services by reason of whose death such annuity is payable".

(e) Section 2039 of such Code is amended by striking out "section 1438" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1438 or 1452 (a)".

(f) The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply to taxable years ending on or after September 21, 1972. The amendments made by subsections (d) and (e) shall apply with respect to individuals dying on or after such date.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 2, strike out "(a)" and insert "(d)".

On page 2, line 11, insert "(c)" immediately after "2039".

On page 2, line 13, strike out "(a)" and insert "(d)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—402

Abdnor	Andrews, N.C.	Arends
Abzug	Andrews,	Armstrong
Adams	N. Dak.	Ashley
Addabbo	Annuzio	Asplin
Alexander	Archer	Bafalis

Baker	Flynt	McKay	Schneebell	Stubblefield	Whitehurst
Barrett	Foley	McSpadden	Schroeder	Stuckey	Whitten
Beard	Ford, Gerald R.	Macdonald	Sebellus	Studds	Widnall
Bell	Forsythe	Madden	Seiberling	Sullivan	Wiggins
Bennett	Fountain	Madigan	Shipley	Symms	Williams
Bergland	Fraser	Mahon	Shoup	Talcott	Wilson, Bob
Bevill	Frelinghuysen	Mailliard	Shriver	Taylor, Mo.	Wilson,
Blaggi	Frenzel	Mallory	Shuster	Taylor, N.C.	Charles H.,
Biester	Frey	Mann	Sikes	Teague, Calif.	Calif.
Bingham	Froehlich	Martin, Nebr.	Sisk	Teague, Tex.	Wilson,
Blackburn	Fulton	Martin, N.C.	Skubitz	Thomson, Wis.	Charles, Tex.
Boggs	Fuqua	Mathias, Calif.	Slack	Thone	Winn
Boland	Gaydos	Mathis, Ga.	Smith, Iowa	Thornton	Wolff
Bolling	Gettys	Matsunaga	Smith, N.Y.	Tiernan	Wright
Bowen	Gialmo	Mazzoli	Snyder	Towell, Nev.	Wydler
Brademas	Gibbons	Meeds	Spence	Treen	Wylie
Brasco	Gilman	Melcher	Staggers	Udall	Wyman
Bray	Ginn	Metcalfe	Stanton,	Ullman	Yates
Breckinridge	Goldwater	Mezvisinsky	J. William	Vander Jagt	Yatron
Brinkley	Gonzalez	Michel	Stanton,	Vanik	Young, Alaska
Brooks	Goodling	Millford	James V.	Veysey	Young, Fla.
Broomfield	Grasso	Miller	Stark	Vigorito	Young, Ga.
Brown, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Minish	Steele	Waggonner	Young, Ill.
Brown, Mich.	Green, Pa.	Mink	Steelman	Waldie	Young, S.C.
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	Minshall, Ohio	Steiger, Ariz.	Walsh	Young, Tex.
Broyhill, N.C.	Gross	Mitchell, Md.	Steiger, Wis.	Wampler	Zablocki
Broyhill, Va.	Grover	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stephens	Ware	Zion
Buchanan	Gubser	Mizell	Stokes	Whalen	Zwach
Burgener	Gude	Moakley	Stratton	White	
Burke, Calif.	Gunter	Mollohan			
Burke, Fla.	Guyer	Montgomery			
Burke, Mass.	Haley	Moorhead,			
Burleson, Tex.	Hamilton	Calif.			
Burlison, Mo.	Hammer-	Moorhead, Pa.			
Burton	schmidt				
Butler	Hanley	Morgan			
Byron	Hanna	Mosher			
Camp	Hanrahan	Moss			
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, Ill.			
Carney, Ohio	Hansen, Wash.	Myers			
Carter	Harrington	Natcher			
Casey, Tex.	Harsha	Nedzi			
Cederberg	Harvey	Nelsen			
Chamberlain	Hastings	Nichols			
Chappell	Hawkins	Nix			
Chisholm	Hays	O'Brien			
Clancy	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara			
Clark	Heckler, Mass.	O'Neill			
Clausen,	Heinz	Owens			
Don H.	Helstoski	Passman			
Clawson, Del.	Henderson	Patten			
Cleveland	Hicks	Pepper			
Cochran	Hillis	Perkins			
Cohen	Hogan	Pettis			
Collier	Holifield	Peyser			
Collins, Ill.	Holt	Pickle			
Collins, Tex.	Holtzman	Pike			
Conable	Horton	Poage			
Conlan	Hosmer	Podell			
Conte	Howard	Powell, Ohio			
Conyers	Huber	Preyer			
Corman	Hudnut	Price, Ill.			
Cotter	Hungate	Price, Tex.			
Crane	Hunt	Pritchard			
Cronin	Hutchinson	Quie			
Culver	Ichord	Quillen			
Daniel, Dan	Jarman	Rallsback			
Daniel, Robert	Johnson, Calif.	Randall			
W., Jr.	Johnson, Colo.	Rangel			
Daniels,	Johnson, Pa.	Rarick			
Dominick V.	Jones, Ala.	Rees			
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N.C.	Regula			
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Okla.	Reid			
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Tenn.	Reuss			
de la Garza	Jordan	Rhodes			
Delaney	Karth	Riegle			
Dellenback	Kastenmeier	Rinaldo			
Dellums	Kazen	Roberts			
Denholm	Keating	Robinson, Va.			
Dennis	Kemp	Robison, N.Y.			
Dent	Ketchum	Rodino			
Dickinson	King	Roe			
Diggs	Kluczynski	Rogers			
Dingell	Koch	Roncalio, Wyo.			
Donohue	Kuykendall	Roncalio, N.Y.			
Downing	Kyros	Rooney, Pa.			
Drinan	Landgrebe	Rose			
Dulski	Landrum	Rosenthal			
Duncan	Latta	Rostenkowski			
du Pont	Leggett	Roush			
Eckhardt	Lehman	Rousselot			
Edwards, Ala.	Lent	Roy			
Edwards, Calif.	Litton	Roybal			
Ellberg	Long, La.	Runnels			
Erlenborn	Long, Md.	Ruppe			
Esch	Lott	Ruth			
Eshleman	Lujan	Ryan			
Evans, Colo.	McClory	St Germain			
Evins, Tenn.	McCloskey	Sandman			
Fascell	McCollister	Sarasin			
Findley	McCormack	Sarbanes			
Fish	McDade	Satterfield			
Flood	McEwen	Saylor			
Flowers	McFall	Scherle			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—31

Anderson,	Derwinski	Mayne
Calif.	Devine	Mills, Ark.
Anderson, Ill.	Dorn	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Fisher	Parris
Badillo	Ford,	Patman
Blatnik	William D.	Rooney, N.Y.
Breaux	Gray	Steed
Brotzman	Hébert	Symington
Clay	Hinshaw	Thompson, N.J.
Coughlin	McKinney	Van Deerlin
Danielson	Maraziti	Wyatt

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Brotzman.

Mr. Gray with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Mayne.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. McKinney.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Danielson with Mr. Parris.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Maraziti.

Mr. Symington with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Clay with Mr. Badillo.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 8917, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 470 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 470

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8917) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 470 permits the Committee on Appropriations to submit the 1974 appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and other related agencies including the U.S. Forest Service for action on the floor of the House of Representatives without being subject to points of order.

House Resolution 470 provides that the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI of the Rules of the House are waived against the bill.

The total appropriation in the bill is \$2,269,554,200. Of this total, \$529,590,000 is allocated for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$234,705,000 for the National Park Service, \$72,940,000 for the Smithsonian Institution and \$13,689,000 for the Office of Water Resources.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8917 also includes funds for soil and water conservation, for the protection of mineral, fish, and wildlife resources, and for many other vital and necessary programs.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 470 is the rule which provides for the consideration of H.R. 8917, Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill. The rule waives points of order against the bill for failure to comply with clause 2, rule XXI, which prohibits both unauthorized appropriations and legislation on an appropriation bill.

The several programs which need a waiver because the authorizing legislation has not yet been enacted into law are:

Page 20, lines 15 to 22, the National Visitor Center.

Page 22, lines 9 to 12, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Page 35, lines 10 to 25 and page 36, lines 1 to 18, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

The committee report notes several legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill:

Page 7, in connection with construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Page 20, in connection with planning and construction, National Park Service.

Page 23, in connection with departmental operations, Office of the Secretary.

Page 32, in connection with administrative provisions, Forest Service.

Page 37, in connection with museum programs and related research—special foreign currency program—Smithsonian Institution.

Page 41, in connection with general provisions.

The purpose of H.R. 8917 is to provide \$2,269,554,200 in new budget authority for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1974. This is \$4,877,100 less than requested and \$285,476,100 less than fiscal year 1973.

The total for liquidation of contract authority is \$7,000,000 less than requested.

Because of a lack of authorizing legislation, the Appropriations Committee decided to pass over the following programs without prejudice.

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	\$56,000,000
Preservation of historic properties (grants-in-aid-to States)	15,505,000
Saline water research	2,527,000
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission	7,100,000

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 470 in order that the House may begin debate on H.R. 8917.

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

Mr. LATTA. I will be pleased to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio made the statement that the Committee on Rules decided to pass over without prejudice certain programs.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman from Iowa, but I would like to correct the gentleman.

It was not the Committee on Rules that passed them over without prejudice, but the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. I would then ask the gentleman from Ohio what exactly is meant by "pass over without prejudice" in this instance?

Mr. LATTA. That means the Appropriations Committee did not put them in this appropriation bill because the authorizing legislation on them has not yet gone through the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Would not that have been the proper procedure in the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio on all the rest of the proposals they did include in this appropriation bill that have not been authorized?

Mr. LATTA. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that I could probably point to a couple of projects that I mentioned here that I oppose, and I believe the gentleman from Iowa opposes, that probably they could have passed over without prejudice, but they did not.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an appropriation committee, or a legislative committee?

Mr. LATTA. It is an appropriation committee. And I would say in defense of this committee that I think they have done a very excellent job on a very difficult subject.

Mr. GROSS. I guess so, because if you can get the rules bent and warped to take care of every situation, perhaps you can do a good job. That all depends on your interpretation of what is good and what is bad.

Mr. LATTA. I quite agree with the gentleman from Iowa that it is an interpretation. But, in view of the fact that we are right up to the end of this fiscal year, and we have to get some of these appropriation bills passed, there is no other way to do it so as to cover the situation.

Mr. GROSS. Once again I suggest to

the gentleman that we should do one thing or the other, either forget about authorizing legislation and turn that function over to the Committee on Rules; or in a combination of the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Appropriations, or go back to the procedure that served the Congress well for so many years, that of a consistently enacting authorizing legislation as a requisite to appropriation.

Mr. LATTA. I might advise my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, further that there just is not any other way when legislative committees have not completed their work. Until such time as they complete their work, this is the only way this committee can operate.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Washington Post, and perhaps many other newspapers around the country, carried a column by Mr. Jack Anderson criticizing several members of the House Select Committee on Crime for allegedly "gutting"—and that is his word—the report of that committee dealing with drug commercials on radio and television. The reckless charge of Mr. Anderson was that members of the Crime Committee sold out the public interest in exchange for campaign contributions by deleting from their report a recommendation that drug commercials be severally curtailed.

In particular, our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KEATING) was singled out for special attack.

Mr. Speaker, once again Mr. Anderson is wrong, and once again he has acted irresponsibly. The truth is that members of the Crime Committee staff, acting without guidance from the committee, drafted a proposed report which was intended to reflect our hearings on drugs in schools. Although there was no careful inquiry into the effect of drug advertising on drug abuse, these staff members interjected their own unsupported views that such advertising should be curtailed.

As has been the custom, unfortunately, in the Crime Committee, the staff effort was promptly leaked to sensationalists in the press.

When the committee itself considered the draft, it unanimously—all of its members—rejected the staff recommendations and instead recommended that an appropriate committee of this Congress, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, conduct an in-depth study to determine the true effect of drug advertising on drug abuse.

There was no industry pressure of any sort, absolutely none, on this member, and so far as I have been able to determine, on any other member, to affect the content of our report.

Mr. KEATING is a fine, honorable, hard-working Member of Congress, Mr. Speak-

er. I deeply deplore this irresponsible, unfounded attack on Mr. KEATING which was made today by Mr. Anderson.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman briefly explain some of the contents of this bill, with particular reference to the arts and humanities?

Mr. LATTA. I should be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, if she would like to go into greater detail at this time on the question of the arts and humanities.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I shall be glad to, if given the opportunity, discuss this bill and any items in it not on the presentation of the rule but on the presentation of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, if he will yield further, I note in the report that it is stated:

The Committee is aware of the rapidly increasing production costs for all the performing arts and is also deeply aware of the wide public support for these programs. The Committee has provided an increase of \$24,161,000 in this appropriation over 1973 to reflect its support for these programs in the arts and the humanities.

I am sure the gentleman is as equally and deeply aware of the need to stop inflation in this country and stop the increases in the cost of bread, milk and bacon and beans for the poor in this country who command so much blood from the House of Representatives in other appropriation bills?

Mr. LATTA. In answer to the gentleman's question, let me say, as he knows I do not serve on this committee, I am a member of the Rules Committee, and we were not privy to the information that was given to the distinguished Subcommittee on Appropriations which handled this bill.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest the distinguished gentleman from Iowa may find the answer to his question on page 59, part 5 of the hearings, wherein, in response to a question propounded by the gentlewoman from Washington this dialog ensued:

Mrs. HANSEN. Please insert in the record the total number of people you feel that the program reaches, through your museum participation, art training, et cetera.

Miss HANKS. We have estimates broken down roughly between the fields. We would be glad to submit that.

[The information follows:]

Estimates on audiences/participants (based on full funding, fiscal year 1974)

Audiences/Participants	
I. Availability of the Arts.....	331,000,000
II. Cultural Resources Development.....	175,000,000
III. Advancement of our Cultural Legacy.....	380,000,000

Miss Hanks, as the gentleman knows, is Miss Nancy Hanks. If the gentleman refers to that page he will see the estimates of the numbers of people the arts programs will reach. As the gentleman can see, availability of the arts reaches 331 million, cultural resources development reaches 175 million people, and advancement of our cultural legacy reaches 380 million people.

In other words, the arts are no longer just for the wealthy or the gifted or for the favored few. The arts in this country are now for the benefit of all the people.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield so I may ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois, will the arts and humanities operation in the District of Columbia reach to the one in every six people who are on welfare rolls here?

Mr. YATES. I would suggest to the gentleman that, yes, the people who are on welfare will probably find pleasure in some of the arts exhibitions that are on display in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Who will pay for their tickets to the Kennedy Center at \$10 to \$12 each? I would assume once in awhile they would like to occupy the boxes and better seats in the place.

Mr. YATES. The performances at the Kennedy Center of which the gentleman speaks are not supported by the arts and humanities programs.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman does think the arts and humanities will reach out to the one in every six in the District of Columbia who are on welfare?

Mr. YATES. I would say they are available and I think it is a good thing that they are available to all people in this country.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman means they are as available for the one in six as they are to the Mayor and other poobahs of Washington?

Mr. YATES. Again I say the performances at the Kennedy Center are not supported by the Endowment for the Arts and Humanities. I think we have to keep them separate.

Mr. GROSS. But how else do they get this culture unless it is at some place?

Mr. YATES. There are exhibits in the schools, at the Anacostia Museum, there are traveling exhibits and programs and other performances.

Mr. GROSS. Do these one in every six who are on welfare in the District of Columbia get grants for studies under the arts and humanities?

Mr. YATES. Some of them may. I suggest to the gentleman, if they have talents for that purpose they can receive appropriate grants for these purposes.

Mr. GROSS. All I want to see is the poor, wherever they may be, enjoy these benefits, if they can be called that.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is seeking to end any possible discrimination against them?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I want them to have

some of the good things in life that are being passed around to others and on the same basis.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman joins me, then, in supporting this program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, especially in view of the fact that the appropriation is practically being doubled to \$145 million for the arts and "humanities", or whatever it is.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire about the purpose of the resolution and the way in which it is worded. Could I inquire of the gentleman from Louisiana or the gentleman from Ohio why it was necessary to bring this bill up under such a resolution?

I have noticed an alarming increase in the number of instances in which we are considering such resolutions prior to the consideration of appropriations bills. I think it is a serious departure from our past practice. In the footnotes, underneath rule 21, clause 2, it is indicated that:

In rare instances the House, by agreeing to a report from the Committee on Rules or by adopting an order under suspension of the Rules, has authorized legislation on general appropriations bills.

These rare instances have been coming one after another in the last few weeks. In fact, this is, I think, the third such resolution we have considered within the last week.

Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of the gentleman from Louisiana why we are doing this?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will recall, there was a colloquy on this matter on the floor of the House between Mr. BOLLING of the Committee on Rules and Mr. DINGELL of Michigan yesterday. Mr. DINGELL had earlier in the day appeared before the Committee on Rules and made exactly the same point the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) is making at the present time.

It was considered by the Committee on Rules at the time. We felt that there was some validity in the comments which were made to the Committee on Rules by Mr. DINGELL. Consequently, the Committee on Rules unanimously agreed at that time that, while we were, with respect to bills which were before the Committee on Rules, under a considerable amount of pressure to get those rules out, we would continue those under more or less a broader rule than had been some years ago, before I joined that committee, employed by the committee in their approach to these bills.

We did decide that we would go ahead with them at this time, but that we

would narrow our interpretation back to what it had been previously in general consideration of this nature. This was the unanimous view of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I think the point is a valid one.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to hear that. I really believe that it is most important that we do so, because if the Appropriations Committee is going to establish itself in the business of legislating, we might as well forget about other committees.

I would certainly hope that the Committee on Rules exercises the restraint that the gentleman from Louisiana has indicated it will.

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

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend my good friend from Michigan for raising this point. The gentleman from Louisiana indicated there was colloquy in the RECORD yesterday between Mr. BOLLING and myself and other Members of this body on the precise point.

I want to commend the gentleman for raising it again. I think it is well for the House to have clearly before it the determination that we will not see again these broad waivers of points of order with which we have been afflicted in the last few days.

I think the Committee on Rules is moving toward some intelligent resolution of this problem, and I give the gentleman from Michigan my assurance that I intend to follow it through, as I am sure he will.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize to my friend from Michigan and to the House for having brought the matter up today after it was discussed yesterday. I was not present for the colloquy referred to on yesterday.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting that the gentleman brings this up. I think he should know, from the standpoint of various subcommittees on the Appropriations Committee, that we are under great pressure not only from the leadership of the House, but from departments in the Government to move to get appropriations out before the end of the fiscal year, June 30.

In many instances the authorizing legislation has expired, and the chances of having new authority passed before we appropriate are rather slim. It is a problem we have to face. It is faced this way under this rule.

Certainly, for the future, I believe it would be good to design a better program of authorizing and appropriating, so as not to have this overlapping.

Mr. O'HARA. I understand that. I understand that there may be instances when authorization bills are lagging behind or have not been approved by the other body that the House would want to waive the provisions of the first sentence of clause 2. But I cannot see any

real justification for waiving the provisions of the second sentence of clause 2. I am particularly concerned that the waivers have been so broad that they include not only the first sentence but also the second sentence.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I simply wanted to say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) that the House ought to commend him. He owes the House no apology for bringing up this subject.

I want to welcome the two gentlemen from Michigan, Mr. O'HARA and Mr. DINGELL, to the ranks of the few in the House who for a long time have been protesting the increasing use of rules waiving points of order, not only on appropriation bills but also on other bills. I commend the gentlemen.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I agree with the gentleman. I would hope that the Rules Committee would be more discriminatory in the rules it drafts, in order to protect points of order against legislation not passed. If there are other points of order they ought not to be waived.

Mr. GROSS. I add a "welcome" to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I might say I have enjoyed listening to this colloquy. I would invite some of these gentlemen to come up before the Rules Committee and sit in on some of our sessions. It is easier said than done.

We have seven appropriation bills coming before this House in about as many days. We have not been as busy in our legislative committees, or perhaps I should say not as productive in some of our legislative committees as in the Appropriations Committee. If we had been we would not be in this situation.

Certainly there is not any other way to conduct the business of this House at this time. That is the reason why the Rules Committee brought forth this rule. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 12, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—401

Abdnor	Andrews, N.C.	Ashley
Abzug	Andrews,	Aspin
Adams	N. Dak.	Bafalis
Addabbo	Annunzio	Baker
Alexander	Archer	Barrett
Anderson,	Arends	Bell
Calif.	Armstrong	Bennett

Bergland	Fountain	Mann
Bevill	Fraser	Maraziti
Biaggi	Frelinghuysen	Martin, Nebr.
Blester	Frenzel	Martin, N.C.
Bingham	Frey	Mathias, Calif.
Blackburn	Freohlich	Mathis, Ga.
Boggs	Fulton	Matsunaga
Boland	Fuqua	Mayne
Bolling	Gaydos	Mazzoli
Bowen	Gettys	Meeds
Brademas	Gialmo	Melcher
Brasco	Gibbons	Metcalfe
Bray	Gilman	Mezvinsky
Breckinridge	Ginn	Michel
Brinkley	Goldwater	Milford
Brooks	Gonzalez	Miller
Broomfield	Goodling	Minish
Brotzman	Grasso	Mink
Brown, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Minshall, Ohio
Brown, Mich.	Green, Pa.	Mitchell, N.Y.
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	Mitchell, N.Y.
Broyhill, N.C.	Grover	Mizell
Broyhill, Va.	Gubser	Moakley
Buchanan	Gude	Mollohan
Burgener	Gunter	Montgomery
Burke, Calif.	Guyer	Moorhead,
Burke, Fla.	Haley	Calif.
Burke, Mass.	Hamilton	Moorhead, Pa.
Burleson, Tex.	Hammer-	Morgan
Burlison, Mo.	schmidt	Mosher
Burton	Hanley	Moss
Butler	Hanna	Murphy, Ill.
Byron	Hanrahan	Myers
Camp	Hansen, Idaho	Natcher
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Wash.	Nedzi
Carney, Ohio	Harrington	Nelsen
Carter	Harsha	Nichols
Casey, Tex.	Harvey	Nix
Cederberg	Hastings	Obey
Chamberlain	Hawkins	O'Brien
Chappell	Hébert	O'Hara
Chisholm	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neill
Clancy	Heckler, Mass.	Owens
Clark	Heinz	Passman
Clausen,	Helstoski	Patman
Don H.	Henderson	Patten
Clawson, Del	Hicks	Pepper
Clay	Hillis	Perkins
Cleveland	Hinshaw	Pettis
Cochran	Hogan	Peyser
Cohen	Hollifield	Pickle
Collier	Holt	Pike
Collins, Ill.	Holtzman	Poage
Collins, Tex.	Horton	Podell
Conable	Hosmer	Preyer
Conlan	Howard	Price, Ill.
Conte	Huber	Pritchard
Conyers	Hudnut	Quile
Corman	Hungate	Quillen
Cotter	Hunt	Rallsback
Coughlin	Hutchinson	Randall
Cronin	Ichord	Rangel
Culver	Jarman	Rees
Daniel, Robert	Johnson, Calif.	Regula
W. Jr.	Johnson, Colo.	Reid
Daniels,	Johnson, Pa.	Reuss
Dominick V.	Jones, Ala.	Riegle
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N.C.	Rinaldo
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Okla.	Roberts
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Tenn.	Robinson, Va.
de la Garza	Jordan	Robison, N.Y.
Delaney	Karth	Rodino
Dellenback	Kastenmeier	Roe
Dellums	Kazen	Rogers
Denholm	Keating	Roncallo, Wyo.
Dennis	Kemp	Roncallo, N.Y.
Dent	Ketchum	Rooney, Pa.
Devine	King	Rose
Dickinson	Kluczynski	Rosenthal
Diggs	Koch	Rostenkowski
Dingell	Kuykendall	Roush
Donohue	Kyros	Roy
Downing	Landrum	Roybal
Drinan	Latta	Runnels
Dulski	Leggett	Ruppe
Duncan	Lehman	Ruth
du Pont	Lent	Ryan
Eckhardt	Litton	St Germain
Edwards, Ala.	Long, La.	Sandman
Edwards, Calif.	Long, Md.	Sarasin
Ellberg	Lott	Sarbanes
Erlenborn	Lujan	Saylor
Esch	McClory	Scherle
Eshleman	McCloskey	Schneebell
Evans, Colo.	McCollister	Schroeder
Evins, Tenn.	McCormack	Sebelius
Fascell	McDade	Seiberling
Findley	McEwen	Shipley
Fish	McFall	Shoup
Flood	McKay	Shriver
Flowers	McKinney	Shuster
Flynt	McSpadden	Sikes
Foley	Madden	Sisk
Ford, Gerald R.	Madigan	Skubitz
Ford,	Mahon	Slack
William D.	Mailliard	Smith, Iowa
Forsythe	Mallary	Smith, N.Y.

Snyder	Teague, Calif.	Williams
Spence	Teague, Tex.	Wilson,
Staggers	Thomson, Wis.	Charles H.,
Stanton,	Thone	Calif.
J. William	Thornton	Wilson,
Stanton,	Tiernan	Charles, Tex.
James V.	Towell, Nev.	Winn
Stark	Treen	Wolff
Steed	Udall	Wright
Steele	Ullman	Wyatt
Steelman	Van Deerlin	Wylder
Steiger, Ariz.	Vander Jagt	Wylie
Steiger, Wis.	Vanik	Wyman
Stephens	Veysey	Yates
Stokes	Vigorito	Yatron
Stratton	Waggonner	Young, Alaska
Stubblefield	Waldie	Young, Fla.
Stuckey	Walsh	Young, Ga.
Studds	Wampler	Young, Ill.
Sullivan	Ware	Young, S.C.
Symington	White	Young, Tex.
Talcott	Whitehurst	Zablocki
Taylor, Mo.	Whitten	Zion
Taylor, N.C.	Wiggins	Zwack

NAYS—12

Beard	Hays	Rarick
Crane	Landgrebe	Roussot
Daniel, Dan	Macdonald	Satterfield
Gross	Price, Tex.	Symms

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson, Ill.	Dorn	Rhodes
Ashbrook	Fisher	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Gray	Thompson, N.J.
Blatnik	Mills, Ark.	Whalen
Breaux	Murphy, N.Y.	Widnall
Danielson	Parris	Wilson, Bob
Derwinski	Powell, Ohio	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Breaux with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Danielson with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Parris.
 Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Rhodes.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. Whalen.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Ashbrook.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 12, 1973:

H.R. 6077. An act to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees.

On June 14, 1973:

H.J. Res. 533. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim June 17, 1973, as a day of commemoration of the opening of the upper Mississippi River by Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet in 1673.

On June 15, 1973:

H.J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week of June 1973, as "National Autistic Children's Week."

On June 18, 1973:

H.R. 2246. An act to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period.

On June 19, 1973:

H.R. 4704. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

On June 22, 1973:

H.R. 4682. An act to provide for the immediate disposal of certain abaca and sisal cordage fiber now held in the national stockpile; and

H.R. 5610. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1973—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-125)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning today without my approval H.R. 7447, the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1973.

I am doing so because of my grave concern that the enactment into law of the "Cambodia rider" to this bill would cripple or destroy the chances for an effective negotiated settlement in Cambodia and the withdrawal of all North Vietnamese troops, as required by Article 20 of the January 27 Vietnam agreement.

After more than ten arduous years of suffering and sacrifice in Indochina, an equitable framework for peace was finally agreed to in Paris last January. We are now involved in concluding the last element of that settlement, a Cambodian settlement. It would be nothing short of tragic if this great accomplishment, bought with the blood of so many Asians and Americans, were to be undone now by Congressional action.

The decision to veto is never easy, but in this case there is no other responsible course open to me. To understand this decision, we should all recognize what the full impact would be if we call a total halt to U.S. air operations in Cambodia, as now sought by the Congress:

—A total halt would virtually remove Communist incentive to negotiate and would thus seriously undercut ongoing diplomatic efforts to achieve a ceasefire in Cambodia. It would effectively reverse the momentum towards lasting peace in Indochina set in motion last January and renewed in the four-party communique signed in Paris on June 13.

—The proposed halt would also gravely jeopardize the ability of the Cambodian armed forces to prevent a Communist military victory achieved with the assistance of outside forces and the installation of a Hanoi-controlled government in Phnom Penh.

—A Communist victory in Cambodia, in turn, would threaten the fragile balance of negotiated agreements, political alignments and military capabilities upon which the overall peace in Southeast Asia depends and on which my assessment of the acceptability of the Vietnam agreements was based.

—Finally, and with even more serious global implications, the legislatively imposed acceptance of the United States to Communist violations of the Paris agreements and the con-

quest of Cambodia by Communist forces would call into question our national commitment not only to the Vietnam settlement but to many other settlements or agreements we have reached or seek to reach with other nations. A serious blow to America's international credibility would have been struck—a blow that would be felt far beyond Indochina.

I cannot permit the initiation of a process which could demolish so substantially the progress which has been made, and the future relationships of the United States with other nations.

However, I must emphasize that the provisions of H.R. 7447, other than the "Cambodia rider," contain a number of appropriations that are essential to the continuity of governmental operations. It is critical that these appropriations be enacted immediately.

By June 28, nine Government agencies will have exhausted their authority to pay the salaries and expenses of their employees. The disruptions that would be caused by a break in the continuity of government are serious and must be prevented. For example, it will be impossible to meet the payroll of the employees at the Social Security Administration, which will threaten to disrupt the flow of benefits to 25 million persons.

But an even greater disservice to the American people—and to all other peace loving people—would be the enactment of a measure which would seriously undermine the chances for a lasting peace in Indochina and jeopardize our efforts to create a stable, enduring structure of peace around the world. It is to prevent such a destructive development that I am returning H.R. 7447 without my approval.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 27, 1973.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill H.R. 7447, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have had wide exposure to the content of H.R. 7447, the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1973. Members are familiar with portions of the bill which relate to the regular ongoing affairs of the Government, the pay of employees and other matters. Members have debated at great length the international aspects of the matter as the bill relates to Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot see that any profit would result from an extensive additional debate at this time. Members are quite familiar with the situation confronting the House. Therefore, at this historic moment, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic de-

vice, and there were—yeas 241, nays 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

YEAS—241

Abzug	Gibbons	Pepper
Adams	Gilman	Perkins
Addabbo	Ginn	Peyser
Alexander	Gonzalez	Pickle
Anderson,	Grasso	Pike
Calif.	Gray	Podell
Anderson, Ill.	Green, Oreg.	Preyer
Andrews, N.C.	Green, Pa.	Price, Ill.
Annunzio	Griffiths	Pritchard
Archer	Gross	Quile
Ashley	Gude	Randall
Aspin	Gunter	Rangel
Barrett	Hamilton	Rees
Bell	Hanley	Reid
Bennett	Hanna	Reuss
Bergland	Hansen, Wash.	Riegle
Biaggi	Harrington	Rinaldo
Bieber	Hays	Robison, N.Y.
Bingham	Hechler, W. Va.	Rodino
Boggs	Heckler, Mass.	Roe
Boland	Helstoski	Rogers
Brademas	Henderson	Roncallo, Wyo.
Brasco	Hicks	Roncallo, N.Y.
Brooks	Holifield	Rose
Broomfield	Holtzman	Rosenthal
Brotzman	Howard	Rostenkowski
Brown, Calif.	Hungate	Roush
Burke, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.	Roy
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Colo.	Roybal
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, Ala.	Runnels
Burton	Jones, N.C.	Ruppe
Carey, N.Y.	Jones, Okla.	Ryan
Carney, Ohio	Jones, Tenn.	St Germain
Chisholm	Jordan	Sandman
Clark	Karh	Sarasin
Clausen,	Kastenmeier	Sarbanes
Don H.	Kazen	Schroeder
Clay	Kluczynski	Seiberling
Cohen	Koch	Shipley
Collins, Ill.	Kyros	Shoup
Conte	Landrum	Sisk
Conyers	Leggett	Slack
Corman	Lehman	Smith, Iowa
Cotter	Litton	Staggers
Coughlin	Long, La.	Stanton,
Cronin	Long, Md.	James V.
Culver	Lujan	Stark
Daniels,	McClory	Steed
Dominick V.	McCloskey	Steele
de la Garza	McCormack	Steelman
Delaney	McDade	Stokes
Dellenback	McKinney	Stubblefield
Dellums	McSpadden	Studds
Denholm	Macdonald	Sullivan
Dent	Madden	Symington
Diggs	Mallory	Symms
Dingell	Mann	Taylor, N.C.
Donohue	Mathias, Calif.	Teague, Calif.
Drinan	Matsunaga	Thone
Dulski	Mazzoli	Thornton
du Pont	Meeds	Tierman
Eckhardt	Melcher	Towell, Nev.
Edwards, Calif.	Metcalfe	Udall
Ellberg	Mezvinisky	Ullman
Esch	Miller	Van Deerlin
Eshleman	Minish	Vanik
Evans, Colo.	Mink	Vigorito
Evins, Tenn.	Mitchell, Md.	Waldie
Fascell	Moakley	Whalen
Findley	Mollohan	White
Fish	Moorhead, Pa.	Widnall
Flynt	Morgan	Wilson,
Foley	Mosher	Charles H.,
Ford,	Moss	Calif.
William D.	Natcher	Wilson,
Forsythe	Nedzi	Charles, Tex.
Fountain	Nix	Wolff
Fraser	Obey	Wyatt
Frenzel	O'Hara	Yates
Fulton	O'Neill	Yatron
Fuqua	Owens	Young, Ga.
Gaydos	Patman	Zablocki
Giaimo	Patten	Zwach

NAYS—173

Abdnor	Broyhill, N.C.	Cleveland
Andrews,	Broyhill, Va.	Cochran
N. Dak.	Buchanan	Collier
Arends	Burgener	Collins, Tex.
Armstrong	Burke, Fla.	Conable
Bafalis	Burleson, Tex.	Conlan
Baker	Butler	Crane
Beard	Byron	Daniel, Dan
Bevill	Camp	Daniel, Robert
Blackburn	Carter	W. Jr.
Bowen	Casey, Tex.	Davis, Ga.
Bray	Cederberg	Davis, S.C.
Breckinridge	Chamberlain	Davis, Wis.
Brinkley	Chappell	Dennis
Brown, Mich.	Clancy	Devine
Brown, Ohio	Clawson, Del	Dickinson

Downing	Latta	Sebelius
Duncan	Lent	Shriver
Edwards, Ala.	Lott	Shuster
Erlenborn	McCollister	Sikes
Flood	McEwen	Skubitz
Flowers	McFall	Smith, N.Y.
Ford, Gerald R.	McKay	Snyder
Frelinghuysen	Madigan	Spence
Frey	Mahon	Stanton,
Froehlich	Malliard	J. William
Gettys	Maraziti	Steiger, Ariz.
Goldwater	Martin, Nebr.	Steiger, Wis.
Goodling	Martin, N.C.	Stephens
Grover	Mathis, Ga.	Stratton
Gubser	Mayne	Stuckey
Guyer	Michel	Talcott
Haley	Milford	Taylor, Mo.
Hammer-	Minshall, Ohio	Teague, Tex.
schmidt	Mitchell, N.Y.	Thomson, Wis.
Hanrahan	Mizell	Treen
Hansen, Idaho	Montgomery	Vander Jagt
Harsha	Moorhead,	Veysey
Harvey	Calif.	Waggonner
Hastings	Myers	Walsh
Hébert	Nelsen	Wampler
Hillis	Nichols	Ware
Hinshaw	O'Brien	Whitehurst
Hogan	Passman	Whitten
Holt	Pettis	Wiggins
Horton	Poage	Williams
Hosmer	Powell, Ohio	Wilson, Bob
Huber	Price, Tex.	Winn
Hudnut	Quillen	Wright
Hunt	Railsback	Wylder
Hutchinson	Rarick	Wylie
Ichord	Regula	Wyman
Jarman	Roberts	Young, Alaska
Johnson, Pa.	Robinson, Va.	Young, Fla.
Keating	Rousselot	Young, Ill.
Kemp	Ruth	Young, S.C.
Ketchum	Satterfield	Young, Tex.
King	Saylor	Zion
Kuykendall	Scherle	
Landgrebe	Schneebeli	

NOT VOTING—19

Ashbrook	Dorn	Parris
Badillo	Fisher	Rhodes
Blatnik	Hawkins	Rooney, N.Y.
Bolling	Heinz	Rooney, Pa.
Breaux	Mills, Ark.	Thompson, N.J.
Danielson	Murphy, Ill.	
Derwinski	Murphy, N.Y.	

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey and Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Rooney of New York, against.

Mr. Braeux and Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Danielson and Mr. Murphy of Illinois for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Badillo and Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Rhodes against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Heinz with Mr. Parris.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and the bill are referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 300 on the Presidential veto of the second supplemental appropriation bill, I intended to vote "yea," but inadvertently voted "no." I ask that the RECORD show that I would have voted "yea."

PROPOSED ACTION ON SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state for the benefit of the Members of the House that there is, insofar as I know, no controversy in the Committee on Appropriations in regard to the matters which were encompassed in the second supplemental appropriations bill, other than those matters relating to Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that the Committee on Appropriations could convene probably this afternoon, that we could report out a bill covering all items except the items referring to Southeast Asia, not changing the bill in any other respect—not even changing a comma or a period—and bring the bill back to the House by way of whatever parliamentary procedure may be deemed best. Then let us send it to the other body.

I feel really that the contest over the matter of the bombing in Cambodia can now best be handled during consideration of the continuing resolution to which the amendment has also been added.

We, of course, have the problem of what to do about the continuing resolution, but that is another matter which we will have to deal with later this week.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to point out I am in thorough accord with my chairman, but I would like to point out that in the bill just passed we do have funds available for the great disaster that occurred in the lower Mississippi Valley. It is my feeling those matters will not be taken care of in the continuing resolution for a variety of reasons. I hope the gentleman will not include the objectionable matters on the bill, so that we do take care of that matter in the lower Mississippi Valley.

Mr. MAHON. I agree it is urgent that these matters be taken care of in an unencumbered second supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. GIAIMO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. Do I understand that it is the intention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to come out with legislation which will make appropriations for all activities of the Government, including the Department of Defense, except that it will not provide for any funds for Southeast Asia?

Mr. MAHON. I am not sure. The gentleman appears to be talking about the continuing resolution which has already passed the House.

Mr. GIAIMO. No. I am talking about the supplemental.

Mr. MAHON. The second supplemental contains about \$900 million, I believe, in pay and many other items for various departments and agencies of the Government. As you say, flood control for the

lower Mississippi Valley area and many other items are involved which are not controversial.

Mr. GIAIMO. Yes. Exactly.

Mr. MAHON. For the year ending, of course, Saturday night.

Mr. GIAIMO. Let us get to the controversial matter, which is that this is a direct confrontation between the President of the United States and the Congress over the question as to whether or not bombing shall continue in Cambodia and, of course, the statement of the President in support of his veto message.

In seems to me, in listening to what the gentleman from Texas suggests, we are going to meet and convene in the committee and report out a bill which will make provision for all of the necessary needs of Government but, in effect, still allow the President to continue bombing in Cambodia.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit me to say this, the fiscal year which is covered in the second supplemental ends on Saturday night.

Mr. GIAIMO. It also ends with the President, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MAHON. The Federal Government as a legal matter will be out of operating funds for all purposes beginning Saturday night midnight unless the continuing resolution is enacted. The place for the confrontation and the appropriate resolution of the matter involving Southeast Asia is not in the second supplemental now at this late hour. It is better placed with the continuing resolution.

These matters will be discussed by the committee and by the leadership in the House and the Senate. I am hoping we will find a way to resolve our differences.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Basically what the chairman is saying is we are proposing legislation that would yield to the President in relation to the bombing activities in Cambodia. I ask myself why did the President bother to veto the legislation in view of the fact that the continuing resolution takes over in just a few days. I finally figured that he vetoed it, because without this bill he can continue to spend money in the pipeline.

The heretofore appropriated money, not the money in the second supplemental, but the money in the pipeline, he can continue to spend that money in the next 48 hours and during the next fiscal year until he runs out of pipeline money, and begins to run into a bind on the continuing resolution. I am trying to find out, and perhaps the chairman can tell me, when the time is going to come as a practical matter that he runs out of money on the continuing resolution, because I understand they have to pay the people on the 15th of July, but there may be many bills that have to be paid by July 1.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

The gentleman from Maryland is aware of the fact that the continuing resolution provides that no funds appropriated by the continuing resolution or funds heretofore appropriated by Congress can be used for the bombing of

Cambodia or Laos. So there is no pipeline money that would be available for these purposes.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter that we can cover in general debate. I asked for only 1 minute. I do not wish to trespass on the time of the House. We will have a bill before the House momentarily, the Department of Interior appropriation bill, which will be followed by another appropriations bill tomorrow, and another appropriations bill on Friday.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, let us not confuse the second supplemental and the continuing appropriation. We have before us today the supplemental appropriation. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) has correctly stated that unless we have these supplemental moneys that many, many projects, and important projects, Federal pay increase payments, civil service retirement pay, grants to States for public assistance, military pay, payments for our educational institutions and many other kinds of expenditures will come to a halt on Saturday night.

We have a responsibility to act in a responsible fashion to make sure that the affairs of the U.S. Government continue. But, so does the President of the United States have an equal if not greater responsibility.

Now, the President has based his entire veto message on one key point that he does not want to stop the bombing in Cambodia even though the House and the Senate have overwhelmingly told him on several occasions that they want the bombing stopped. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot, if we are to remain responsible to our constitutional oaths, cave in at this time and pass a sanitized supplemental bill which will, in effect, provide for all of the necessary activities of the Government, but will also allow the President to continue bombing in Cambodia.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL

(Mr. LONG of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to the remarks made by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) that the President has the responsibility because he vetoed a bill containing congressional appropriations. Now, the continuing resolution certainly contains the same language as the second supplemental. It applies to heretofore appropriated money.

Once the President signs the continuing resolution there cannot be any pipeline money from this \$8 or \$10 billion that is hanging around unspent. What the President has gained by this veto is time. He can continue to spend pipeline money until he signs the continuing res-

olution. When the time will be that he signs it, or refuses to sign it, I do not know, but it could be 5 or 10 days. And that is the important thing here that we have to consider.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to put this matter in its proper perspective. If they want to have a clear-cut issue on the question of bombing in Cambodia, they ought to bring out a bill from the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The only reason they put it in the continuing resolution and in the supplemental is they did not think the President had guts enough to veto it, and his veto message clearly sets forth his reasons.

Why do they not do it the proper legislative way? This is not the way to do it. They just did not think that the President would veto it, because they had him in a bind; that is why.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. We can put it another way. We can say the President did not think we had guts enough to stand up to him.

Mr. CEDERBERG. We have already found that out just a few minutes ago.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. If the gentleman will yield further, let me point out that the entire power and strength of constitutional democratic government has stood for 500 years in the power of appropriations. Where would there be a more appropriate place in which to deny the President power to bomb except in an appropriation bill?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Except on a continuing resolution and on a supplemental at the end of the fiscal year, and the gentleman knows that is correct.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8917) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8917, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to be as brief as possible, because this is not exactly the climate in which to conduct the domestic affairs of the United States. In fact, I sort of feel like an early Christian in a lion's den in Rome.

There has been some question here about why the Committee would ask for a rule. May I say, first of all, this is the first time in 7 years we have ever gone for a rule. The reason is as we have enumerated, three bills do not have the President's signature: The Visitors Center is on the desk at San Clemente, but it has not been signed as of this hour; the John F. Kennedy Center passed the House, and I believe it was scheduled to pass the Senate yesterday; the Arts and Humanities bill also has yet to be enacted.

Today, again, I bring you the appropriations bill on the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

However, before presenting the details of this bill, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to all the members of the subcommittee who have so faithfully participated in our committee activities. I particularly appreciate the opportunity of working with members from so many areas of this Nation, from the Far West to the east coast, who have worked diligently and responsibly in carrying out the activities of this committee. Congressman YATES of Illinois, Congressman McKAY of Utah, Congressman LONG of Maryland, Congressman EVANS of Colorado, and Congressman VEYSEY of California, all from diverse areas, bring to the committee a wealth of knowledge from their own fields and localities. Their work has been exceptional and I wish to thank them for their efforts to make our great Nation greater.

It has also been a distinct privilege and pleasure to work with our ranking minority member, Congressman JOE McDADE, of Pennsylvania. We have been on the committee together for several years. His dedication and effort to understand and solve our complex problems are outstanding. His unfailing courtesy is deeply appreciated.

With him is my very distinguished and capable colleague and neighbor, Congressman WENDELL WYATT, of Oregon.

To each and every one of these colleagues, I express my appreciation. All of us do not always agree, but from these

disagreement discussions come a better understanding of our great common denominator—America.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the full committee, who has been most cooperative, courteous, and helpful, although very economical.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the hard-working and excellent staff of our appropriations subcommittee, the committee's new Clerk, Dave Wilson, and Byron Nielson who has been with us for 4 years, as well as Keith Mainland of the full committee.

I would also like to thank and express appreciation to each Member of the House who took the time to appear at hearings before our subcommittee, who has talked with me and other members of the committee relative to funding items in this bill and the importance and impact of what that funding means to our total national environment, economy, land management and human progress. I am only sorry that each and every request could not be granted in this funding year.

The committee recommends to Members of the House that they read our six volumes of hearing testimony. Within these you will find detailed budgetary analyses and innumerable facts relative to the operation of the 27 departments and agencies funded here today. These hearings may help you explain to many of your constituents exactly what problems our Government faces in this year, 1973, and some of the solutions available through the budget system. In studying these volumes you will find numerous detailed contracts relative to management of pertinent activities, some in highly controversial areas.

In presenting this bill, I will try to give you a short summary, as in other years, of where we have been, where we are, what we are trying to achieve through the funded activities and, indeed, perhaps enable you to have a glimpse of that part of the Nation owned by our people for the benefit of all Americans.

This committee does not spend the most money, but our significance is in the immensity of the land we serve and the people. The boundaries of this committee's responsibility run from Micronesia to Maine and from Alaska to Florida. We present to you management funds proposed for the preservation and orderly development of our national resources, not in the amounts which we wish or in the amounts we think responsible, but solely within arbitrary budget constraints. These encompass recreation across the far-flung areas of our domain, pollution abatement, the welfare and education of approximately 600,000 American Indians in and adjacent to the reservation world and 230,000 citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

In addition, there are programs here for the people in the cities through the arts and humanities, summer in the parks, urban Indians, urban Indian health, and there is a substantial portion of this bill devoted to education.

If you are a fisherman standing on the

banks of some stream in the wilderness, please remember that it is entirely possible and probable that the fish you catch are from one of the hatcheries in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. As Americans share the beauty and delight within our magnificent national park system, which is the finest in the world; or in a national forest; or on the BLM lands of the desert; it is my hope that they remember that funding for their opportunity of enjoyment comes from money in this bill.

In addition, I would ask you in consideration of this bill today, to appropriate to yourself a great degree of tolerance and understanding, for unlike most appropriation bills in this House which deal with a single or a very related program, the Interior and related agencies' bill demands of you great breadth of understanding and imposes upon you the discipline of a complete disregard for regionalism.

The members of this subcommittee, because of the spread of the 27 agencies, have had to be interested in the arts and humanities, parks, sport fishing, migratory fowl, forests, deserts, Indians in the Navajo world, young Indians at boarding schools, and children in the far north of Alaska who are sick and need hospitals.

The members of our subcommittee have never been able to afford the luxury of a narrow viewpoint. We have always had to take this great American world of ours from Alaska to Florida, from Maine to Micronesia with all its variety and diversity of thinking, customs, and desires into consideration.

The committee has not been legislating for Illinois, Washington, Maryland, Oregon, Utah, Colorado, California, or Pennsylvania. We have had to become American all the way and to appropriate for the entire United States. The letters "U.S." in the committee's vocabulary stands for US, America. Our land is wide, its needs and people are divergent, and perhaps, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is the best definition of America there is—a dream that is endless as time for a country weaving multiple strands of national need and desire into one great, strong fabric, America.

This bill before you reflects to some degree the best of each of us and the understanding we each try to give the building of this Nation. It also reflects our shortcomings, our failures, and our mandate to use the lessons from these failures and measure with the successes, the total needs of tomorrow.

There are thousands of Americans who cannot possibly understand why a neighbor spends an hour in an art gallery. There are thousands of others who will never realize the pleasure of a day spent on the banks of a fishing stream, and there are many who also ponder and are troubled that we bother with recreation.

Thus, in summary, may I say that this has been the great task of this subcommittee; the challenge to these outstanding members to understand, to know, to love and appreciate each segment of the American experience which is reflected moneywise here today. People, programs, land, energy, lack of energy, roads, schools, forests, water—you name it, it is here, and it is America, our land, your land, surviving in spite of the un-

friendly sky of budgetary constraints but needing and demanding the relaxation of budgetary ill will.

The America that our children inherit depends upon this Congress, the Office of Management and Budget, and the administration tomorrow. We could only correct part of the problems this year, but in the future if our land and people are to survive, we must surmount the inherent weaknesses of placing land resources and people second to other activities.

The greatest dilemma the committee has in this funding year was posed by budgetary cuts and appropriation impoundments in a wide variety of fields. The mine health and safety research was cut more than \$3 million, and the forest program was cut by more than \$79 million. In fact, the forest roads program was reduced by \$71 million and nothing was provided for trials. In spite of the increasing need for Indian health care and hospitals, the budget provided only the current escalation of doing business as usual. Water research funds were cut, the Federal land and water conservation acquisition program was nonexistent in this budget, and the State program was funded only to \$50 million, leaving at least 10 States that had done a splendid job with only enough money for operating expenses for this next fiscal year.

There is a recognition of the national desire for an increasing sum of money

for the arts and humanities and activities of the Smithsonian Institution. There was a small step toward accomplishing research for solutions to the energy problem. All projects which Congress had funded last year for research in fields of disease and insects in the Forest Service were not only impounded but money was shown as a transfer from these projects to other projects selected by the Office of Management and Budget. We did not agree.

I was told by the chairman of the full committee that we must stay within the top budget request of \$2,274,431,300 in new obligational authority for the 27 agencies included in this bill. Therefore, the committee was confronted with the task of reducing some programs, desirable and wanted as they might be, in order to make sure that Indian health needs were met, that mine health and safety work continue, and that the Forest Service did not disintegrate.

Please bear in mind as you listen to the summary of this bill that there are crises today in the United States. First, is the field of energy; second, in the field of producing enough lumber for our housing; third, that our environmental standards remain high; and fourth, that the needs of human beings be met. Therefore, this bill reflects not wishes but hard disagreeable choices. It is very similar to the housewife who wants to

give her family roast beef and strawberries and has to settle for hamburger and tapioca pudding.

I again regret that the Office of Management and Budget continually refuses to recognize that a nation depending upon its natural resources and made up of living people must be provided with funds. I suspect that, when the totals are in during these last 7 years of budget constraints, we will have spent far less to maintain and manage our forests, Indian schools, discover some of the energy answers than we have spent in destroying the forests of Indochina.

The committee has tried to be responsible fiscally and responsive to America, which has not been easy, and all our answers will not be popular. Perhaps in this bill one can see what overall budget ceilings could reflect, for in the 27 agencies we have had to sort out the blunt necessities from the pleasure of spending where we would like to spend.

I think the committee is also particularly unhappy about having to provide so meagerly for activities that produce revenue as I will note in a moment. The Department of Interior and the Forest Service in the year 1973 have estimated receipts of \$5,094,119,933, almost twice the total appropriations bill of 1973, which included permanent appropriations and trust funds.

A summary of the bill follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL

Item	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1974	Recommended in bill	Comparison
Title I. Department of the Interior: New budget (obligational) authority	\$1,450,567,000	\$1,467,684,500	+\$17,117,500
Title II. Related agencies: New budget (obligational) authority	823,864,300	801,869,700	-\$21,994,600
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority	2,274,431,300	2,269,554,200	-\$4,877,100

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

In addition to the amounts in the accompanying bill, which are reflected in the table above, permanent legislation authorizes the continuation of certain Government activities without consideration by the Congress during the annual appropriations process.

Details of these activities are listed in appropriate tables appearing at the end of this report. In fiscal year 1973 these activities are estimated to total \$620,788,266. The estimate for fiscal year 1974 is \$632,750,788.

The following table reflects the total budget (obligational) authority contained both in this bill and in permanent appropriations for fiscal years 1973 and 1974:

Item	Fiscal year—		Change
	1973	1974	
Interior and related agencies appropriations bill	\$2,555,030,300	\$2,269,554,200	-\$285,476,100
Permanent appropriations, Federal funds	424,276,266	478,745,788	+\$54,469,522
Permanent appropriations, trust funds	196,512,000	154,005,000	-\$42,507,000
Total, budget authority	3,175,818,566	2,902,304,988	-\$273,513,578

REVENUE GENERATED BY AGENCIES IN BILL

The following tabulation indicates total new obligational authority to date for fiscal years 1972 and 1973, and the amount recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1974. It

compares receipts generated by activities in this bill on an actual basis for fiscal year 1972 and on an estimated basis for fiscal years 1973 and 1974.

Item	Fiscal year—		
	1972	1973	1974
New obligational authority	\$2,423,563,035	\$2,555,030,300	\$2,269,554,200
Receipts:			
Department of the Interior	720,435,364	4,672,354,933	12,551,155,158
Forest Service	350,006,700	421,765,000	379,545,000
Total receipts	1,070,442,064	5,094,119,933	2,930,700,158

¹ Excludes the following decreases in Outer Continental Shelf receipts: Bonus sales \$952,000,000; and release of escrow funds as a result of the Supreme Court's Dec. 20, 1971, order of \$1,123,336,000 for a total decrease in fiscal year 1974 of \$2,075,336,000.

SUMMARY OF INCREASES AND DECREASES

Following is a summary by activity of the major increases and decreases in new obligational authority recommended for fiscal year 1974 compared to the budget estimates:

Major increases:

Education, welfare, health services, and other assistance to American Indians	+\$24,096,000
U.S. Forest Service	+19,095,000
Land and Water Conservation Fund	+16,000,000
Coal Research	+9,000,000
Mines and Minerals	+8,600,000
Fish and Wildlife	+4,746,500
Oil and Gas Activities	+1,100,000
Water Resources Research	+540,000
Subtotal, major increases	+83,177,500

Major decreases:

Arts and Humanities	-\$46,325,000
Office of the Secretary of the Interior	-26,360,000
Bureau of Land Management	-7,475,000
Smithsonian Institution	-5,865,000
National Park Service	-1,454,000
Office of the Solicitor, Interior	-350,000
Subtotal, major decreases	-\$87,829,000

Other increases and decreases (net) -----

Net total, decreases under budget estimates. -----

-\$4,877,100

EFFECT OF COMMITTEE ACTION ON PROJECTED BUDGET EXPENDITURES (OUTLAYS) IN FISCAL YEAR 1974

The budget estimates for bureaus and agencies funded in this bill projected new obligational authority of \$2,274,431,300, and total expenditures of \$2,530,047,000.

The committee has recommended total new budget (obligational) authority of \$2,269,554,200, a decrease of \$4,877,100 below the budget estimate. Concurrent with its recommendation of a decrease in new budget (obligational) authority, the Committee has also recommended a reduction of \$7,000,000 in appropriations to liquidate contract authority.

The estimated net effect of Committee action on expenditures for bureaus and agencies funded in this bill for fiscal year 1974 will be an increase of about \$9,000,000.

EXTENT OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN BILL

There follows a listing of selected items which indicate the extent of activities funded in this bill:

Management of public lands

Acres onshore:

Bureau of Land Management	\$451,043,353
U.S. Forest Service	187,101,120
Bureau of Indian Affairs	52,573,863
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	31,103,595
National Park Service	28,878,123

Subtotal, acres onshore... 750,700,054

Acres offshore:

Under 200 meters	515,000,000
Over 200 meters	631,680,000

Subtotal, acres offshore... 1,146,680,000

Total acres... 1,897,380,054

	Current inventory	1974 construction
Road construction (miles):		
Bureau of Land Management	44,330	102
Bureau of Indian Affairs	21,559	676
National Park Service	10,185	10
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	6,022	
U.S. Forest Service	198,206	7,473
Total miles	280,302	8,240

	1972 actual	1974 estimate
Recreation visitation (millions):		
National Park Service	206	225
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	23	20
Bureau of Land Management	52	60
U.S. Forest Service	182	198
Total visitations (millions)	463	503

Timber production

Forest Service.—An estimated harvest of 11.8 billion board feet is anticipated for 1974, with receipts from sales of approximately \$355 million. This volume represents about one-fourth of the total timber cut for industrial purposes annually, and is equivalent to the construction of about 1.1 million average sized homes.

Bureau of Land Management.—Administers the sale of over 1.3 billion board feet of timber annually. Timber receipts are estimated to be \$76.8 million in 1974.

Soil and water conservation

Forest Service.—The National Forests of the West, about 20 percent of the area, produce about 50 percent of the water, conservatively estimated at a value of over one billion dollars annually.

Bureau of Land Management.—Administers an active program of soil stabilization practices on 160 million acres of public lands covering about 1,300 watersheds. Practices are designed to conserve and develop public land soil and water resources and include

construction of small water control structures, contouring and cultivation, revegetation, protective fencing, and water developments.

Grazing

Bureau of Land Management.—Administers grazing of approximately 9.5 million head of livestock and 2.4 million big game animals. Grazing receipts are estimated to be about \$11.2 million in 1974.

Forest Service.—Administers the grazing of 7.0 million head of livestock, including offspring. This provides a continued and necessary source of grazing required by 17,200 family-type ranch units. In addition, an estimated 4.1 million big game animals graze on National Forest lands.

Mineral Resources

Bureau of Land Management.—Administers mining and mineral leasing on approximately 760 million acres of land in the continental United States and more than 515 million acres of submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf within 200 meter water depth.

Geological Survey.—Provides the basic scientific and engineering data concerning water, land, and mineral resources; and supervises the development and production of minerals and mineral fuels on leased Federal Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf lands. The annual value of production on Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf mineral leases is \$3.5 billion, with royalties accruing to the Government of \$492 million. Bonuses from lease sales this fiscal year will approximate \$2.2 billion.

Fish and Wildlife Resources

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.—Produces in excess of 7 million pounds of fish a year. The cumulative effect is estimated to support approximately 45 million fisherman-days annually. In addition, this Bureau's refuges accommodate about 1.6 billion waterfowl-use-days, not including Alaska. These refuges also support almost 5 million hunting and fishing-use-days.

Administration of Territories

The Department of the Interior is responsible for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (over 2,000 islands covering about 3 million square miles of the Western Pacific Ocean), American Samoa, and Guam. This involves the management of about 985 square miles of land with a total native population of approximately 222,000.

Indian Education and Welfare

Indian children in Federal Day and Boarding Schools, 56,566.

Indian children in Public Schools, 93,800.

Indians provided with welfare guidance service, 96,100.

Operation and maintenance of 300 Indian irrigation systems.

In the committee report to the Congress the committee stated the following:

MANAGEMENT OF OUR NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES

As the foregoing statistics indicate, the programs included in this bill cover a wide variety of activities. These are programs which are vital if we are to successfully address and solve the urgent needs which this country faces in the last quarter of this century: improving the environment, providing an adequate supply of energy, improving the wise utilization of our scarce natural resources, providing adequate recreation opportunities for all Americans and assuring that our American Indians have sufficient resources to determine their own destiny.

The Committee, after lengthy hearings and deliberations, has reported a bill which is within the total Administration budget estimates. However, the Committee does not believe that the funds provided in this bill are adequate to meet the pressing needs facing

this country in the management of its natural and human resources. Those who are responsible for the budget show a lack of foresight by failing to consider adequately the long-term implications of present management and budget decisions. They appear to have no recognition that a tree planted today cannot be harvested the following day; that an Indian who fails to learn because he has no glasses will be handicapped for the rest of his life; that delays in land acquisition for Federal recreation areas will eventually cost the Nation many times the current prices; that the need for an adequate supply of quality drinking water is a necessity, not a luxury; that the solutions to our critical natural resources management problems are dependent on long-range research; and that the wealth of this great Nation lies fundamentally in its resources and its people.

The committee also addressed itself as to the problem of impoundment and to the effect of continued constrained budgets.

IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS

In spite of the pressing need for improved management of our natural and human resources, those who determine the budget have followed a policy of severely constrained budgets in these areas. In recent years, the committee has re-ordered priorities in order to provide additional funds for forest management and research, additional funds for Indian health services and facilities, additional funds for Indian education, and additional funds for energy and minerals research. Time after time, these funds have been impounded.

When the proposed budget for fiscal year 1974 was announced drastic actions were taken with respect to the fiscal year 1973 budget. There were proposals to rescind or reprogram \$6,208,000 added by Congress for critical health needs of the Indian people. Furthermore, there were proposals to reprogram or transfer \$22,105,000 provided by Congress for increased management and research of our forest resources by the U.S. Forest Service. Funds added by Congress for Forest Service construction in fiscal year 1973 have been impounded and, almost without exception, proposed for different construction projects in fiscal year 1974.

The committee takes a dim view of these policies which fail to recognize that the priorities established by the Congress in the appropriations process are those of constitutional direction. If adjustments to the budget have to be made for the sake of fiscal policy, both the pressing need for improved natural resources management and also the will of Congress as expressed in appropriation bills must be considered.

It is time to stop and ponder what a Nation without trees, water, and natural beauty could be. Coupled with the necessity for fiscal restraint is also the mandate to be equally responsible to the future of this great Nation.

EFFECTS OF CONTINUED CONSTRAINED BUDGETS

In the course of its hearings on the 1974 budget, the committee was continually confronted with the unpleasant realities we face in the management of our natural resources. The adverse effects of many years of constrained budgets were continuously apparent to the committee. Some highlights of this situation follow:

Calculations made by the committee

indicate that the Federal Government spends about \$1.37 per acre per year, onshore, for the management of its lands; estimates of spending by the commercial forest industry for their land are about \$128.42 per acre per year for acreage planted and \$4.30 per acre per year for total acreage.

Offshore, the Federal Government is responsible for 515,000,000 acres of land under 200 meters depth and an additional 631,680,000 acres beyond 200 meters. A total of 7,300,000 of these acres are presently under lease. The Federal Government spends about \$2.40 per acre per year for acres under lease and about \$.03 per acre per year for total acres under 200 meters.

An estimated 6.8 billion board feet of sawtimber is killed each year by insect damage, fire, disease, and animal damage on commercial forest lands. This compares with the total sales projection in fiscal year 1974 of 10.8 billion board feet as stated in the budget justifications of the U.S. Forest Service.

An estimated 179,938,000 acres of public land is currently in need of rehabilitation. Rehabilitation would permit 57.8 million animal unit months of grazing compared to the 30.6 million animal unit months at present, substantially increasing our meat supply and the economic development of the areas affected. Many of these areas contain some of the lowest income groups in the Nation.

The Geological Survey has just issued a study which states that the United States is critically short of some of the key minerals which "are the physical source of most of the necessities, conveniences, and comforts of life in the United States today." Future supplies must come from subeconomic deposits or from potential resources yet to be discovered. Yet the budgets for research on minerals extraction, processing, utilization, and recycling are woefully inadequate and have been for many years in the budget proposals submitted to the committee.

The committee for the past several years has been deeply concerned with the increasing energy crisis. The committee heard testimony several years ago about the need to explore with ever increasing speed our resource reserves and correlate this knowledge with research techniques for wise and efficient use.

A long step was taken a few years ago by the committee in granting the Geological Survey money so that Agency might have an ever-increasing knowledge of our offshore oil potential as well as its hazards.

Money was placed in last year's budget for several coal research projects. However, the committee is still concerned in the energy area.

NATIONAL COAL POLICY

The average American citizen is the greatest consumer of energy in the world. Americans presently consume about 390 million Btu's per year per capita. This compares with 170 million Btu per capita in Great Britain, 140 million Btu per capita in West Germany, and 20 million Btu per capita in Brazil.

A good deal of public attention has recently been focused on the energy crisis. The extraction and utilization of coal is

an important component of our total energy resource picture and is likely to become more important in the years ahead. Last year, the committee urged the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the appropriate committees of the Congress, to give immediate attention to the promulgation of a formal national coal policy. The committee said:

There is considerable discussion today regarding the extent to which strip mining should be limited. In fact, several bills are currently pending in the Congress which, if enacted into law, would greatly reduce the extent of strip mining activity in this country. It is to be remembered that about 35 percent of our coal is obtained by strip mining.

On the other hand, the Committee is being requested to approve the appropriation of millions of dollars per year for research and development of coal utilization processes. Although the Committee endorses adequate reclamation of strip mined areas, it is neither advocate nor antagonist with regard to strip mining per se. However, the Committee does feel the question of whether it is practical to invest millions of dollars in various coal research programs if the source of supply for these programs is to be severely limited must be resolved at the earliest possible date.

Another important matter for consideration in this connection is the effect of various pollution control limitations that might be placed on the use of coal. If standards are so severe that the utilization of coal is priced out of the market, the cost-benefit ratio of various coal research programs now underway and anticipated will be most adverse.

The urgency of such a policy has not diminished in the past year. Although the hearings revealed that a coal policy report was currently in "secretarial review," the Committee has not yet seen such a statement.

Despite the absence of a national coal policy there are many items proposed in the 1974 budget which hinge on such a policy. Almost \$120 million was requested for coal research by the Office of Coal Research, the Bureau of Mines, and the Office of the Secretary. Budget estimates for the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey also include funds relating to the leasing and extraction of coal from public lands.

The committee emphasizes again the need for a formal statement of national coal policy. Such a statement should focus on three problems of critical concern:

First. Reclamation.—What sorts of reclamation requirements must be imposed for surface and underground coal mining? How are these requirements to be enforced? What will be the effect on total coal availability and costs as related to these various types of requirements?

Second. Leasing Procedures on Federal Lands.—What leasing policies and lease terms will adequately assure the environmentally sound and timely utilization of Federal coal resources, at the same time providing a maximum return to the U.S. Treasury? How are leasing policies and practices to be enforced, given the current constraints in budget and personnel?

Third. Research.—What capability does present technology provide in the extraction, processing, and utilization of coal? What further developments are

required in order to provide us the capability to increase coal utilization while protecting the environment and the health and safety of America's coal miners? How does the importance of coal research compare with other energy research? What are total Btu needs of the future and what are the necessary conservation measures?

ENERGY RESEARCH

Despite this lack of a formal coal policy, the committee believes that the current energy situation necessitates increased energy research, particularly in coal. Accordingly, the committee recommendation provides substantial increases over the current budget for research projects related to energy. These are summarized as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Activity	1973 current estimate	1974 commit- tee bill	Change
Coal resource development....	94.5	115.5	+21.0
Petroleum and natural gas....	5.6	6.3	+ .7
Geothermal energy.....	2.7	3.1	+ .4
Economic analyses, energy conservation.....		1.5	+1.5
Total.....	102.8	126.4	+23.6

In addition to the items listed above, the committee has included an additional \$1.1 million for the Office of Oil and Gas. These additional funds will provide for 50 additional persons to help the Office implement new responsibilities under the voluntary petroleum allocation program.

The committee believes that a vigorous energy research program in all areas of energy use, resource management, and conservation is vital if Government and industry are to provide the Nation with a sustained and reliable energy supply in the future. The 23-percent increase in energy research provided in this bill will help reach this objective.

The committee also believes that the appropriate committees of Congress should conduct an inquiry into the apparent monopolistic tendencies in the American energy industry. Attention should also be given to our domestic resource base, and the availability of those resources.

At every corner one hears discussions about energy, how we may discontinue the use of cars, discontinue the use of lights, and so forth. May I say to the Congress, let us not get carried away with what can and cannot be done. Can you men imagine your wives returning to ironing your shirts with an iron heated on the stove? Of course you cannot. And if you could EPA would have fits over burning more wood with increased smoke rising into the air.

Second, what about better street lighting? We are well aware, and statistics bear it out, that the failure of street lighting means crime and it takes power to provide lights. Sometimes certain dark Washington, D.C. streets remind me of stories of medieval times when citizens proceeded down the street with a pine torch and guards fore and aft. Nationwide, we will never return to those days. Crime operates in the dark and I do not

believe this Congress is about to offer criminals a series of havens.

May I also remind the Congress that we are all "gung-ho" about recycling. Taking care of our garbage is mandatory. But we cannot merely say we are going to do it; we have to provide energy to fuel recycling plants.

The committee has been deeply concerned for years about the total knowledge of American resources which are available to make America operate efficiently. We are still concerned and we ask the American public to join us in providing budget implementations. We must provide the public with all the facts and research necessary for judgment making. Funds were provided to get to the Moon. My suggestion is that we now provide funds to prevent America's liquidation.

We have been extremely generous with countries around the world in various aid programs and in support of the independence of the South Vietnamese. What do we have to show for it? Not even much good will. I think the time has arrived and I do not mean this in terms of isolation, but in terms of strengthening America so that she may become an example of a nation dedicated to the service of human goals, an example of a nation who develops maximum potentials from all sources and for all sources of her daily life.

It is time to build our technology, environment and environmental knowledge so that we may share these great strengths with other nations as we have shared our military strength in the past. We must know how to salvage man's destroyed land, how to stop pollution and safeguard against future pollution, to provide an international dominion of security from the results of neglect, callousness and in many instances greed. This, the committee is dedicated to accomplishing.

America which was built because of transportation—once the covered wagon, now the automobile, suddenly finds itself with a shortage of gasoline and no genuine comprehension of what a transportation system is all about. We are not putting into context the press releases which warn of diplomatic problems in North Africa, the Middle East, South America and our own failure to know how to protect the development of future energy sources.

Mr. Chairman, it is mandatory that in the phrase of the "now" generation, we "get with it." And to the Office of Management and Budget I reemphasize, Mr. Chairman, stop closing your fists on America and shaking them in the face of everyone when we do not have the knowledge to realize that an open handful of knowledge is worth more than all the guns on earth to the world of tomorrow.

LOG EXPORTS

The committee has placed a limitation on the use of funds available under this act for sales of unprocessed timber made by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture where the timber will be sold for export, or be used as a substitute for timber exported by the purchaser. The limitation would not apply to the use of such funds for activities under sales already made. In any future sales, the com-

mittee expects the Secretaries to take steps to include provisions in timber sales contracts that will assure that the timber involved will not be exported, or used by the purchaser as a substitute for timber he exports, or sells for export. The committee expects the Secretaries to publish regulations to implement this limitation and the act of April 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 242, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 617) so as to control substitution of Federal timber for private timber sold for export.

This provision will make an estimated additional 200 million board feet of timber available for domestic needs.

INDIAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CONTINUING PROBLEMS

There has recently been a great deal of attention to the problems in the world of the American Indian. The committee is aware of these problems and has endeavored over the years to ameliorate them. With the funds provided by this committee and with the active participation of the Indians themselves, substantial improvements have been made in recent years. The committee believes that the Congress, and the public, should be aware of these accomplishments. They include the following:

As a result of improvements in Indian health services and facilities, the last 16 years have seen a decrease in death rates for infants of 62 percent; for maternal deaths, a decrease of 54 percent; from influenza and pneumonia, a decrease of 57 percent; from tuberculosis, a decrease of 86 percent; from gastritis, a decrease of 84 percent.

Also in the last 16 years, hospital admissions have increased 104 percent; the percentage of babies born in hospitals has increased 12 percent; the number of outpatient visits has increased 391 percent; and dental services have increased by 396 percent.

During the last 2 years, 995 new homes have been constructed and 9,040 homes renovated under the BIA housing improvement program.

Since 1962, 26,211 new classroom spaces and 13,548 replacement classroom spaces have been provided to Indian children through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

In the last 12 years, enrollment in BIA schools has increased from 40,194 to 56,566.

Before 1969, there was no kindergarten program in BIA schools. In 1969, there were 761 Indian children in kindergarten; by 1972, the number increased to 2,522.

In 1962, 763 Indian students received higher education grants; the average grant was \$328 per year. In 1973, 13,500 Indian students will receive higher education grants; the average grant will be \$1,350.

Despite these accomplishments, there is still much to be done. In the course of the 1974 hearings, the committee was constantly confronted with the deficiencies in Indian programs. Some of these deficiencies are as follows:

Despite the improvements noted above, the mortality rate from various causes for Indians is considerably higher than the general population.

Twenty Indian hospitals need re-

placement and 16 additional hospitals require major modernization. The estimated cost of this work is more than \$210 million.

Only 12 out of 51 Indian hospitals fully meet fire and safety codes; only 21 of the 51 Indian hospitals are accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals.

An estimated 18,843 Indian homes need running water and adequate waste disposal facilities; and estimated 18,968 Indian homes need upgrading of existing sanitation facilities.

According to a recent survey, there are about 103,300 Indian families for which only 30,100 existing dwellings are in standard condition. About 20,500 can be renovated to standard condition and about 48,300 new homes are required to replace existing substandard dwellings.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates a major alteration and improvement backlog amounting to \$55,481,000.

The estimated school construction needs for public schools where there is a substantial Indian impact amount to over \$116,000,000.

The committee recognizes these inadequacies and has provided \$759,735,000 for Indian programs in the bill. This is an increase of \$25,139,000 over the 1973 level and \$24,296,000 above the budget estimates for 1974. However, the committee reiterates that in no way do these funds meet the total requirements. The committee urges that future budget proposals provide funds which will eliminate inadequacies in hospitals, housing, and education facilities.

INDIAN EDUCATION ACT

Last year, Congress passed the Indian Education Act. Congress provided \$18 million for implementation of this act in the 1973 supplemental appropriation bill. The President proposed to rescind this appropriation, but Congress did not concur. It is expected that these funds will be obligated before the end of fiscal year 1973 and available for the coming school year.

Because the applications for assistance under this act from eligible school districts have just come to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department could give the committee no basis for making a reasonable projection of requirements for the coming fiscal year. They have assured the committee that when the requirements are known, the information will be supplied to the committee so that consideration can be given to proper funding.

The committee directs that both BIA and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare review the impact-aid program, the Johnson-O'Malley program, and the Indian Education Act program and provide recommendations so that all Indian children will have an equal educational opportunity. The committee also requests the BIA to review and reassess the Johnson-O'Malley distribution formula. The committee cannot emphasize too strongly that it is deeply interested in the progress of Indian education, but it wants the funds for these programs to be managed with complete fiscal responsibility so there is equity among the children served by them.

PROPOSED INDIAN GRANT PROGRAM

When the budget was submitted to Congress in January, there was a \$25 million item for the proposed Indian self-determination grant program. Unfortunately, the proposed legislation was not transmitted to Congress from the administration until June 12, 1973. The authorizing committees have not yet had an opportunity to take action on this proposal and it is therefore impossible for the committee to provide funding for the program in the bill. When authorization action has been completed, the committee will look favorably upon budget requests to fund this program.

Emotion alone will never solve the Indian problem. There must be a recognition in every city, every State, and every county that the Indian is an American citizen. When an Indian has left the reservation, he or she has the same rights and privileges as all other Americans. There is no excuse for an Indian in any city which provides welfare and medical aid, et cetera, to its citizens to go without these services.

It is the singular problem of Congress to try and offer a fiscal program that will allow our Indians knowledge of what is available to them as Americans. A little later in the bill you will note that the committee has provided \$1 million for counseling services in cities with major Indian populations. This money does not provide for the construction of Indian health centers; it provides for people with know-how to tell the Indian and to counsel them with regard to what is available to him or her.

Minneapolis was given a grant by this Congress 2 years ago. With the cooperation of Minneapolis and St. Paul Indian people, and the Indian health service, an outstanding job was done in providing information and service to Indian people in that area. It is this pattern of making available to Indian people these services that we hope will be used in this million dollar appropriation.

I would also like to call your attention to one more facet in the Indian problem of education. Public Law 815 has never been funded adequately to provide for the construction of public schools which have large Indian student daily attendance. Therefore, year after year, appeals come to us for unbudgeted funds to construct Indian attended public schools. The committee can only meet a small portion of these needs.

I would, therefore, remind communities who have bonding ability unused that they work with the Congress in a total construction program. It is unrealistic to ask the Congress to completely fund a school in a public school district which has available unused bonding authority. The district has a responsibility to Indian students to provide its share.

I have discussed with you many times the desire and hope that Indian people determine their own future and manage their own affairs. It is a pleasure to report that increasing contracts with Indian tribes are being made to carry out this philosophy. Tribes are now managing Indian schools, Indian development programs, and the Indian economy.

CXIX—1374—Part 17

However, I cannot stress too strongly that many of the funds of the past, like OEO, are in a questionable status today. If funds in these categories do not remain available, the BIA budget must of necessity be increased. It is mandatory that Indian children have the opportunity for Headstart programs and that Indian tribes have access to a program such as CAP. It is hoped that the Indian development fund may be expedited to the fullest, for upon that fund depends much of the Indian economy.

The Indian world can only be self-sufficient when its economy will sustain its people; when education is universal; when health is maintained at a maximum standard. We must recognize the fact that Indian housing is substandard and sanitation facilities are substandard. We will never have a diminution of ignorance and illness until we have provided a way to work, a place to learn, and a home which will not contribute to illness.

DEPARTMENTAL REORGANIZATION

On February 6, and again on May 7, 1973, the Department of the Interior announced a series of organizational changes. The highlights of these changes are the following:

New staff assistant secretaries for management, and program development and budget have been created.

The Assistant Secretary-Energy and Minerals has within his jurisdiction the power marketing agencies and the Bonneville Power Administration as well as the other agencies under the former Assistant Secretary-Mineral Resources. New staff offices have been established for energy data and analyses, research and development, and energy conservation. The health and safety enforcement activities of the Bureau of Mines have been split off into a new Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration which is also under the jurisdiction of the Assistant Secretary-Energy and Minerals.

The Assistant Secretary-Land and Water Resources has within his jurisdiction the Bureau of Land Management, Office of Saline Water, Office of Water Resources Research, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, with responsibility for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, reports directly to the Secretary. The same is true for the Office of Territorial Affairs.

The committee has discussed this reorganization with Interior Department officials. The committee will have a full review of the implementation of this reorganization, including the increased

efficiencies and cost savings in Departmental operations, in the 1975 hearings.

The committee notes with interest the intention of the President, expressed in the recent energy message, to propose a Department of Energy and Natural Resources. It is recognized that such a reorganization cannot be accomplished without action by Congress. The committee will have a full review of the proposal in the 1975 hearings, or sooner if congressional action should be forthcoming. It is not the intention of this committee to appropriate funds for one purpose and then have them used for another.

PROGRAMS NOT INCLUDED IN THE BILL

The budget estimates for fiscal year 1974 included funding for the following activities:

Trust Territory of Pacific Islands	\$56,000,000
Preservation of Historic Properties (grants-in-aid to States) ..	15,505,000
Saline Water Research	2,527,000
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission	7,100,000
Total	81,132,000

Existing legislation authorizing these activities expires June 30, 1973.

Hearings were held on the budget estimates, but in absence of authorizing legislation for these activities in fiscal year 1974, the committee has decided to pass over these items without prejudice.

LIMITATION ON UNIT COST OF EMPLOYEE HOUSING

The limitation on the unit cost of employee housing—regardless of the source of financing—in the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Territories shall be \$29,000. This limitation includes engineering and design costs, but excludes provision of utilities to the lot line. Any exceptions to this monetary limitation shall be submitted to the committee for its advance review and approval. Employee houses shall not exceed the standards outlined by the committee in House Conference Report No. 2049, 87th Congress, 2d session.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1973	\$96,565,000
Estimate, 1974	91,347,000
Recommended, 1974	83,872,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	-12,693,000
Estimate, 1974	-7,475,000

The amount recommended by the committee, compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Bill compared with—		
	Committee bill, 1974	1973 appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Resource management, conservation and protection	\$67,212,000	+\$5,533,000	-\$7,450,000
Cadastral survey	8,201,000	+199,000
Firefighting and rehabilitation	5,400,000	-18,500,000
General administration	3,059,000	+75,000	-25,000
Total, management of lands and resources	83,872,000	-12,693,000	-7,475,000

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for the conservation, management, and development of about 451

million acres of the Nation's public lands, including 278 million acres in Alaska.

In addition, the Bureau administers

mining and mineral leasing on other federally owned lands, or former Federal lands where minerals have been reserved in public ownership, and on the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf.

The reduction of \$7,475,000 below the budget estimate consists of the following decreases:

Supervision of trans-Alaska pipeline construction—\$7,400,000.

Off-road vehicle management—\$50,000.

General administration—\$25,000.

The committee is deleting, without prejudice, requested funds to supervise the construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline. Before a permit can be issued by the Secretary of the Interior, legislation must be passed by Congress, authorizing a wider right-of-way. This legislation must be passed before appropriations can be made. The committee believes that the correct forum for a debate on this entire issue, including the question of pipeline location, is on the authorizing legislation rather than the appropriation bill. When authorization legislation is passed, the committee will consider a request for additional funds for construction supervision.

This Nation must have the know-how to accomplish this increasingly important project without disrupting vast areas of the North American continent. We have through the years accomplished equally complex construction feats. The only new problem is the protection of the environment and there is progress in that area on all fronts.

I have other basic concerns relative to funding both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management—the need for acceleration of reforestation on our public forest lands, as well as an ever increasing education of the public in the proper protective use of these lands. Manmade fires, roads, and trails strewn with litter as well as an amazing amount of plain vandalism are destructive of the America we love.

Also, in the Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, and BIA, I have a distinct feeling that the Office of Management and Budget has disappeared into a dark hole without examining its responsibility relative to improved range land. Not only the economy but, as we noted earlier, the increase of food is involved in a stepped-up supply of better range lands.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1973.....\$7,965,000
Estimate, 1974.....6,300,000
Recommended, 1974.....6,300,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973.....—1,665,000
Estimate, 1974.....

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,300,000, the budget estimate, for construction and maintenance of various facilities necessary for the proper administration of public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

The Committee notes with dismay the testimony from the Bureau of Land Management that at the beginning of fiscal year 1974 only 14 percent of the estimated 16 million visitations annual-

ly can be accommodated by BLM recreation facilities. The committee expects that future budget proposals will reflect the high priority needs in this area.

PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

Appropriation, 1973.....\$3,265,000
Estimate, 1974.....4,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....4,000,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973.....+735,000
Estimate, 1974.....

This appropriation is required to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authority provided in the Federal Aid Highway Act for development of roads and trails on public lands.

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for maintaining about 45,000 miles of roads on the 451 million acres administered by the Bureau. Of the 36,000 miles of roads which are classed as primitive, 32,000 are in need of upgrading. There is an additional need of 21,300 miles of road construction and surfacing in order to serve the long-term management needs of the public lands.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

(INDEFINITE APPROPRIATION OF RECEIPTS)

Appropriation, 1973.....\$17,500,000
Estimate, 1974.....17,500,000
Recommended, 1974.....17,500,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973.....
Estimate, 1974.....

The bill continues the indefinite appropriation of 25 percent of the gross receipts from sales of timber and other products, representing one-third of the 75 percent of revenues due the Oregon and California counties.

It is estimated that a total of \$17,500,000 will be available during fiscal year 1974 for construction, acquisition, and operation and maintenance of access roads and improvements, and for forest protection and development on the re-

vested lands and on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land grant counties of Oregon.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

(INDEFINITE APPROPRIATION OF RECEIPTS)

Appropriation, 1974.....\$2,714,000
Estimate, 1974.....3,376,000
Recommended, 1974.....3,376,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973.....+662,000
Estimate, 1974.....

The committee recommends an indefinite appropriation of \$3,376,000 to be derived from public lands and Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act Lands grazing receipts for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements.

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF RECREATION FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1973.....
Estimate, 1974.....\$165,000
Recommended, 1974.....165,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973.....+165,000
Estimate, 1974.....

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$165,000, the budget request. This is an appropriation of receipts from admission fees and user charges from recreation users of lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management. The funds will be used to help maintain the 214 recreation sites, plus the 11 sites proposed for construction in 1973. The funds will also be used for necessary improvements at older facilities.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

Appropriation, 1973.....\$303,556,000
Estimate, 1974.....297,072,000
Recommended, 1974.....299,976,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973.....—3,580,000
Estimate, 1974.....+2,904,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Bill compared with—		
	Committee bill, 1974	1973 Appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Educational assistance, facilities, and services.....	\$185,991,000	—\$1,335,000	+\$1,804,000
Welfare and guidance services.....	70,312,000	+4,775,000	+1,000,000
Employment assistance.....	35,307,000	—7,120,000	
Maintaining law and order.....	8,366,000	+100,000	+100,000
Total, education and welfare services.....	299,976,000	—3,580,000	+2,904,000

The increase of \$2,904,000 over the budget estimate includes the following projects:

Operation of the Navajo Community College, Arizona, +\$600,000.

Demonstration program in college counseling, +\$250,000.

Operation of the St. Francis School, +\$140,000.

High priority needs of the Busby School, Montana, +\$14,000.

National Indian Training Center, Intermountain School, Utah, +\$300,000.

Housing improvement program, including funds for the Miccosukee Tribe of Florida and the Housing Demonstration Project of the Quileute Tribe of Washington, +\$1,000,000.

Assistance to tribal governments, including funds for Papago Tribal roll, Quinault Tribal government, and the Sioux Tribal Government Development Program, Minnesota, +\$500,000.

Law enforcement, Navajo Tribe, Arizona, +\$100,000.

Under the administration's policy of self-determination for Indian people, many of the activities formerly carried out directly by the Bureau of Indian Affairs are now being contracted out to the tribes. The committee expects that, in making these contracts, the BIA will include a reasonable provision for overhead and administrative costs incurred by the tribes in administering these contracts.

The committee has provided an addi-

tional \$100,000 for law enforcement on the Navajo Reservation. The committee acknowledges and endorses the traditional and historical responsibility which existed prior to 1958 for the maintenance of law and order on the Navajo Reservation as being a joint Federal-tribal responsibility. However, in recent years the funding responsibility for law enforcement has been completely assumed by the Navajo Tribe. The committee directs that the BIA include the Navajo Division of Law Enforcement as a budget item on a continuing basis. The BIA should meet with the appropriate Navajo officials to develop a joint plan and budget by which the acknowledgment of the joint Federal-tribal responsibility for law and

order on the Navajo Reservation will be effected and made operational.

Again, I cannot emphasize enough the necessity for additional Indian housing and in correlation with Indian housing more work by the extension agency of the Department of Agriculture in a down-to-earth program of teaching Indian people how to live in their new homes. It is also mandatory, I believe, for us to explore a new kind of low cost housing which will fit into the environment of the Indian world. Merely because a house is successful on Seventh Street, Washington, D.C., does not necessarily mean it is equally successful in Taholah, Wash.

Let us use some of our artistic ingenuity and engineering skills in planning the kind of home which fits into the environment and accommodates the very simple down-to-earth desires of the Indian people.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$86,041,000
Estimate, 1974.....	85,358,000
Recommended, 1974.....	86,022,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-19,000
Estimate, 1974.....	+664,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—		Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 Appropriation	Estimate, 1974			1973 Appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Forest and range lands.....	\$10,723,000	+\$2,577,000	+\$564,000	Management of Indian trust property.....	\$12,314,000	-\$100,000	-----
Outdoor recreation.....	353,000	-----	-----	Repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities.....	24,967,000	+100,000	+\$100,000
Fire suppression and emergency rehabilitation.....	800,000	-----	-----	Operation, repair, and maintenance of Indian irrigation systems.....	1,611,000	-----	-----
Agricultural and industrial assistance.....	17,362,000	-----	-----	Environmental quality services.....	523,000	-----	-----
Soil and moisture conservation.....	10,089,000	-----	-----	Total, resources management.....	86,022,000	-19,000	+664,000
Maintenance of roads.....	6,592,000	-----	-----				
Development of Indian arts and crafts.....	688,000	-----	-----				

The increase of \$664,000 over the budget estimate includes \$100,000 for the work-learn program, \$350,000 for reforestation and forest management, Quinault Tribe, and \$214,000 for management and administration of the McQuinn Strip, Oreg.

May I urge that more and more money be budgeted to Indian tribes in the United States for the management of all their natural resources, that they assume management of their own reforestation, train their own forest workers, and negotiate the financial arrangements for sale or preservation, as the case may be, of their land.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$56,078,000
Estimate, 1974.....	44,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....	53,343,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-2,735,000
Estimate, 1974.....	+9,343,000

The amount provided in the bill includes a net increase of \$9,343,000. Testimony before the committee revealed that of the \$5,730,000 appropriated in 1973 for the Haskell Junior College, Kans., \$1,930,000 will not be obligated until fiscal year 1975. The committee directs that these funds be reprogrammed for use in fiscal year 1974. These funds, along with the funds added by the committee, shall be used for the following projects not included in the budget estimate:

Design for Riverside Indian School, Oklahoma, +\$250,000.

Design and master site plan, Chillicothe Indian School, Oklahoma, +\$200,000.

Exterior facilities, Cherokee High School, North Carolina, +\$500,000.

Construction of classrooms and related facilities, Pryor Elementary School, Montana, +\$223,000.

Construction of classrooms and related facilities, Lame Deer Elementary School, Montana, +\$500,000.

Planning, design, and land acquisition, Edgar High School, Montana, +\$100,000.

Construction, Santa Rosa School, Arizona, +\$4,500,000.

Navajo Indian irrigation project, +\$4,000,000.

Colorado River irrigation and power project, +\$1,000,000.

As we have noted earlier, the committee is continually confronted with plans and expenditures for the construction of classrooms and related facilities in the public schools which Indians attend.

I have expressed this thought earlier, and I express it again; the BIA cannot afford to construct facilities unless the proportion of bonding authority available by the local school district is integrated with the BIA expenditures.

It is more than unconscionable that white citizens in an area expect that the Indians attending locally should carry the entire cost of construction projects in their school district when available tax bonding authority should provide their share. It is entirely un-American to expect that Indian students carry the burden of white students. We are all Americans and as Americans we can expect to spend jointly for the construction of facilities.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$45,539,000
Estimate, 1974.....	43,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....	43,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-2,539,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-----

This appropriation is required to liquidate obligations incurred for Indian road construction under contract authority provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

In addition to the proposed obligation program, the Department is directed to provide \$75,000 for road construction at the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak.

In many Indian areas roads are the key to good schools, good Indian health programs, and the economy. I urge that

we get on with the business of building environmentally conscious and economically sound roads by and with the advice of those they will serve—the Indians.

ALASKA NATIVE FUND

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$50,000,000
Estimate, 1974.....	70,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....	70,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+20,000,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-----

Section 6 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (Public Law 92-203) provides for the establishment in the U.S. Treasury of an Alaska Native Fund into which \$462,500,000 shall be deposited over a period of 11 years.

After completion of an Alaskan Native roll, all money in the Alaska Native Fund, except for certain fees as provided in section 20 of the act, will be distributed among the regional corporations—organized pursuant to section 7 of the act—for the benefit of Alaskan Natives.

The bill includes \$70,000,000, the budget estimate, which is the amount specified in the authorizing legislation for deposit in the Alaska Native Fund in fiscal year 1974.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$6,200,000
Estimate, 1974.....	5,319,000
Recommended, 1974.....	5,244,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-956,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-75,000

The deduction of \$75,000 below the budget estimate relates to decreases in BIA administrative costs.

TRIBAL FUNDS

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$16,530,000
Estimate, 1974.....	16,505,000
Recommended, 1974.....	16,505,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-25,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-----

Funds held in trust for Indian tribes under the provisions of various acts are used for expenses of tribal governments,

administration of Indian tribal affairs, employment of tribal attorneys, establishment and operation of tribal enterprises, investments, and the welfare of Indians.

**BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$4,150,000
Estimate, 1974.....	4,436,000
Recommended, 1974.....	\$4,396,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+246,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-40,000

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation serves as the focal point in the Federal Government for activities relating to outdoor recreation. In addition, a liaison is maintained with State and local governments and with the private sector with a view toward developing and executing a nationwide coordinated effort in the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities.

The Bureau also administers a program of matching grants to States for recreation planning, for acquisition of land and water areas, and for the development of such areas.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,396,000, a reduction of \$40,000 below the budget estimate.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$300,000,000
Estimate, 1974.....	55,223,000
Recommended, 1974.....	71,223,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-228,777,000
Estimate, 1974.....	+16,000,000

The following table reflects the action recommended by the committee on the budget request.

Activity	Budget estimate	Committee bill, 1974	Change
Assistance to States.....	\$50,000,000	\$66,000,000	+\$16,000,000
Federal programs.....		(Reprogram)	
Administrative expense.....	5,223,000	5,223,000	
Total, estimate.....	55,223,000	71,223,000	+16,000,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$66 million for the State grant portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund program. In addition, an estimated \$146 million in unobligated balances from previous years' appropriations will be available in 1974. This \$212 million obligation program in 1974 is compared to estimated obligations of \$202 million in 1973. Of the \$66 million

appropriated for apportionment to the States, \$16 million is to be apportioned by the Secretary through a special account to those States who have fully obligated all previously apportioned moneys, including the funds otherwise apportioned for fiscal year 1974. In addition, the Secretary may establish a \$2.5 million contingency fund. Upon request from a State, the Secretary may make available from the special account an additional apportionment not to exceed the lesser of either 7 percent of the total amount appropriated or the amount apportioned to the State in fiscal year 1973, minus the fiscal year 1974 apportionment. All apportionments to any State from the special account will be deducted from the State's fiscal year 1975 apportionment or from other future year apportionments as shall be determined by the Secretary. Fiscal year 1975 or future year apportionments to all States shall be adjusted upward or downward by the Secretary to reflect their apportioned share of the special account to assure that each State's accumulative apportionments are equitable under the formula.

The Federal land acquisition program is to be carried out in 1974 entirely from unobligated balances from previous years. Of the total \$80 million program proposed, \$59,400,000 will be obligated by the National Park Service, \$18,000,000 by the U.S. Forest Service, \$2,400,000 by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and \$200,000 by the Bureau of Land Management. In the course of its hearings, the committee discovered that \$31,422,000 in funds previously appropriated for the Federal land acquisition program will not be used until fiscal year 1975. The committee directs that a portion of these funds be reprogrammed for use in fiscal year 1974, as follows:

National Park Service:	
Golden Gate National Recreation Area.....	\$10,000,000
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.....	10,000,000
U.S. Forest Service: Lake Tahoe Basin lands (California).....	
	4,030,450

The committee expects the Department to submit formal reprogramings to implement these actions.

The committee also expects that those responsible for budget decisions will provide in the 1975 budget the full \$300 million program so that escalation of land costs does not consume the authorized limits for the various recreation areas

provided by Congress for the use of the American people.

**TERRITORIAL AFFAIRS
ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES**

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$22,375,000
Estimate, 1974.....	15,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....	15,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-7,375,000
Estimate, 1974.....	

The Secretary of the Interior is charged with responsibility of promoting the economic and political development of those territories which are under the U.S. jurisdiction and within the responsibility of the Interior Department.

In addition to certain funds available to the Virgin Islands and Guam under permanent appropriations, this bill provides \$1,000,000 for the Guam Economic Development Fund.

The \$14,000,000 included in the bill for American Samoa will provide for priority programs in education, public health, sewage facilities, and electric power. The committee calls attention to the progress made by the legislative branch of the government of American Samoa in accepting more responsibility and providing additional funds for various programs in American Samoa.

The committee has no way of knowing the amount of money expended by OEO programs which will not be funded in 1974. However, if the committee is called upon to provide extra money for these activities, it will be necessary to have additional hearings and supplementary estimates.

I would remind the administration that until special revenue sharing is passed by the Congress that some monetary provisions may need to be included as additions to the budget. Of the amount for these the committee has no knowledge since we do not have the OEO justifications.

**MINERAL RESOURCES
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$150,450,000
Estimate, 1974.....	156,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....	155,974,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+5,524,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-26,000

The total amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Bill compared with—		
	Committee bill, 1974	1973 Appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Special resource and environmental projects.....	\$4,053,000	+\$300,000	+\$300,000
Alaska pipeline related investigations.....	838,000	-501,000	-12,000
Topographic surveys and mapping.....	34,259,000	-300,000	
Geologic and mineral resources surveys and mapping.....	42,795,000	-170,000	
Minerals discovery loan program.....	272,000		
Water resources investigations.....	39,854,000	-275,000	
Conservation of lands and minerals.....	16,029,000	+1,770,000	
<hr/>			
Activity	Bill compared with—		
	Committee bill, 1974	1973 Appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Facilities.....	\$5,700,000	+\$5,700,000	-\$214,000
Earth resources observation systems.....	8,443,000	-1,900,000	
Resource and land information program.....	900,000	-\$900,000	-100,000
General administration.....	2,831,000		
Total, geological survey.....	155,974,000	+5,524,000	-26,000

The Geological Survey provides the basic scientific data concerning water, land, and mineral resources and supervises the prospecting, development, and production of minerals and mineral fuels on leased Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf lands.

The net reduction of \$26,000 below the budget estimate consists of decreases of

\$12,000 for Alaska pipeline related investigations, \$214,000 for relocation of personnel to the National Center, Reston, Va., \$100,000 for the Resource and Land Information program, and an increase of \$300,000 for geothermal studies.

BUREAU OF MINES

MINES AND MINERALS

Appropriation, 1973..... \$157,456,000

Estimate, 1974..... \$136,824,000
Recommended, 1974..... 145,424,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973..... -12,041,000
Estimate, 1974..... +8,600,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 ap- propriation	Estimate, 1974
Mineral resources development:			
Energy.....	\$19,396,000	—\$425,000	+\$1,300,000
Metallurgy.....	14,393,000	—1,000,000
Mining.....	5,633,000	—100,000	+600,000
Data collection and analysis.....	10,763,000	+1,192,000	+500,000
Subtotal.....	50,185,000	—333,000	+3,400,000
Engineering, evaluation, and demonstration.....	8,696,000	—1,229,000	+1,400,000

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 ap- propriation	Estimate, 1974
Mine health and safety:			
Coal mine inspections.....	\$31,734,000	—\$432,000
Metal and nonmetal mine inspections.....	7,574,000	+1,454,000
Education and training.....	5,321,000	—12,892,000
Technical support.....	7,194,000	+300,000
Research.....	32,117,000	+915,000	+\$3,800,000
Subtotal.....	83,940,000	—10,655,000	+3,800,000
Program administration.....	2,603,000	+176,000
Total, mines and minerals.....	145,424,000	—12,041,000	+8,600,000

The increase of \$8,600,000 over the budget estimate consists of the following:

Research on subsurface disposal of industrial wastes, Bartlesville, Okla., and Morgantown, W. Va., +\$300,000.

Research on conversion of organic wastes to oil, +\$400,000.

Research on extraction technology and explosives, +\$600,000.

Research on filling critical mine void areas, Rock Springs, Wyo., +\$700,000.

Mined area investigations and demonstrations, anthracite coal region, +\$700,000.

Coal mine health and safety research, +\$3,800,000.

Energy economic analysis and research on energy conservation, +\$1,500,000.

Nonnuclear stimulation of oil and gas, +\$500,000.

Research on the corrosive effects of geothermal steam on metals, +\$100,000.

The committee directs that funds appropriated for the Bureau of Mines will be spent in conformance with the departmental reorganization that was discussed with the committee. The Bureau of Mines will continue to perform its historic mission with respect to research and data analysis. Only those activities concerned with health and safety enforcement responsibilities will be moved to the new organization, the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$43,490,000
Estimate, 1974..... 52,500,000
Recommended, 1974..... 61,500,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973..... +18,010,000
Estimate, 1974..... +9,000,000

The Office of Coal Research contracts for research and development of new and more efficient methods of mining, preparing, and utilizing coal.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$61,500,000, an increase of \$9,000,000 over the budget estimate.

Testimony before the committee revealed that there is presently unobli-

gated about \$2,000,000 which has been previously appropriated for operation of the facility at Cresap, W. Va. Since this project is presently deactivated, the committee directs that the \$2,000,000 be reprogrammed for other priority needs. The net increase of \$9,000,000 over the budget estimate consists of a decrease of \$2,000,000 from reprogramming the funding for the Cresap facility and increases of \$7,000,000 for the solvent refined coal process, \$2,000,000 for research on magnetohydrodynamics—MHD—and \$2,000,000 for project COED.

The research on MHD includes enthalpy extraction testing in Tennessee, and also cooperative programs with the U.S.S.R. in advancing this technology.

The 1974 program consists of the following:

Coal gasification pilot plant projects (to be matched with \$10,000,000 of private contributions)..... \$20,000,000
Coal liquefaction pilot plants..... 16,000,000
Non-pilot-plant projects..... 24,300,000
Administration..... 1,200,000

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$1,558,000
Estimate, 1974..... 1,485,000
Recommended, 1974..... 2,585,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973..... +1,027,000
Estimate, 1974..... +1,100,000

The Office of Oil and Gas serves as a focal point for leadership and information on petroleum matters in the Federal Government, and the principal channel of communication between the Federal Government, the petroleum industry, and the oil producing States. It also maintains the capability to respond effectively to emergencies affecting the Nation's supply of oil and gas to consumers.

The Office of Oil and Gas has recently assumed the responsibility for administering the Voluntary Petroleum Allocation program. The committee recommendation provides an additional \$1,100,000 above the budget estimate to assist in implementing these responsibilities. The additional funds will provide

for an additional 50 positions. The committee expects a supplemental estimate from the administration if further resources are necessary.

FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1973..... \$76,639,500
Estimate, 1974..... 79,004,000
Recommended, 1974..... 80,137,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973..... +3,497,500
Estimate, 1974..... +1,133,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 Appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Habitat preservation.....	\$11,849,000	+\$376,000	-\$100,000
Wildlife resources.....	36,208,000	+3,844,500	+775,000
Fishery resources.....	19,317,000	-82,000	+208,000
Endangered species.....	4,372,000	+200,000
Interpretation and recreation.....	5,163,000	-841,000	+250,000
Administration.....	3,228,000
Total, resources management.....	80,137,000	+3,497,500	+1,133,000

The net increase of \$1,133,000 above the budget estimate consists of a \$100,000 reduction for preparation of environmental impact statements and the following increases:

General wildlife refuge management, +\$750,000.

Recreation management on wildlife refuges, +\$250,000.

Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge, Virginia, +\$25,000.

Warm Springs National Fish Hatchery, Georgia, +\$50,000.

Welaka National Fish Hatchery, Florida, +\$13,900.

Millen Aquarium and Hatchery, Georgia, +\$23,000.

Miles City National Fish Hatchery, Montana, +\$65,000.

Marion National Fish Hatchery,

Training, and Research Center, Alabama, +\$50,000.

Orangeburg National Fish Hatchery, South Carolina, +\$6,100.

The budget proposal for 1974 included significant curtailments in National Wildlife Refuge management and fish production from warm-water hatcheries. The basis of these reductions, in large part, was that these activities could be transferred to the State or local jurisdictions involved. The committee is concerned that ongoing programs will be abandoned before adequate arrangements can be made for funding from other sources.

The committee directs that before any ongoing programs in the refuge or hatchery system are transferred to other jurisdictions, the committee be consulted. The committee wants assurances that the Federal investment in technology, land and improvements, and fish and wildlife resources is not sacrificed for the sake of budget priorities.

The budget also proposed reductions in the recreation use of selected wildlife refuges. The committee is aware of the provisions of the Recreational Use of Conservation Areas Act, which allows consistent public recreational uses on wildlife refuges. The committee has restored \$250,000 of the proposed budget reduction for curtailed public use of refuges. This increase is provided in order to allow an orderly coordination between the Federal Government and the various jurisdictions who must implement the policies of this act. The committee intends to give close attention to the results of this effort.

Within available funds, the committee directs that the Bureau continue work on the Malheur-Harney Basin study.

The committee feels that the loss of a single life due to nonsupervision of recreation on our wildlife refuges is too expensive in the context of the American experience. We urge that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife work with the States and local jurisdictions to iron out the acceptance of responsibility so that the entire program of recreation and wildlife may be integrated expeditiously and safely.

The committee urges that those responsible for budgeting in the United States recognize that our wildlife refuges are desperately in need of increased maintenance moneys and increasing enforcement.

CONSTRUCTION AND ANADROMOUS FISH

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$2,333,000
Estimate, 1974.....	9,233,000
Recommended, 1974.....	12,846,500
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+10,513,500
Estimate, 1974.....	+3,613,500

This appropriation finances the construction and rehabilitation of fish hatcheries and wildlife refuge facilities, and fishery and wildlife research facilities. It also provides funds to carry out the provisions of Public Law 91-249, to preserve, develop, and enhance anadromous fishery resources within the several States and the Great Lakes.

In addition to those projects included

in the budget estimate, the committee recommendation includes the following projects:

Core hole drilling, Salton Sea, Calif., +\$43,000.

Warm Springs National Fish Hatchery, Oreg., +\$1,300,000.

Makah Fish Hatchery, Wash., +\$500,000.

Atlantic Salmon Fish Hatchery, Bethel, Vt., +\$600,000.

Pumping station, Mammoth Springs National Fish Hatchery, Ark., +\$60,500.

Green Lake National Fish Hatchery, Maine, +\$160,000.

Lighthouse Interpretive complex and seawall restoration, St. Marks National Wildlife Refuge, Fla., +\$200,000.

Fishing ponds and reservoir, Fishery Research Laboratory, LaCrosse, Wis., +\$600,000.

Allegheny National Fish Hatchery, Pa., +\$150,000.

The 1974 program recommended by the committee will provide \$11,013,500 for construction and rehabilitation and \$1,833,000 for anadromous fish grants-in-aid.

Finally, may I say to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and to the Office of Management and Budget, please do not go on acquiring more land if you have no intention of managing it.

Our facilities owned by the United States of America and managed by it should represent the finest kind of American management. Sloppy down-at-the-heels Federal land management is discouraging not only to visitors but to our hard-working personnel, and may I say at this point that the people in the service of the United States in all facilities funded by this bill are top-flight. From Alaska to Florida and Maryland

to Micronesia, the people who work for us are entitled to a salute. Not only do they give us extra hours of service but they cheerfully live in remote areas, serving us with courtesy and energy.

One only has to visit our Federal installations to realize the day-after-day affectionate care lavished on facilities by our employees.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$7,100,000
Estimate, 1974.....	
Recommended, 1974.....	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-7,100,000
Estimate, 1974.....	

An estimated \$7,000,000 will be available from receipts from Federal migratory bird hunting stamps to continue the wetlands acquisition program.

Under the provisions of the Wetlands legislation, this appropriation provides advances to the fund for acquisition of refuges. The advances are to be repaid from receipts beginning in fiscal year 1977. The congressional intent in approving advance funding was to enable purchase of wetlands before land price escalation. The budget policy of eliminating this advance funding is shortsighted. The committee expects further requests from the budget authorities to continue this advance funding program.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM		
Appropriation, 1973.....	\$162,918,000	
Estimate, 1974.....	176,780,000	
Recommended, 1974.....	176,720,000	
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1973.....	+13,802,000	
Estimate, 1974.....	-60,000	

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Park management.....	\$171,880,000	+\$13,802,000	-\$60,000
Forest fire suppression and rehabilitation of burned areas.....	700,000		
Executive direction.....	4,140,000		
Total, operation of the National Park System.....	176,720,000	+13,802,000	-60,000

The reduction of \$60,000 below the budget estimate relates to the interpretive program for Bicentennial Parks.

The committee recommendation provides for the operation of new facilities in 30 park areas. It also provides for initial funding and staffing at 11 new areas and at three existing areas. Included in the total increase over 1973 is \$6,209,600 for the Gateway National Recreation Area, New York-New Jersey, and \$2,537,400 for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Calif.

PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$54,146,000
Estimate, 1974.....	20,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....	20,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-34,146,000
Estimate, 1974.....	

Information supplied to the committee revealed that there will be an estimated unobligated balance of \$41,967,000 at the end of fiscal year 1973. Many

projects for which Congress previously appropriated funds have been delayed because of planning delays and the preparation of environmental impact statements. Others are now considered lower priority by the National Park Service. The committee directs that funds for these projects be reprogrammed to provide for the following projects:

Continued restoration work, Fort Vancouver, Wash., \$500,000.

Park development, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind., \$771,000.

Stabilization and project planning, Gulf Islands National Seashore, Fla., \$750,000.

Visitors center planning and fencing, Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Cultural National Monument, Tex., \$190,000.

Project planning, Arkansas Post National Memorial, Ark., \$110,000.

Planning and design, and seawall res-

toration, Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial, Ohio, \$420,000.

The committee directs the Department to provide a formal reprogramming request to implement these actions.

The committee directs the National Park Service to provide assistance, as requested, for advice and consultation in planning the Makah-Ozette Museum, Wash.

Included in the committee recommendation is \$175,000 for the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial. Funds for this project are to be derived from \$130,000 previously requested for the Old Georgetown Stone Craft Center and \$45,000 from the planning activity.

I would personally recommend that the planning program of the Parks Department meld together the planning for the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial funded in the form of a Rose Garden with that of the Constitution Garden and see what kind of program could emerge. It seems to me that money could be saved in integrated planning and that not only a memorial, but beauty could be assured.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

Appropriation, 1973	\$5,416,000
Estimate, 1974	35,000,000
Recommended, 1974	35,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+29,584,000
Estimate, 1974	

This appropriation provides for liquidation of obligations incurred for construction of parkways and roads and trails by the National Park Service under contract authority provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

In addition to the obligation program proposed for 1974, \$560,000 shall be obligated for planning and \$2,000,000 for construction of section 3-C of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Mississippi. No additional liquidating cash is required in fiscal year 1974.

Also in addition to the obligation program proposed, \$60,000 shall be used for planning the Big Spring Canyon Bridge, Canyonlands National Park, Utah. The committee directs that the required environmental reviews for this project be completed as expeditiously as possible.

In conformance with committee recommendation on the Constitution Gardens in the Planning, Development, and Operation of Recreation Facilities appropriation, \$150,000 included in the proposed obligation program will be unnecessary in fiscal year 1974.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Appropriation, 1973	\$4,054,000
Estimate, 1974	4,054,000
Recommended, 1974	4,054,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	
Estimate, 1974	

The committee recommendation provides \$4,054,000, the budget estimate, for those portions of this program which are currently authorized. The committee regrets that due to lack of authorizing legislation it was not possible to provide funding for the grant portion of the program, including the proposed Bicentennial grants. The total amount provided includes:

Maintenance of the national register	\$674,100
Advisory council on historic preservation support	479,000
Historic sites survey	545,200
Historic American buildings survey	400,200
Historic American engineering record	209,600
Archeological investigations and salvage	1,745,900
Total	4,054,000

The committee directs that within the funds provided, \$150,000 be included for continuation of work at the Makah-Ozette diggings.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, AND OPERATION OF RECREATION FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1973	
Estimate, 1974	\$32,925,000
Recommended, 1974	31,531,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+31,531,000
Estimate, 1974	-1,394,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$31,531,000, a reduction of \$1,394,000 below the budget estimate. Authority for this program originates from Public Law 92-347, approved July 11, 1972, whereby fees collected by the National Park Service for admission to designated units of the system and for special recreation-use facilities are earmarked for appropriation for its own use.

The reduction of \$1,394,000 includes \$79,000 for cherry tree lighting around the Tidal Basin, and \$1,315,000 for construction of the information building, boathouse and lakes for Constitution Gardens, National Capital Parks. The committee recommendation includes \$1,885,000 in this appropriation and \$150,000 in the parkway and road construction obligation program for construction of underground bus parking facilities and related utilities for the proposed Constitution Gardens. Also included is \$1,300,000 for reconstruction of the C. & O. Canal, \$300,000 for repairs to the Jefferson Memorial, \$200,000 for repairs at the Washington Monument, and \$973,000 to reconstruct the Reflecting Pool.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Appropriation, 1973	\$2,000,000
Estimate, 1974	2,400,000
Recommended, 1974	2,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+400,000
Estimate, 1974	

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,400,000, the budget estimate, for the cost of the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. These funds will provide for maintenance, security, information, interpretation, janitorial, and all other services necessary to the nonperforming arts functions of the Center.

OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973	\$16,344,000
Estimate, 1974	13,149,000
Recommended, 1974	13,689,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	-2,655,000
Estimate, 1974	+540,000

The objective of this program is to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the fields of water and resources which affect water, in order to assist in assuring the Nation of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$13,689,000, an increase of \$540,000 over the budget estimate. The increase will provide an additional \$10,000 per State for the 50 States and Puerto Rico where institutes have already been established—for a total of \$110,000 per State. In addition, \$10,000 each is provided for newly authorized institutes in the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia.

The amount included in the bill provides the following:

Assistance to States for institutes	\$5,640,000
Matching grants to institutes	3,000,000
Water resources research to be performed by any qualified entity or individual as provided under Title II of the Act	3,170,000
Scientific information center	934,000
Administration	945,000
Total	13,689,000

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973	\$7,360,000
Estimate, 1974	7,850,000
Recommended, 1974	7,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+140,000
Estimate, 1974	-350,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,500,000, a reduction of \$350,000 below the budget estimate. The reduction consists of \$300,000 for printing and publication of Indian civil rights works, which is not authorized, and a \$50,000 general reduction in operating expenses.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973	\$15,295,100
Estimate, 1974	15,895,000
Recommended, 1974	15,495,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+199,900
Estimate, 1974	-400,000

The committee recommends a general reduction of \$400,000 in the operating expenses of the Office of the Secretary.

The committee disapproves the Department's proposal to add eight staff assistant positions for the Secretary's regional field representatives.

DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS

Estimate, 1974	5,737,000
Appropriation, 1973	\$4,466,000
Recommended, 1974	5,737,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+1,271,000
Estimate, 1974	

The bill provides \$5,737,000, the budget estimate, for Departmental Operations. The amount provided includes \$3,628,000 for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, \$1,189,000 for the Natural Resources Library, \$220,000 for the Johnny Horizon

Program, and \$700,000 for the World Energy Conference.

The committee approves the creation of the proposed Office of Aircraft Services and will discuss the results of the implementation of the pilot program in Alaska during the 1975 hearings.

CENTRAL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUND

Appropriation, 1973-----
Estimate, 1974----- \$25,000,000
Recommended, 1974-----
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973-----
Estimate, 1974----- -25,000,000

The committee recommends no appropriation for this activity. At the time of the hearings, the Department had only a vague idea as to the allocation of this large amount of money. Subsequently, the committee received a suggested allocation from the Office of the Secretary. The committee believes that funds provided for energy research should be appropriated for specific projects to agencies already involved in these activities. Accordingly the committee has provided additional funds in appropriations for the Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey, Office of Coal Research, and the U.S. Forest Service for specific energy research projects, using the overall guidelines provided by the Office of the Secretary.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

Appropriation, 1973----- \$500,000
Estimate, 1974----- 1,630,000
Recommended, 1974----- 670,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973----- +170,000
Estimate, 1974----- -960,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$670,000, a reduction of \$960,000 below the budget estimate, for various research programs utilizing excess foreign currencies.

The allowance will provide for the continuation of on-going projects related to energy, minerals, mine safety, and desalinization research.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FOREST SERVICE

This year the committee did an unusual thing for an Appropriations Subcommittee. Following the completion of the presentation of the U.S. Forest Service we called a panel of experts and interested citizens in forest programs to sit with the committee and express viewpoints and discuss problems and solutions. Those participating were: Mr. Kenneth B. Pomeroy, National Associa-

tion of State Foresters; Mr. Brock Evans, Washington representative, Sierra Club; Mr. Joseph McCracken, Western Forest Industries Association; Dr. Robert Wombach, dean, School of Forestry, University of Montana; Mr. Ralph Hodges, president, National Forest Products Association; Mr. George Alderson, Washington representative, Friends of Earth; Dr. James S. Bethel, College of Forest Resources, University of Washington; and Mr. Charles Connaughton, American Forestry Association.

Volume I carries this full discussion and I urge that Members of this House read it. It is challenging and stimulating and out of it came the consensus that the Nation's forests must have more effective and efficient management which is largely the responsibility of the budget dollar.

There must be good planning to provide for a maximum timber crop in the high yield harvest context as well as provide for an adequate lumber cut which will not encroach upon nor endanger our wilderness, or our beauty, that will not contribute to erosion or the destruction of watersheds, and that will still leave our forests for the enjoyment of millions of people who visit them for an experience in the outdoors.

As you act upon the appropriations here, I want you to realize that in no way does the committee feel that this bill provides the necessary appropriations. It is a continuation of the committee's feeling that because of the serious deficiency in managerial funds, we have of necessity added to the budget within the context of the overall budget frame. Therefore, the committee has been handicapped by money to do what it desires.

However, we have provided funds to make it possible for the Forest Service to increase tree planting, but we urge that future budget officials step up this amount until we are able to plant the maximum for future production. The committee will be decidedly angry if any of these funds today provided are impounded or transferred to other purposes. We want it plainly understood that this appropriation is to be used for more intensive and better management of forest area and for better management of our recreation areas.

I would point out to Members that the Forest Service is an agency which contributes substantial direct financial assistance to the U.S. Treasury and more indirect revenue. Timber sales for 1974

are expected to provide revenue to the U.S. Treasury far in excess of the costs of administration. Total receipts in the bill are estimated at \$2,930,700,518 while fiscal year 1974 appropriations are recommended at \$2,269,554,200.

We cannot regard national forests as "just another patch of trees." These U.S. forests have a tremendous role in the national economy. Logging and the manufacture of lumber, plywood, and other building products provide extensive employment throughout the Nation. After lumber leaves the marketplace for use in home construction, it again contributes to the economy of the United States in the building trades industry and total home production.

You will note that we have discussed log exports. I have felt for many years that those products raised on our national forests should not be in the export category, but should be available for domestic consumption. This is not usurping in any way a State Department policy.

I am sure the State Department would not sell its building to a foreign country. Our national forests are in the same context. Certainly in this critical time of underplanting and underfunding of these forests we are not in the position of ability to sell abroad. Any nation who is a purchaser from us should realize exactly our dilemma. Until we have put our national forests back into top-flight shape and until there is no further need for this volume of timber, I think it is mandatory we use this timber in domestic consumption.

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

The bill includes under this heading a total appropriation of \$346,606,000, a decrease of \$47,608,000 below the 1973 appropriation, and an increase of \$19,247,000 over the budget estimate.

The following is a summary of actions taken on the programs included under this appropriation:

FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1973----- \$299,231,000
Estimate, 1974----- 246,324,000
Recommended, 1974----- 259,701,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973----- -39,530,000
Estimate, 1974----- +13,377,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—		Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 appropriation	Estimate 1974			1973 appropriation	Estimate 1974
FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT							
National Forest protection and management:							
Timber resource management:							
Sales administration and management	\$68,909,000	—\$571,000	—\$560,000	Forest advanced logging and conservation (FALCON)		—\$5,000,000	
Reforestation and stand improvement	35,136,000	+3,034,600	+12,000,000	Payments to Employees' Compensation Fund	\$2,300,000	+169,000	
Recreation-public use	42,280,000	+124,600	+937,000	Subtotal	238,992,000	+235,000	+13,377,000
Wildlife habitat management	7,802,000	—55,000		Amount advanced from cooperative range improvements	—700,000		
Range land management	14,987,000	—529,000		Subtotal, National Forest protection and management	238,292,000	+235,000	+13,377,000
Soil and water management	11,123,000	+1,225,000	+1,000,000	Water resource development related activities	4,022,000	—75,000	
Mineral claims leases and special uses	6,667,000	+899,000		Fighting forest fires	4,275,000	—39,563,000	
Land classification, adjustments, and surveys	9,085,000	+890,000		Insect and disease control	10,585,000	—111,000	
Forest fire protection	32,127,000	—618,000		Cooperative law enforcement program	2,527,000	—16,000	
Maintenance of improvements for fire and general purposes (including communications)	8,576,000	+667,000		Total, forest land management	259,701,000	—39,530,000	+13,377,000

The net increase of \$13,377,000 over the budget includes reductions of \$560,000 for log exports and \$63,000 for visitor information services and the following increases:

Reforestation, +\$7,000,000.

Timber stand improvement, +\$5,000,000.

Administration of recreation and public use facilities, +\$1,000,000.

Project SEAM—Surface environment and mining, +\$1,000,000.

Testimony before the committee has revealed for years that there are serious deficiencies in the management of our national forest lands. Millions of acres of potential commercial forest lands are unreforested, and commercial forest lands are not managed with the intensity necessary for high yield. In addition, budget cutbacks have forced curtailment of recreation use of the national forests.

With the additional funds again provided by the committee, the Forest Service will be able to make a beginning at catching up on the reforestation backlog. The committee will be highly displeased if budget authorities impound these funds or propose to transfer or reprogram them to other purposes. The committee directs that funds included in this appropriation be used for more in-

tensive management of those forest areas which are amenable to high-yield timber production without serious environmental damage. The committee further directs that the Forest Service provide the committee with a long-range multiyear budget and management plan to bring the management of Forest Service lands up to standards consistent with multiuse objectives. The committee points out that an estimated \$20 million is spent by the Forest Service each year to pick up after visitors and repair damage done by vandals in the national forests. If the public were more careful in the use of these lands, additional funds could be used for critical forest management programs.

It is the understanding of the committee that the timber sales goal as justified to the committee by the Forest Service consists entirely of sound merchantable timber volume. It is also the committee's understanding that other provisions have been made in the budget to handle non-sound volume, such as cull volumes, in addition to the announced volumes of commercially sound volumes mentioned above.

The administration has recently announced an increase in the timber sales program for fiscal year 1974 of 1 billion board feet, for a total sales program of 11.8 billion board feet. However, with

this announcement, there was no revised budget estimate submitted to the committee to provide for this increased sales program. The committee directs that none of the additional funds provided by the committee for forest management be used for administration of the increased timber sales program, but that the administration submit a budget amendment or supplemental requesting such funds. It should be noted that timber sales provide revenue to the U.S. Treasury far in excess of the costs of their administration and therefore additional budget requests are entirely justified.

In addition to language limiting log exports, discussed earlier in this report, the committee has included a provision in the bill to prohibit the realignment of the regional boundaries of the U.S. Forest Service.

FOREST RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$62,146,000
Estimate, 1974.....	57,275,000
Recommended, 1974.....	59,145,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-3,001,000
Estimate, 1974.....	+1,870,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Forest research:			
Forest and range management research:			
Timber management research.....	\$11,936,000	—\$902,000	+\$190,000
Watershed management research.....	7,116,000	+390,000	+850,000
Wildlife habitat and range research.....	3,833,000	—823,000	+360,000
Forest recreation research.....	1,153,000	—221,000	+50,000
Subtotal, Forest and range management research.....	24,038,000	—1,556,000	+1,450,000
Forest protection research:			
Fire and atmospheric sciences research.....	7,578,000	—389,000	+200,000
Forest insect and disease research.....	9,950,000	—747,000	+120,000
Subtotal, Forest protection research.....	17,528,000	—1,136,000	+320,000

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Forest products and engineering research:			
Forest products utilization research.....	\$9,231,000	—\$163,000	+\$100,000
Forest engineering research.....	1,478,000	—20,000
Subtotal, Forest products and engineering research.....	10,709,000	—183,000	+100,000
Forest resource economics research:			
Forest survey.....	3,433,000	—63,000
Forest products marketing research.....	2,030,000	—23,000
Forest economics research.....	1,407,000	—40,000
Subtotal, Forest resource economics research.....	6,870,000	—126,000
Total, Forest research.....	59,145,000	—3,001,000	+1,870,000

The increase of \$1,870,000 over the budget estimate includes the following:

Silviculture research, Bend, Oreg., +\$90,000.

Intensive culture of Southern hardwoods, Stoneville, Miss., +\$100,000.

Strip mining research, Berea, Ky., +\$50,000.

Watershed management research, Durham, N.H., +\$100,000.

Project SEAM—Surface Environment and Mining—+700,000.

Wildlife habitat research, Stoneville, Miss., +\$100,000.

Wildlife habitat research, Olympia, Wash., +\$100,000.

Wildlife habitat research, St. Paul, Minn., +\$100,000.

Wildlife habitat and range management research, La Grande, Oreg., +\$60,000.

Recreation use management research, Seattle, Wash., +\$50,000.

Controlled burning research, Macon, Ga., +\$200,000.

Black walnut tree research, Carbon-dale, Ill., +\$120,000.

Forest residues research, Madison, Wis., +\$100,000.

As earlier noted, the annual destruction to our forest resources from insects, animals, and disease is phenomenal. The research funds provided in this appropriation will provide necessary steps to help solve our insect and disease problems as well as provide a reservoir of knowledge on how to properly manage recreation use, timber production, and forest products.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$32,837,000
Estimate, 1974.....	23,760,000
Recommended, 1974.....	27,760,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-5,077,000
Estimate, 1974.....	+4,000,000

This program, carried on in cooperation with the States, encourages private timber management.

The increase of \$4,000,000 above the budget estimate applies to cooperation in forest fire control. This will provide

for a total program of \$20,000,000 in this activity.

At present, 188 million acres of commercial timber lands are owned by the Federal Government, 21 million acres by the States, and 364 million acres by private individuals and corporations. In future years, there will need to be an accelerated program of small timber lot management because in many areas these small timber lots will mean the difference between an adequate and inadequate supply of timber.

CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$48,794,900
Estimate, 1974.....	25,498,000
Recommended, 1974.....	26,353,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-22,441,900
Estimate, 1974.....	+855,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Forest land management construction:			
Development of recreation—public use areas.....	\$1,075,000	—\$6,116,400	+\$1,075,000
Water resources development construction.....	169,000	—3,021,000	+122,000
Construction for fire, administration, and other purposes.....	1,103,000	—1,225,500	
Research construction.....	5,058,000	—87,000	+5,058,000
Pollution abatement.....	17,648,000	—11,988,000	—5,500,000
Land acquisition, Weeks act.....	1,300,000	—4,000	+100,000
Total, construction and land acquisition.....	26,353,000	—22,441,900	+855,000

The net increase of \$855,000 above the budget estimate consists of a reduction of \$5,500,000 in pollution abatement construction for projects as yet unplanned and the following increases:

Laboratory construction, Corvallis, Oreg., +\$1,500,000.

Land exchange-purchase, Madison, Wis., +\$963,000.

Construction of Redwoods laboratory, Arcata, Calif., +\$800,000.

Construction of shrub improvement laboratory, Provo, Utah, +\$760,000.

Construction of headhouse-greenhouse, Rhinelander, Wis., +\$335,000.

Laboratory construction, Auburn University, Ala., +\$700,000.

Recreation construction, Council Bluffs, Clark National Forest, Mo., +\$500,000.

Recreation facilities, Mount Rogers National Recreation Area, Va., +\$200,000.

Visitors Center and campgrounds, Lava Lands, Oreg., +\$200,000.

Recreation facilities, Cave Run Reservoir, Ky., +\$122,000.

Recreation facilities, Okanogan National Forest, Wash., +\$175,000.

Land Acquisition, Weeks Act, +\$100,000.

The committee was disappointed that no funds were requested for continuing the renovation and expansion of Timberline Lodge, Oregon. This facility is in danger of serious deterioration because of overuse unless the program begun by the committee is vigorously and promptly pursued. The committee understands that the Forest Service and the concessionaire are considering a revision of the original plans which would result in a considerable saving in capital outlay, and encourages both parties to complete agreement along these lines.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Appropriation, 1973	\$3,500,000
Estimate, 1974	10,000,000
Recommended, 1974	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+6,500,000
Estimate, 1974	

The bill provides \$10,000,000, the budget estimate for the Youth Conservation Corps.

The objectives of this program are to provide gainful employment and knowledge of America's outdoor world to America's youth, ages 15 through 18, during the summer months. In a healthful outdoor atmosphere, an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage is provided. In addition, there is further development and maintenance of the

natural resources of the United States by our youth.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

Appropriation, 1973	\$158,840,000
Estimate, 1974	87,700,000
Recommended, 1974	90,700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	—68,140,000
Estimate, 1974	+3,000,000

These funds are required to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authority contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act. The increase of \$3,000,000 over the budget estimate is to be used for liquidation of an increased obligation program for the construction of trails.

The budget proposed a substantial reduction in the obligation program, and a corresponding reduction in the liquidating cash requirements. The basis for this reduction was that timber purchasers should be given the responsibility for constructing timber access roads. The committee does not agree with this policy. It has the effect of reducing total receipts to the Federal Government, and therefore to the State and county governments who also share the revenues. Furthermore, it encourages construction of roads whose quality is not consistent with the multiple use objectives of Forest Service lands. In addition, it discourages the small timber operator from competing for timber contracts and depletes the fine engineering staff presently employed by the Forest Service.

The committee directs that no funds be used to prepare for timber sales which require purchasers to locate, survey, or design permanent roads. The committee expects a supplemental estimate or budget amendment to be submitted to the committee providing for both the 11.8 billion board feet sales program recently announced and also a more responsible road construction program in light of the long term needs of all forest users. It is recognized that the road construction program must have the most thoughtful attention if it is to serve both timber production and the environment esthetics of the Nation.

In addition to the proposed obligation program, the committee directs the Forest Service to assist the State and county jurisdictions involved in the costs for construction of a 29-mile segment of road between Boulder, Utah, and Grover, Utah.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS, SPECIAL ACTS

Appropriation, 1973	\$80,000
Estimate, 1974	94,000
Recommended, 1974	94,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1973	+14,000
Estimate, 1974	

Congress has enacted several special laws which authorize appropriations from the receipts of specified national forests for the purchase of lands to minimize erosion and flood damage.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

Appropriation, 1973	
Estimate, 1974	\$55,300
Recommended, 1974	55,300
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	55,300
Estimate, 1974	

The act of December 4, 1967—16 U.S.C. 484a—stipulates that deposits made by public school districts or public school authorities to provide for cash equalization of certain land exchanges can be appropriated to acquire similar lands suitable for national forest system purposes in the same State as the national forest lands conveyed in the exchanges.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS (SPECIAL FUND, INDEFINITE)

Appropriation, 1973	\$700,000
Estimate, 1974	700,000
Recommended, 1974	700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	
Estimate, 1974	

Part of the grazing fees from the national forests, when appropriated, are used for revegetation of depleted range lands, construction and maintenance of range improvements, rodent control, and eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

Appropriation, 1973	\$1,020,000
Estimate, 1974	1,020,000
Recommended, 1974	1,013,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	—7,000
Estimate, 1974	—7,000

These funds are used to provide advice, technical assistance, and financial contributions under section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, to carry out increased tree planting and reforestation work on non-Federal forest lands.

Grants are matched by the States, and work is conducted in accordance with the plans submitted by the States, and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF RECREATION FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1973	
Estimate, 1974	\$3,546,000
Recommended, 1974	3,546,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+3,546,000
Estimate, 1974	

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,546,000, the budget estimate. Authority for this program originates from Public Law 92-347, approved July 11, 1972, whereby admission fees and user charges collected by the U.S. Forest Service at certain recreation areas are made available for appropriation for recreation-related activities.

The recommendation will provide for repair of facilities at 3,053 fee-designated sites and increased enforcement of laws

and regulations on Forest Service lands in order to reduce vandalism.

SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

Appropriation, 1973.....
Estimate, 1974..... \$1,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973.....
Estimate, 1974..... -1,000,000

The bill provides no appropriation for this activity. The committee believes that forest-related research can more usefully be accomplished in this country at this particular time.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$135,000
Estimate, 1974..... 144,000
Recommended, 1974..... 143,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973..... +8,000
Estimate, 1974..... -1,000

The Commission of Fine Arts is a permanent advisory agency created to give advice concerning aesthetic standards and matters of civic design involved in the orderly development of the city of Washington; and to furnish expert opinion on questions of art to the President, to the Congress and its committees, and to the heads of various departments and agencies of the Federal and District governments.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Earlier I noted the deficiencies we have in our hospital programs. I cannot urge too strongly that OMB correct this imbalance in the next budget year. We must begin to put money into the reconstruction and construction of Indian hospitals.

Interestingly enough, in the years from 1965 through 1972 this Congress has authorized the expenditure of \$43,675,000 for the construction and capital improvements of American hospitals abroad in Beirut, Paris, Turkey, Rome, Taiwan, Nigeria, Israel, Poland, Afghanistan, India, Turkey, and Liberia. In those same years the Indian hospital construction for the American Indians in the United States of America was \$19,693,900. These figures speak for themselves, but as a footnote may I remind this Congress that American Indians are our own citizens and it was probably due to their cooperation that we are now here as a nation. Some recipients of hospitals abroad, I dare say, seldom bother to worry about the United States for more than the cash that has been spent there. I am interested in good hospitals wherever they be, but let us not forget that our American Indians have a priority.

Ladies and gentlemen of this Committee, I speak not as an isolationist but on behalf of the first Americans on this continent—our Indians. Let OMB remember their needs in the next budget year.

HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH

ADMINISTRATION

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$172,748,000
Estimate, 1974..... 176,968,000
Recommended, 1974..... 184,118,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973..... +11,370,000
Estimate, 1974..... +7,150,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 appropriation	1974 estimate
Patient care.....	\$124,893,000	+\$7,132,000	+\$4,100,000
Field health services.....	55,701,000	+4,134,000	+3,050,000
Administration.....	3,524,000	+104,000	
Total, Indian health services.....	184,118,000	+11,370,000	+7,150,000

The increase of \$7,150,000 over the budget estimate include the following:

Mental health care, +\$500,000.
Medical care program, Ute Mountain Tribe, Colorado, +\$100,000.

Health Centers at Hugo, McAlester, and Eufaula, Oklahoma, including 51 additional positions, +\$500,000.

Dental care, including programs for the Crow Tribe, Montana and the Small Tribes Organization of Western Washington, +\$300,000.

California Rural Indian Health Board, including funds for a medical care program of the Hoopa Valley Tribe, California, +\$2,000,000.

Pilot urban Indian Health projects using the model of the Minneapolis Indian Health Board, +\$1,000,000.

Additional 150 community health representatives, +\$750,000.

Contract health care, including the Navajo Tribe, Arizona, +\$2,000,000.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$44,549,000
Estimate, 1974..... 41,717,000
Recommended, 1974..... 46,027,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1973..... +1,478,000
Estimate, 1974..... +4,310,000

The recommended increase of \$4,310,000 over the budget estimate will provide for the first phase construction of a replacement facility for the Philadelphia Indian Hospital, Philadelphia, Miss.

The committee urges that the budget

Activity	1973 appropriation	1974 budget estimate	Committee bill, 1974	Increase or decrease
National Endowment for the Arts:				
Grants-in-aid to groups or individuals.....	\$27,825,000	\$56,750,000	\$41,425,000	-\$15,325,000
Grants-in-aid to States.....	6,875,000	8,250,000	8,250,000	
National Endowment for the Humanities: grants and loans to individuals and groups.....	34,500,000	65,000,000	42,500,000	-22,500,000
Administrative expenses.....	5,314,000	8,000,000	6,500,000	-1,500,000
Total.....	74,514,000	138,000,000	98,675,000	-39,325,000

The committee is aware of the rapidly increasing production costs for all the performing arts and is also deeply aware of the wide public support for these programs. The committee has provided an increase of \$24,161,000 in this appropriation over 1973 to reflect its support for these programs in the arts and the humanities. The committee regrets that budget priorities required that the full budget request could not be provided.

As a part of the Arts Endowment program, the State Arts Councils are doing an excellent job throughout the Nation. In testimony before the committee, the

authorities present to Congress next year construction and maintenance budgets commensurate with the needs in this area.

The bill provides \$4,378,000 for replacement of a health facility at Black Rock, N. Mex. It also provides sanitation facilities for 8,500 new housing units and for water and/or waste disposal facilities for 3,489 existing housing units.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$1,075,000
Estimate, 1974..... 1,086,000
Recommended, 1974..... 1,086,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1973..... +\$11,000
Estimated, 1974.....

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,086,000, the budget estimate for the Indian Claims Commission.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$1,425,000
Estimate, 1974..... 1,462,000
Recommended, 1974..... 1,459,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1973..... +34,000
Estimate, 1974..... -3,000

The bill provides \$1,459,000, a reduction of \$3,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee has approved \$32,000 for the 1976 Bicentennial exhibit program rather than the \$35,000 budget estimate.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$74,514,000
Estimate, 1974..... 138,000,000
Recommended, 1974..... 98,675,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1973..... +24,161,000
Estimate, 1974..... -39,325,000

The bill provides a total appropriation of \$98,675,000 for activities under this appropriation account. This is a reduction of \$39,325,000 below the budget estimate.

The following tabulation reflects the distribution of funds as provided in the bill:

Humanities Endowment also presented one of the most impressive Bicentennial programs which will incorporate national participation in the realization of the essential values of the revolutionary period.

The entire committee, I am sure, is aware of the importance of Arts and Humanities to the quality of life in the United States. However, at the beginning of my presentation I warned the House that we had to regard the bill in context of a total overall spending ceiling.

The Arts and Humanities budget shows a 30-percent increase over 1973 funds.

Moneys added for the Indians and forests are not in this range. For that all important item of crisis today—research for energy—there is a 23-percent increase.

Therefore, although the committee is a strong supporter of our arts program, and we are tremendously excited and pleased with their programs for all Americans, we had to face the brutal realities of our budgetary ceilings and considerations.

I commend the management of the very distinguished Director of the Arts, Nancy Hanks, and I commend Dr. Berman of the Humanities Foundation, for their tremendously perceptive and outstanding work. However, I think they, too, understand the fiscal imponderables and difficulties we face. And, please do not think that the money reflected in Arts and Humanities is all the money in this budget for the arts. I list for you now the programs associated with arts which are in this bill.

ARTS PROGRAMS FISCAL YEAR 1974

Endowment for the Arts.....	\$53,675,000
Endowment for the Humanities.....	46,500,000
Development of Indian arts and crafts	688,000
Commission of Fine Arts.....	143,000
National Gallery of Art.....	5,832,000
American Samoa—Museum and Arts Councils.....	110,000
Smithsonian Institution:	
National Museum of Art.....	\$874,000
National Collection of Fine Arts	1,478,000
National Portrait Gallery.....	1,068,000
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.....	1,269,000
Freer Gallery of Art.....	191,000
Archives of American Art.....	208,000
National Armed Forces Museum Adv. Bd.....	136,000
Smithsonian Archives.....	108,000
Anacostia Neighborhood Museum	302,000
Division of Performing Arts.....	341,000
Subtotal, Smithsonian.....	5,975,000

National Park Service:

John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	2,400,000
Ford's Theater.....	523,000
Wolf Trap Farm Park.....	1,474,000
Carter Barron Amphitheater.....	452,600
Summer-in-the-parks	1,090,000
Sylvan Theater.....	110,000
Gunboat Cairo.....	42,100
National Symphony.....	215,000
Audiovisual Arts (Harpers Ferry)	880,600
Museum exhibit production (Harpers Ferry)	834,900
Preservation of historic properties	4,054,000

Subtotal, National Park Service

12,076,200

Grand total..... 124,999,200

MATCHING GRANTS

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$7,000,000
Estimate, 1974.....	15,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....	8,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+1,000,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-7,000,000

Funds provided under this appropriation account are available for matching in an amount equal to the total amount

of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received by each endowment during the current and preceding fiscal years, for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

The bill provides a total of \$8,000,000 for this appropriation account, a decrease of \$7,000,000 below the budget estimate. This will provide \$4,000,000 for each endowment.

There are those who would oppose spending anything for arts. To these people may I say that, had you watched the CBS presentation of the arts train the other evening, you would understand the committee's desire to fund our arts program.

The reporter on the train moving through the West and arriving at small towns in Montana and Idaho showed us the faces of children who, for the first time in their lives, saw a magnificent work of art, who had an opportunity of watching artists at their work, and who, perhaps, for the first time were introduced into that singular quality of life which takes us out of the syndrome known to many as frustration and despair—the opportunity to know that beauty and creativity are eternal and can belong to everyone.

I have watched with interest Kenneth Clark's presentation of "Civilization," and when we realize in the so-called Dark Ages of world history and in the emerging renaissance, art was actually the basic language of survival. Battles, bombs, and boundaries are forgotten, but existing forever is the architecture and sculpture of Greece, cathedrals of England and France, paintings of all nations, the music of all nations, and the great literature of every era. The American Indians, the Samoans, the Micronesians, those who came to America from other lands have brought us their heritage of music, dancing, and the joy of living.

The small amount in this budget which will sustain the vitality of artistic presentation to people across this Nation, and the small amount that will insure, that in a country of free people, discussions of ethics, the contribution which a deep sense of values gave to the founders of this country and were intrinsic to the establishment of this country's Government, lying, in fact, beneath its Bill of Rights, are moneys well expended.

We have subsidized cotton, milk, corn, wheat; we have subsidized a thousand other items of life. This Congress need not be ashamed of subsidizing some essential immortal qualities of the spirit.

Two thousand years ago civilization fought battles, nations were conquered and died. Two thousand years ago these same civilizations developed poetry, drama, music, and art. All survived. Two thousand years from now Cambodia, Vietnam, and other names on the map may well be erased in the tears of time. But the music, literature, art, we leave behind us will be a precious legacy. And, I think this Congress, regardless of our personal feelings about some one

grant or some one allocation of funds will be proud to know that we said we are interested as a nation in the survival of the spirit, the beauty of our finest and best expressions and bequeath to the future a better understanding of our human goals.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$51,633,000
Estimate, 1974.....	56,438,000
Recommended, 1974.....	55,438,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+3,805,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-1,000,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1973 appropriation and the 1974 budget estimate is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 Appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Science.....	\$19,362,000	+\$1,200,000	—\$385,000
History and art.....	7,660,000	+410,000	—105,000
Public service.....	2,230,000	+143,000	—31,000
Museum programs.....	5,940,000	+576,000	—125,000
Special programs.....	3,339,000	+384,000	—110,000
Administrative, protection, and support.....	7,849,000	+470,000	—150,000
Buildings management.....	9,058,000	+622,000	—94,000
Total, salaries and expenses.....	55,438,000	3,805,000	—1,000,000

MUSEUM PROGRAMS AND RELATED RESEARCH

(SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$3,500,000
Estimate, 1974.....	9,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....	4,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+1,000,000
Estimate, 1974.....	—4,500,000

This appropriation item is to provide for the special foreign currency program of awarding grants to American universities, museums, or other institutions of higher learning, interested in conducting research in foreign countries. The committee urges that these funds be used only for projects of the highest possible priority.

The reduction of \$4,500,000 below the budget estimate includes decreases of \$3,000,000 for the salvage of archeological sites on the island of Philae, Egypt, \$600,000 for archeology and related disciplines, \$600,000 for systematic and environmental biology, \$250,000 for astrophysics and earth sciences, \$30,000 for museum programs, and \$20,000 for grant administration.

SCIENCE INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$1,600,000
Estimate, 1974.....	1,665,000
Recommended, 1974.....	1,650,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+50,000
Estimate, 1974.....	—15,000

The science information exchange receives, organizes, and disseminates information about research in progress in the life, physical, and social sciences. Its mission is to assist the planning and management of research activities supported by Government and nongovernment agencies and institutions by pro-

moting the exchange of information that concerns subject matter, distribution, level of effort, and other data pertaining to current research in the prepublication stage.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$675,000
Estimate, 1974-----	3,850,000
Recommended, 1974-----	3,650,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	+2,975,000
Estimate, 1974-----	-200,000

The amount recommended will provide for the following:

Construction of Lion Hill-----	\$3,000,000
Planning:	
Visitors parking-----	160,000
Primate exhibit-----	100,000
Elephant house-----	100,000
Bird house-----	60,000
Repairs and renovations-----	230,000

The recommended program will put emphasis on providing better quarters for the animals. The master plan for the zoo has recently been approved and this program represents the first stage of its implementation.

RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$5,014,000
Estimate, 1974-----	1,220,000
Recommended, 1974-----	1,070,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	-3,944,000
Estimate, 1974-----	-150,000

The reduction of \$150,000 below the budget estimate consists of decreases of \$75,000 for Smithsonian facilities master plan and \$75,000 for library addition and planning, National Museum of History and Technology.

CONSTRUCTION (APPROPRIATION TO LIQUIDATE CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

Appropriation, 1973-----	
Estimate, 1974-----	\$27,000,000
Recommended, 1974-----	17,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	+17,000,000
Estimate, 1974-----	-10,000,000

This appropriation provides liquidating cash requirements for contract authority previously authorized for construction of the National Air and Space Museum. Testimony from the Smithsonian Institution indicated that only \$17,000,000 is actually needed to liquidate obligations in fiscal year 1974.

I am pleased to report to this committee that the National Air and Space Museum is on schedule and has to date no overrun. Also, I urge the members of this committee to read the hearings and understand the kind of new contracting system being done by the GSA. To GSA I offer a salute. I think they have done a practical and tremendously efficient job of rearranging their contracting management.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$5,420,000
Estimate, 1974-----	5,832,000
Recommended, 1974-----	5,832,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	+412,000
Estimate, 1974-----	

The bill provides \$5,832,000, the budget estimate, for salaries and expenses of the National Gallery of Art.

The National Gallery of Art receives, holds, and administers works of art acquired for the Nation by the Gallery's board of trustees; maintains and administers the Gallery building so as to give maximum care and protection to art treasures and to enable these works of art to be exhibited regularly to the public without charge.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$800,000
Estimate, 1974-----	800,000
Recommended, 1974-----	800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	
Estimate, 1974-----	

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was authorized by Public Law 90-637, approved October 24, 1968, as the Nation's official living memorial to the 28th President. It sponsors a continuous advanced scholar, international fellowship program on various social and scientific subjects of special interest in the world of today.

The committee recommendation will provide \$427,350 for the fellowship program and \$372,650 for administrative expenses.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON INDIAN OPPORTUNITY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$290,000
Estimate, 1974-----	300,000
Recommended, 1974-----	100,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	-\$190,000
Estimate, 1974-----	-200,000

The bill provides \$100,000, a reduction of \$200,000 below the budget estimate, for the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

The function of the Council is to encourage full use of programs to benefit the Indian population.

The committee believes that the objectives of the Council can be better met by providing funds directly to agencies handling Indian-related programs and has provided substantial increases over the budget for Indian programs contained in this bill.

May I urge that in the future the National Council on Indian Opportunity work with all Indian groups in trying to establish a common denominator approach to Indian problems.

FEDERAL METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$160,000
Estimate, 1974-----	160,000
Recommended, 1974-----	60,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	-100,000
Estimate, 1974-----	-100,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$60,000, a reduction of \$100,000 below the budget estimate, for the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review which was established by section 10 of the Federal

Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act (30 U.S.C. 721-740).

The adjudicative duties of the Board, in docketed cases, involve the hearing and determination of applications filed by mine operators seeking annulment or revision of, and temporary relief from, orders issued by the Secretary of the Interior under sections 8 and 9 of the act.

Testimony before the committee revealed that to date, no appeals have been made to the Board for hearing. Because of the absence of appeals, \$85,000 of the current appropriation is estimated to lapse. If appeals materialize in fiscal year 1974 and budget increases are required, the committee will entertain a supplemental appropriation request.

JOINT FEDERAL-STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$708,800
Estimate, 1974-----	750,000
Recommended, 1974-----	694,400
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	-14,400
Estimate, 1974-----	-55,600

The Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission for Alaska was established by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (Public Law 92-203). Under the act the Federal Government will pay 50 percent of the Commission's expenses and the State Government will pay 50 percent.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$694,400, a reduction of \$55,600 below the budget estimate. The reduction is necessitated by the fact that the State of Alaska has appropriated only \$694,400 for this purpose in fiscal year 1974.

PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973-----	\$350,000
Estimate, 1974-----	200,000
Recommended, 1974-----	200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	-150,000
Estimate, 1974-----	

The Corporation is charged with the responsibility to develop and implement a development plan for the portion of Pennsylvania Avenue between the White House and the Capitol. The plan must be approved by Congress before it is implemented.

The committee recommends an appropriation of new obligational authority of \$200,000. The budget request was for \$200,000 in borrowing authority. The committee believes that when the Corporation is ready to begin implementation of the plan, funds can be requested under the borrowing authority provisions of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Act, Public Law 92-578.

Mr. Chairman, before I close and because there are many inquiries from the District of Columbia about expenditures, I would like to list at this time the moneys directly being spent through this legislation in the District of Columbia.

Also, because we have had many inquiries on costs of the Zoological Park, I am attaching also, some facts relative to the cost of the zoo operations, aside from construction. These costs are associated with the visitor load which continually escalates.

The zoo tells me that more than 7 million people have enjoyed the pandas, making this probably the most heavily visited single exhibit in the history of our National Capitol.

SELECTED QUESTIONS RELATING TO NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

First. What are the costs of animal food by popular species?

Total annual food costs for the National Zoological Park for fiscal year 1973 are an estimated \$160,000.

Illustrations of annual costs for selected popular species are noted below, with the numbers of each in parentheses:

Pandas (2)-----	\$3,989
Elephants (4)-----	4,940
Gorillas (3)-----	1,708
Orangutans (5)-----	2,701
Tigers (5)-----	5,136
Jaguars (2)-----	685
Kiwis (3)-----	4,380
Pythons (10)-----	1,800

Second. What are the costs of the panda exhibition?

Construction costs have totaled \$499,983.53 in order to prepare climate controlled quarters suitable for successful animal management of the pandas and to enable millions of annual visitors to successfully view the animals.

Operating costs of the exhibit, on an annual basis, are less than \$100,000. This cost includes \$91,740 in labor, as follows: animal keeper costs, \$31,140; facility custodial costs, \$11,200; protective services and crowd management costs, \$43,900; and interpretation services costs, \$5,500.

Three. How many visitors have the pandas brought to the zoo?

The pandas were placed on exhibit on April 20, 1972. For the 12 months preceding that date 4,903,723 visitors came to the zoo. For the 12 months following that date 6,417,588 visitors came for a percentage increase on an annual basis of 51 percent. Assuming that the general rate of increase for visitors to the zoo would have been 10 percent, then 40 percent more visitors have been attracted to the place by the pandas. It is reasonable to assume that 90 percent, at the very least, of zoo visitors view the pandas, in addition to other exhibits. Thus, more than 7,000,000 people have enjoyed the pandas since their arrival making this, probably, the most heavily visited single exhibit in the history of the Capital.

Operating costs for the pandas thus average out at less than 1.7 cents per visitor, or less than 2 cents per visitor including capital investment. Considering the educational and recreational value of the exhibit this must be the finest value in town.

FUNDING IN THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FISCAL YEAR 1974

National Park Service programs

Operation of the National Park

System:	
Office of the Director, NCP----	\$2,134,500
Professional Services-----	394,900
National Capital Parks, East--	3,386,000
National Capital Parks, West--	3,881,400
National Visitor Center-----	358,400
U.S. Park Police-----	10,756,800
Executive Direction-----	206,200

Subtotal, Operation of the National Park System--	21,118,200
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts-----	2,400,000
Planning, Development and Operation of Recreation Facilities: Operation of recreation facilities-----	26,700

Total, operating funds, National Capital parks in the District of Columbia-----	23,544,900
---	------------

Appropriation account, planning and construction, fiscal year 1974

Building, utilities and other facilities:	
National visitor center:	
Developments (portion) remodeling of Union Station--	\$7,100,000
Audiovisual equipment, exhibits and furnishings-----	1,580,000

Subtotal, planning and construction-----	8,680,000
--	-----------

Road construction, roads, trails and parkways:

Anacostia Park: developments (portion) community and visitor recreational use facilities-----	300,000
---	---------

Constitution gardens (Navy munitions site): project planning and developments (portion) reception center, audiovisual and exhibits, underground bus parking and miscellaneous facilities-----	3,000,000
---	-----------

Downtown parks: development (portion) improvements to downtown parks-----	501,000
---	---------

Ellipse: developments (portion) outer circle walks-----	250,000
---	---------

Fort Circle parks: developments (portion) community and visitor recreation use facilities-----	\$300,000
--	-----------

Jefferson Memorial: developments (portion) safety railing-----	78,000
--	--------

Mall: developments (portion) improvements to roads, drives and provide bike-ways-----	1,870,000
---	-----------

Pedestrian walks-----	500,000
-----------------------	---------

West Potomac Park: project planning (portion) Tidal Basin safety railing-----	35,000
---	--------

Developments (portion) reconstruct reflecting pool and walks-----	22,000
---	--------

Subtotal, Road Construction-----	6,856,000
----------------------------------	-----------

Appropriation account, planning, development and operation of recreation facilities, fiscal year 1974

Planning and Development of Recreation Facilities:	
Anacostia Park: developments (portion) community and visitor recreational use facilities-----	\$200,000

Constitution Gardens (Navy munitions site): project planning and developments (portion) reception center, audiovisual and exhibits, underground bus parking and miscellaneous facilities-----	500,000
---	---------

Downtown Parks: developments (portion) improvements to downtown parks-----	499,000
--	---------

Fort Circle Parks: developments (portion) community and visitor recreation use facilities-----	\$352,000
--	-----------

Georgetown Waterfront: developments (portion) Old Stonehouse Craft Center ¹ -----	130,000
--	---------

Jefferson Memorial: developments (portion) exterior cleaning, repointing and lighting improvements-----	300,000
---	---------

Lighting cherry trees (portion)-----	79,000
--------------------------------------	--------

Mall: developments (portion) skating rink, national sculpture garden-----	200,000
---	---------

Underground comfort station (3)-----	450,000
--------------------------------------	---------

Washington Monument: project planning (portion) elevator and visitor use improvements-----	200,000
--	---------

Watering System-----	30,000
----------------------	--------

Developments (portion) lighting improvements-----	68,000
---	--------

West Potomac Park: project planning (portion) comfort station-----	8,000
--	-------

Developments (portion) reconstruct reflecting pool and walks-----	973,000
---	---------

Subtotal, planning and development of recreation facilities-----	3,989,000
--	-----------

Total, development funds, National Capital parks in District of Columbia-----	\$19,525,000
---	--------------

Total, National Park Service-----	\$43,069,900
-----------------------------------	--------------

Other Programs:

National Zoological Park-----	4,406,000
-------------------------------	-----------

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum-----	302,000
------------------------------------	---------

National Capital Planning Commission-----	1,459,000
---	-----------

Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation-----	200,000
--	---------

Total, other-----	6,367,000
-------------------	-----------

Grand total-----	49,436,900
------------------	------------

¹ This project is being deferred in order to allow funding of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Project.

Mr. Chairman, as I conclude, may I urge that you support this bill. It is not perfect, it could be larger and I would hope it can be larger in the years ahead. But this year it acknowledges the necessity of a total national effort to make America the kind of Nation we are all dedicated to serve.

This bill has, as I have told you, money for surveys, construction; it also has music and laughter, education and health services for our young, our old, our blacks and our Indians. It is the composite summary of a committee's affection for its Nation and I urge an aye vote.

I include the following:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1974

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, fiscal year 1973 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (6)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources.....	¹ \$96,565,000	\$91,347,000	\$83,872,000	—\$12,693,000	—\$7,475,000
Construction and maintenance.....	7,965,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	—1,665,000	
Public lands development roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(3,265,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(+735,000)	
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite, appropriation of receipts).....	17,500,000	17,500,000	17,500,000		
Range improvements (indefinite, appropriation of receipts).....	2,714,000	3,376,000	3,376,000	+662,000	
Recreation development and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund).....		165,000	165,000	+165,000	
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	124,744,000	118,688,000	111,213,000	—13,531,000	—7,475,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Education and welfare services.....	303,285,000	295,572,000	298,476,000	—4,809,000	+2,904,000
Education and welfare services (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(271,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+1,229,000)	
Resources management.....	¹ 86,041,000	85,358,000	86,022,000	—19,000	+664,000
Construction.....	56,078,000	44,000,000	53,343,000	—2,735,000	+9,343,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(45,539,000)	(43,000,000)	(43,000,000)	(—2,539,000)	
Alaska native fund.....	50,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	+20,000,000	
Payment to Ute Tribe of Uintah and Ouray Reservation.....	65,000			—65,000	
General administrative expenses.....	6,200,000	5,319,000	5,244,000	—956,000	—75,000
Tribal funds (definite).....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000		
Tribal funds (indefinite).....	13,530,000	13,505,000	13,505,000	—25,000	
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	518,199,000	516,754,000	529,590,000	+11,391,000	+12,836,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation					
Salaries and expenses.....	² 4,150,000	4,436,000	4,396,000	+246,000	—40,000
Land and Water Conservation Fund					
Appropriation of receipts (indefinite).....	300,000,000	55,223,000	71,223,000	—228,777,000	+16,000,000
TERRITORIAL AFFAIRS					
Administration of territories.....	22,375,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	—7,375,000	
Permanent appropriation (special fund).....	(469,000)	(420,000)	(420,000)	(—49,000)	
Transferred from other accounts (special fund).....	(470,000)	(645,000)	(645,000)	(+175,000)	
Total, Territorial Affairs.....	22,375,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	—7,375,000	
Total, Public Land Management.....	969,468,000	710,101,000	731,422,000	—238,046,000	+21,321,000
MINERAL RESOURCES					
Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	⁴ \$150,450,000	\$156,000,000	\$155,974,000	+\$5,524,000	—\$26,000
Bureau of Mines					
Mines and minerals.....	⁵ 157,465,000	136,824,000	145,424,000	—12,041,000	+8,600,000
Office of Coal Research					
Salaries and expenses.....	43,490,000	52,500,000	61,500,000	+18,010,000	+9,000,000
Office of Oil and Gas					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,558,000	1,485,000	2,585,000	+1,027,000	+1,100,000
Total, Mineral Resources.....	352,963,000	346,809,000	365,483,000	+12,520,000	+18,674,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS					
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife					
Resource management.....	¹ 76,639,500	79,004,000	80,137,000	+3,497,500	+1,133,000
Construction and anadromous fish.....	2,333,000	9,233,000	12,846,500	+10,513,500	+3,613,500
Migratory bird conservation account (definite, repayable advance).....	7,100,000			—7,100,000	
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	86,072,500	88,237,000	92,983,500	+6,911,000	+4,746,500
National Park Service					
Operation of the National Park System.....	¹ 162,918,000	176,780,000	176,720,000	+13,802,000	—60,000
Planning and construction.....	¹ 54,146,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	—34,146,000	
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(5,416,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(+29,584,000)	
Preservation of historic properties.....	⁴ 4,054,000	¹¹ 4,054,000	4,054,000		
Planning, development and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund).....		32,925,000	31,531,000	—1,394,000	
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	2,000,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	+400,000	
Total, National Park Service.....	223,118,000	236,159,000	234,705,000	+11,587,000	—1,454,000
Total, Fish and Wildlife and Parks.....	309,190,500	324,396,000	327,688,500	+18,498,000	+3,292,500
OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH					
Salaries and expenses.....	⁷ 16,344,000	13,149,000	13,689,000	—2,655,000	+540,000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR					
Salaries and expenses.....	7,360,000	7,850,000	7,500,000	+140,000	—350,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, fiscal year 1973 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (6)
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses.....	15,295,100	15,895,000	15,495,000	+199,900	-400,000
Departmental operations.....	4,466,000	5,737,000	5,737,000	+1,271,000	
Central energy research and development fund.....		25,000,000			-25,000,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program).....	500,000	1,630,000	670,000	+170,000	-960,000
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	20,261,100	48,262,000	21,902,000	+1,640,900	-26,360,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of the Interior.....	1,675,586,600	1,450,567,000	1,467,684,500	-207,902,100	+17,117,500
Consisting of—					
Appropriations.....	1,675,586,600	1,450,567,000	1,467,684,500	-207,902,100	+17,117,500
Definite appropriations.....	(1,341,842,600)	(1,327,873,000)	(1,330,384,500)	(-11,458,100)	(+2,511,500)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(333,744,000)	(122,694,000)	(137,300,000)	(-196,444,000)	(+14,606,000)
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(54,491,000)	(83,500,000)	(83,500,000)	(+29,009,000)	
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(1,730,077,600)	(1,534,067,000)	(1,551,184,500)	(-178,893,100)	(+17,117,500)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management.....	18 299,231,000	246,324,000	259,701,000	-39,530,000	+13,377,000
Forest research.....	62,146,000	57,275,000	59,145,000	-3,001,000	+1,870,000
State and private forestry cooperation.....	32,837,000	23,760,000	27,760,000	-5,077,000	+4,000,000
Total, forest protection and utilization.....	394,214,000	327,359,000	346,606,000	-47,608,000	+19,247,000
Construction and land acquisition.....	1 48,794,900	25,498,000	26,353,000	-22,441,900	+855,000
Youth conservation corps.....	3,500,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+6,500,000	
Forest roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(158,840,000)	(87,700,000)	(90,700,000)	(-68,140,000)	(+3,000,000)
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Special acts (special fund, indefinite).....	80,000	94,000	94,000	+14,000	
Acquisition of lands to complete exchanges.....		55,300	55,300	+55,300	
Cooperative range improvements (special fund, indefinite).....	700,000	700,000	700,000		
Assistance to States for tree planting.....	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,013,000	-7,000	-7,000
Construction and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund).....		3,546,000	3,546,000	+3,546,000	
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program).....		1,000,000			-1,000,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Forest Service.....	448,308,900	369,272,300	388,367,300	-59,941,600	+19,095,000
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses.....	135,000	144,000	143,000	+8,000	-1,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
Health Services and Mental Health Administration					
Indian health services.....	9 172,748,000	176,968,000	184,118,000	+11,370,000	+7,150,000
Indian health facilities.....	44,549,000	41,717,000	46,027,000	+1,478,000	+4,310,000
Total, Health Services and Mental Health Administration.....	217,297,000	218,685,000	230,145,000	+12,848,000	+11,460,000
Office of Education					
Indian education.....	18,000,000			-18,000,000	
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,075,000	\$1,086,000	\$1,086,000	+\$11,000	
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,425,000	1,462,000	1,459,000	+34,000	-\$3,000
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES					
Salaries and Expenses					
Endowment for the arts.....	34,700,000	65,000,000	49,675,000	+14,975,000	-15,325,000
Endowment for the humanities.....	34,500,000	65,000,000	42,500,000	+8,000,000	-22,500,000
Administrative expenses.....	5,314,000	8,000,000	6,500,000	+1,186,000	-1,500,000
Subtotal, salaries and expenses.....	74,514,000	138,000,000	98,675,000	+24,161,000	-39,325,000
Matching Grants					
Endowment for the arts (indefinite).....	3,500,000	7,500,000	4,000,000	+500,000	-3,500,000
Endowment for the humanities (indefinite).....	3,500,000	7,500,000	4,000,000	+500,000	-3,500,000
Subtotal, matching grants.....	7,000,000	15,000,000	8,000,000	+1,000,000	-7,000,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	81,514,000	153,000,000	106,675,000	+25,161,000	-46,325,000
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION					
Salaries and expenses.....	51,633,000	56,438,000	55,438,000	+3,805,000	-1,000,000
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program).....	3,500,000	9,000,000	4,500,000	+1,000,000	-4,500,000
Science information exchange.....	1,600,000	1,665,000	1,650,000	+50,000	-15,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	675,000	3,850,000	3,650,000	+2,975,000	-200,000
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	5,014,000	1,220,000	1,070,000	-3,944,000	-150,000
Construction.....	13,000,000			-13,000,000	
Construction (contract authority).....	27,000,000			-27,000,000	
Construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....		(27,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(+17,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	5,420,000	5,832,000	5,832,000	+412,000	
Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	800,000	800,000	800,000		
Operation and maintenance, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	10 1,500,000			-1,500,000	
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	110,142,000	78,805,000	72,940,000	-37,202,000	-5,865,000

Footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1974—Continued

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, fiscal year 1973 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (6)
HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS					
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.....	38,000			—38,000	
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON INDIAN OPPORTUNITY					
Salaries and expenses.....	290,000	300,000	100,000	—190,000	—200,000
FEDERAL METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW					
Salaries and expenses.....	160,000	160,000	60,000	—100,000	—100,000
JOINT FEDERAL-STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA					
Salaries and expenses.....	708,800	750,000	694,400	—14,400	—55,600
PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	1 350,000	200,000	200,000	—150,000	
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Related Agencies.....	879,443,700	823,864,300	801,869,700	—77,574,000	—21,994,600
Consisting of—					
Appropriations.....	852,443,700	823,864,300	801,869,700	—50,574,000	—21,994,600
Definite appropriations.....	(844,663,700)	(804,524,300)	(789,529,700)	(—55,134,000)	(—14,994,600)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(7,780,000)	(19,340,000)	(12,340,000)	(+4,560,000)	(—7,000,000)
Contract authority.....	27,000,000			—27,000,000	
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(158,840,000)	(114,700,000)	(107,700,000)	(—51,140,000)	(—7,000,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(1,038,283,700)	(938,564,300)	(909,569,700)	(—128,714,000)	(—28,994,600)
RECAPITULATION					
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles.....	2,555,030,300	2,274,431,300	2,269,554,200	—285,476,100	—4,877,100
Consisting of—					
Appropriations.....	2,528,030,300	2,274,431,300	2,269,554,200	—258,476,100	—4,877,100
Definite appropriations.....	(2,186,506,300)	(2,132,397,300)	(2,119,914,200)	(—66,592,100)	(—12,483,100)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(341,524,000)	(142,034,000)	(149,640,000)	(—191,884,000)	(+7,606,000)
Contract authority.....	27,000,000			—27,000,000	
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(213,331,000)	(198,200,000)	(191,200,000)	(—22,131,000)	(—7,000,000)
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(2,768,361,300)	(2,472,631,300)	(2,460,754,200)	(—307,607,100)	(—11,877,100)

¹ Includes the following amounts contained in the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973:

Bureau of Land Management, "Management of lands and resources".....	\$18,500,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs, "Resources management".....	2,900,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, "Resource management".....	900,000
National Park Service:	
Operation of the National Park System.....	4,040,000
Planning and construction.....	3,100,000
Forest Service:	
Forest land management.....	43,627,000
Forest research.....	1,003,000
State and private forestry cooperation.....	77,000
Construction and land acquisition.....	213,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, "Salaries and expenses".....	350,000
Total.....	74,710,000

² In addition \$2,040,000 transferred from "Salaries and expenses", Office of Water Resources Research and \$286,000 from "Surveys, investigations, and research," Geological Survey pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

³ In addition \$72,000 transferred from "Surveys, investigations, and research," Geological Survey pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

⁴ Includes \$1,064,000 transferred to other Interior Agencies pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

⁵ In addition \$706,000 transferred from "Surveys, investigations, and research," Geological Survey pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

⁶ Excludes \$7,505,000 for grants-in-aid.

⁷ Includes \$2,040,000 transferred to "Education and welfare services," Bureau of Indian Affairs, pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

⁸ In addition \$3,179,000 transferred from "Forest Research" and \$5,000,000 from "State and private forestry cooperation" pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

⁹ In addition \$2,734,000 transferred from "Special benefits for disabled coal miners," pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

¹⁰ Appropriated in fiscal year 1973 for obligations incurred in fiscal year 1972. Fiscal year 1973 funding is included in the National Park Service Appropriation.

¹¹ Excludes \$15,505,000 for grants-in-aid, not authorized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, speaking of vandals, may I ask the gentlewoman this: Is there any money in this bill to take care of the vandalism that was perpetrated in and on the Bureau of Indian Affairs building last November, or does that come under the General Services Administration appropriation?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the restoration of that building has been completed. Many of the stolen items have been returned. There are no specific funds for that purpose in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in particular of the desecration of the interior of the building and the destruction of equipment in the building.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. We had a complete investigation of this incident done by our investigative staff. I would be pleased to give that report to the gentleman from Iowa if he is interested. It is a very interesting report.

Of course, it was a regrettable incident, but on the other hand I would like to say that if you go through the Indian reservations, we have much to be apologetic about. There is yet much to be done for the economy, health, education, and daily living of our Indian people.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to comment by saying that I have never seen more wanton, ruthless, and senseless destruction than that in the Bureau building. I visited that building last November and saw the destruction. I do not know how

anyone can possibly, under any guise, justify what they did to the interior of that building.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No one justifies violence. But, I would also say to the gentleman that the \$20 million spent by the Forest Service each year because of vandalism and litter in our National Forests by some of the most respectable people in the United States is just as regrettable.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I would like simply to commend the gentlewoman for a very fine statement.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SEIBERLING. It shows the kind of priorities I think our country needs, and I want also to commend her sub-

committee for doing an outstanding job under rather stringent conditions.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would like to add my commendation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the very able gentlewoman from Washington. I would like to raise one question concerning coal mine health and safety. On page 21 of the committee report, it is indicated that there is \$10,655,000 less in the new appropriation than in the committee bill for fiscal year 1973. Knowing the interest and leadership of the committee in funding coal mine health and safety, I was wondering if we could have an explanation of the reason why the item under education and training has been reduced \$12,892,000 in comparison to the appropriated amount for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. McDADE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

In reply to the question of the gentleman from West Virginia, in order to refresh his recollection, this is a training camp that was built in the State of West Virginia. Construction has been completed, so there is obviously no need for additional funding. It is a one-shot deal.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Yes. I would simply like the RECORD to show I was certainly aware of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Academy located at Beckley, W. Va., in my district. I am pleased that the record shows it was not a reduction of the emphasis of the committee on mine health and safety,

but simply a large amount of construction funds were involved. The committee is to be commended for its concern that adequate funds are made available to protect the health and safety of coal miners.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to join my colleague in commending the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington for her very fine efforts in the subcommittee and in the committee in presenting to us a very good appropriation bill under the unwise and stringent guidelines as to expenditures set out by the administration. I believe the report merits particular consideration and commendation of the House and referring particularly to page 5, beginning with the words "The management of our natural resources" and running through the middle of page 7 wherein the gentlewoman and the subcommittee have set forth words that I think merit the consideration of this body, of the Nation, and certainly the administration.

I do wish to think the gentlewoman.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). The committee has been deeply concerned about the lack of management funds for our natural resources. We will no longer have these priceless resources of our Nation, nor the quality of our environment that we need, if we do not start spending more money in these areas.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add my words of congratulation and my compliments to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) for an excellent presentation of this bill. I also wish to express my pleasure and appreciation to the members of her subcommittee, all of them, for an excellent job. I think perhaps in certain areas the bill is rather stringent and the amounts appropriated have been dropped on several matters affecting items in Wyoming. However, I recognize, as we all do, that we all have to pay the price of some reasonable balance in our spending policies.

I would also like to say that I am very pleased for the portion of the bill relative to the preservation of our natural resources.

I would like to suggest that some time during the debate it might be well to present into the RECORD a sheet showing the receipts and revenues of various Department of Interior agencies. These revenues are increasing every year through leasing, through BLM drawings, through these agencies that we now fund.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman from Wyoming will yield, I would like to say that our hearings contain a detailed statement of receipts by the Interior Department and the U.S. Forest Service and I will insert them in the RECORD at this point. If the Members will save their copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they will have a very accurate report on those very things.

The material follows:

RECEIPTS BY SOURCES

[The following table shows actual receipts of the Bureau of Land Management for fiscal years 1970, 1971, 1972 and estimated receipts for 1973 and 1974]

	Actual 1970	Actual 1971	Actual 1972	Estimate 1973	Estimate 1974
Sales, public lands and materials.....	\$2,099,849	\$2,013,823	\$1,941,520	\$2,700,000	\$3,200,000
Fees and commissions.....	4,468,455	4,096,965	5,351,278	5,400,000	5,500,000
Mineral leasing.....	141,217,162	151,332,134	145,098,401	156,851,000	160,206,000
Mineral leasing, Outer Continental Shelf.....	186,861,451	1,050,549,370	279,352,756	1,475,000,000	1,210,000,000
Grazing fees.....	5,668,742	7,549,969	8,021,646	9,828,000	11,152,000
Right-of-way leases.....	249,892	270,963	293,908	300,000	310,000
Timber sale.....	65,419,401	70,663,296	83,519,703	77,368,000	76,789,000
Trans Alaska pipeline.....				10,938,000	7,120,000
Miscellaneous receipts.....	401,606	482,104	341,584	621,000	625,000
Total.....	406,386,558	1,286,958,624	523,920,796	4,439,066,000	2,364,902,000

¹ Despite a critical need for additional resources, the receipt level for fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 will depend upon the anticipated impact of each proposed sale upon the environment as well as the continuing safe operation of existing OCS facilities.

Note: This table does not include public land administration or litter prevention and cleanup receipts.

NATIONAL FOREST SERVICE RECEIPTS

[In thousands]

	Fiscal year 1972 actual	Fiscal year 1973 estimated	Fiscal year 1974 estimated		Fiscal year 1972 actual	Fiscal year 1973 estimated	Fiscal year 1974 estimated
National Forests Fund:				National grasslands and land utilization:			
Timber sales.....	\$321,015	\$387,000	\$345,000	Timber sales.....	\$4	\$15	\$15
Grazing.....	4,856	5,960	6,240	Grazing.....	656	660	660
Power.....	205	210	210	Power.....	2	2	2
Recreation.....	3,561	4,100	4,100	Land uses.....	22	22	22
Land uses.....	1,068	1,200	1,200	Mineral leases and permits.....	1,391	1,391	1,491
Mineral leases and permits.....	4,984	5,700	5,700	Admission and user fees.....	5	5	5
Admission and user fees.....	3,198	4,500	4,900				
Subtotal.....	338,887	408,670	367,350	Subtotal.....	2,080	2,095	2,195
Oregon and California grant lands (primarily timber)...	9,040	11,000	10,000	Total receipts.....	350,007	421,765	379,545

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I wish to commend the chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) and the entire subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations.

I think that the gentlewoman has brought forth a very fine bill, and that the gentlewoman has made an excellent statement in behalf of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the gentlewoman for the consideration the committee gave to the Lake Tahoe area. There has been a need for some time to buy the three parcels that are in the bill before us today. I believe that these and other such areas should be acquired by the Forest Service, and be put under their jurisdiction.

Again I want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington for the consideration the committee has given to this matter.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The committee was very pleased to do so.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I too would like to join with my colleagues in support of the praise and approbation they have given to the work done by our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE), the ranking member of the committee, and all of the other members of the subcommittee, for what I believe to be a very thoughtful and desirable legislative product.

May I note just parenthetically that all of the millions of people who reside in the San Francisco Bay area are very grateful that the committee recognized that with skyrocketing land costs that confront this area that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was given funding that will make it possible, hopefully, to be able to buy some of the land at a price this year that will be a good deal less than the price we would have to pay if the purchase of those lands is postponed.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the distinguished chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), whether or not the gentlewoman concurs with my hope, as the author of that legislation, that the Department of the Interior will use these funds, hopefully to make downpayments, rather than using them just to perhaps buy one, two, or three parcels in their entirety?

I may say that a number of the private owners—many of them old Californians—voluntarily offered that their lands be included in the park area, and the authorizing legislation provided for

stage payments so that the tax consequences to these landowners would not become onerous, particularly in light of the fact that they generously, rather than resisting that their own family properties being included, to the contrary they offered and encouraged that their properties be included as a long term haven, if you will, for the millions of people that live in our part of the country.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield. I will reply that the committee was very interested in this procedure. We requested an opinion of the Interior Solicitor. It was the Solicitor's opinion that the purchase on a contract or installment basis was entirely legal.

Subsequent to that time I have learned that the Office of Management and Budget does not approve of this procedure. The members of the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress can never see the Office of Management and Budget to confer with them on the subject of their legal opinions. The best information that I can give the gentleman is that the Solicitor from the Department of the Interior says the procedure is completely legal.

Mr. BURTON. Is it our colleague's view that the Solicitor's opinion is one well founded?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, it is.

Mr. BURTON. And that the Department should proceed on this downpayment route rather than exclusively on the entire-purchase route?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, I do, because I think we have had enough experience with the purchase of land in the United States to realize that the price escalation that goes on, once a park is established, is utterly fantastic. I would hope that the Office of Management and Budget would no longer curtail land and water funds, because this fund was established to meet the critical needs for the purchase of recreation lands in the United States before prices escalate.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the gentlewoman. If I may also note, because I think it most justified and proper, that in addition to Mrs. HANSEN's and Mr. McDADE's work, there was enormous assistance and valuable contribution made by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT); the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY); the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS); the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCKAY); the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG); and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). All of us in our part of the country are grateful to all of these Members for this fine product.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Fifty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 301]		
Archer	Edwards, Calif.	Patman
Ashbrook	Erlenborn	Pike
Badillo	Evins, Tenn.	Podell
Baker	Fisher	Powell, Ohio
Blatnik	Frey	Reid
Boland	Fulton	Rodino
Bolling	Fuqua	Rooney, N.Y.
Breaux	Gettys	Rosenthal
Brotzman	Gray	Runnels
Broyhill, N.C.	Hastings	Ruth
Buchanan	Hawkins	Shipley
Clark	Hébert	Skubitz
Clay	Jarman	Stanton
Cleveland	Johnson, Colo.	James V.
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Stephens
Coughlin	Landrum	Stokes
Danielson	Long, Md.	Stratton
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Delaney	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	Mills, Ark.	Tierman
Derwinski	Mitchell, Md.	Wilson
Devine	Murphy, Ill.	Charles H.
Diggs	Murphy, N.Y.	Calif.
Dorn	Nelsen	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 8917, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 365 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 8817, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal 1974. Before discussing the bill, I wish to extend my appreciation to the chair-lady of the subcommittee, Mrs. HANSEN, for the impartial way in which she conducted the hearings on the bill. Her actions have been conducted in a most thorough and nonpartisan way. I want to compliment, as well, the other members of the subcommittee. Each of them has made an important contribution to the betterment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Interior appropriations bill, which we consider today, is, first and foremost, a resource bill. But it is much more than that. It is both a long term and a short term investment in the people, the land, and the resources of America. The funds we invest today not only generate additional moneys for the treasury tomorrow, but they develop the resources necessary to fuel this Nation's energy needs. They develop the minds of all Americans who benefit from the historical, cultural, and recreational programs funded here. And they develop the bodies and minds of the many native Americans who benefit from the health services and educational opportunities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

The Members will note, however, that this bill is, by no means, an extravagant investment. The committee bill estimates for new obligatory authority are \$4,877,100 below the requested amounts. However, the committee was quite active in establishing certain priorities, making the bill a prudent investment and a responsive investment as well.

The moneys we invest today to man-

age the Nation's natural resources will be used to maintain and improve the nearly 2 billion acres of Federal lands, including the vast outer continental shelf off shore. These lands are a vast storehouse of public wealth. Each year, they yield 13 billion board feet of timber, 50 percent of the Western half of the Nation's water, grazing area for 16 million head of livestock, 7 million pounds of fish, and \$3.5 billion worth of mineral leases—with royalties accruing to the Government of nearly one-half million dollars per year. Bonuses from these lease sales will amount to more than \$2.2 billion this year.

In human terms, these lands and programs provide educational assistance for nearly 150,000 Indian children in Indian and public schools, funds to operate the more than 300 irrigation systems to help Indian farmers grow food, and welfare and family services to some 95,000 Indian families.

This bill provides for the needs of the 222,000 residents of the Trust Territories of American Samoa and Guam, for the 533,700 reservation Indians on 39.7 million acres of tribal land and the estimated 503 million visitations by all Americans to our national parks and national forests.

Once again, my colleagues will note that the largest single increase in this bill is directed to the needs of the American Indians. Many basic services of life, which we take for granted—dental care, maternity care, the birth of a child in a clean, sanitary hospital, are new and life-giving experiences to the American Indians. Death rates from disease, such as tuberculosis, influenza, and gastritis, are decreasing dramatically, while the housing construction, school construction and health services available to Indians are making important advances.

While the committee report details at great length the many accomplishments of the Indian Health Service and the success attributable to the BIA education program, I hope the Members would take the time to read of the many problem areas remaining. They indicate that, while we are making progress, there is still a long road ahead for the American Indian if he is to have the life to which he is entitled.

The budget makes a significant increase in the accounts for management and development of our national resources. The second largest increase found in the budget is directed to the U.S. Forest Service, the Federal agency charged with the responsibility for managing over 187 million acres of national forests and grasslands. The Forest Service also carries on an active program of research in areas such as pest and disease control, as well as cooperative programs with the State and local governments to protect and preserve more than 393 million acres of State and local forestland in our country.

Since 1971, the Forest Service has been cooperating with the States to implement programs to control gypsy moth infestation. Gypsy moth infestation now covers 1.4 million acres—an increase of 500,000 acres over the past decade. The

Forest Service presently funds such agreements with the States on a 50-50 basis. I urge the Forest Service to expedite its efforts to develop better environmental controls and alternative solutions that will provide wide application of such controls without any environmental difficulty.

The U.S. Geological Survey and the U.S. Bureau of Mines total activities need \$300 million to monitor and meet the Nation's mineral and energy needs. The energy crisis, we all envisioned for the future, is very much with us today. However, the Nation is on the verge of another potentially more dangerous crisis brought on by the careless and wasteful way in which we use our Nation's minerals. Recently, the U.S. Geological Survey, in a detailed report, outlined the gravity of the shortages we face in providing vital minerals.

Supplies of our Nation's raw minerals are being seriously depleted. We are now importing 29 percent of our oil and gas requirements, about 33 percent of our iron, and a massive 87 percent of our aluminum. At current rates of consumption, our Nation's supply of copper will be exhausted in 50 years. While we produce 9 percent of the world's zinc, we use three times that much. The fifth most widely used metal is manganese. Yet this Nation has no known reserves, and the last manganese mine in the Nation closed its doors in 1970. And you cannot make steel without manganese.

Even more disturbing is the evidence that we are wasting the ores we use at an alarming rate. If the Government does not devote more significant amounts of its future budgets to new mineral extraction technology, then we will soon find ourselves without any domestic supplies and relying to even greater degrees on foreign imports to meet our mineral needs.

This bill makes a major contribution toward alleviating our energy shortages. The sum of \$126 million is contained in this bill for energy-related research. This is an increase of \$23.6 million above last year's budget for specific projects within the Office of Coal Research, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, and the Forest Service. Many of these projects are in the development or pilot plant stage, all of which, we are confident, will yield significant returns on our investment.

The activities of the U.S. Bureau of Mines focus on several major areas. Since its inception, the Bureau has been the Government's chief research arm in trying to develop new energy sources from our fossil fuels. They have been charged with the responsibility of implementing the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act to protect our Nation's mine workers from the hazards of their occupation. The committee added \$3.8 million in additional funds for coal mine health and safety research to help conquer these hazards.

The Bureau has also embarked upon active and imaginative programs to improve the lands damaged by strip and subsurface mining. Their activities in my Congressional District, wherein so much of the Nation's coal was mined and indus-

try was fueled since the turn of the 20th century, have been particularly laudatory. The present director, Dr. Elbert Osborn, is, in my opinion, the finest director in that agency's proud history. He has an extremely able and cooperative staff, one of whom I would like to single out for special praise. He is Mr. Joseph Corgan, Chief of the Environmental Division of the Bureau, who will be retiring effective June 30, after 36 years of distinguished service to the Bureau and to the Nation. In the often impersonal Federal bureaucracy, Mr. Corgan has become a personal friend not only to me but to the residents of northeastern Pennsylvania. His assistance in extinguishing underground mine fires, in eliminating burning culm banks, in stabilizing vast underground mined areas underlying property, has made the major contribution to a better environment in northeastern Pennsylvania. All of us in the subcommittee shall miss his counsel, and we wish him many happy years of retirement.

I call the Members attention to the \$16 million increase in new budget authority for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's Land and Water Conservation Fund. Since its creation, this fund has been the prime source of funding, not only for State and local outdoor recreation projects, but for Federal land acquisition activity by such agencies as the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Land Management. Income for this fund is generated chiefly from receipts from offshore oil leases.

This year, the budget estimate contained \$50 million in new budget authority for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to provide a catch-up year wherein the Bureau could reduce a backlog of unobligated balances. The BOR indicated to the committee that a program level of \$196 million for fiscal 74 would clean up their pipeline applications. The committee felt that such a program level was inadequate to meet our recreation needs for State assistance. The committee added \$16 million in new budget authority which, when coupled with previous balances, will bring the program level to a point \$10 million above amounts expended in fiscal year 1973. With \$80 million in the pipeline for fiscal year 1974, the Bureau requested no new funds for Federal programs. The action in reprogramming funds for three critical acquisition projects on the Federal side also brings the Federal obligational level to \$110 million.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8917, the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill contains two items of particular importance to the residents of my congressional district.

On page 20 of the committee report, the committee has directed that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, through its land and water conservation fund, to spend an additional \$10 million for land acquisition in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. I am grateful to the committee for taking this course of action at my request. The committee's

decision to commit these funds at this time is a wise one indeed.

This park, authorized in 1962, is the largest unfinished park in the eastern half of the Nation. Yet 6 million Americans visit and enjoy it each year. Last year, the authorization expired, and the National Park Service found itself without the legal means to acquire the remaining 15,000 acres of land. The Congress wisely enacted Public Law 92-575, legislation which I sponsored increasing the authorization ceiling to \$65 million. This represents an increase of \$28 million above the old ceiling. Shortly thereafter, the Office of Management and Budget approved an Interior Department request to reprogram an additional \$7 million through fiscal 1975 to activate its land acquisition program. The action of the House today in making an additional \$10 million available brings the total dollar figure for acquisition to \$17 million through 1974. This does not include the acquisition activities of lands administered by the Army Corps of Engineers. These funds should enable the National Park Service to accelerate their threat of condemnation currently facing land acquisition program to remove the many residents of the park area. These people are in desperate and of relief from the many problems that beset people living in the environs of a half-completed park.

On page 22, the Bureau of Mines has included an additional \$700,000 for environmental improvement in the anthracite area of the district. This money will be used by experts at the Bureau to improve and alleviate various environmental difficulties caused by the ravages of strip and subsurface mining. Last year, the committee also included funds for the Bureau to undertake a demonstration project by taking a badly stripped and scarred piece of land and converting it into a country park. This new money will be used for similar purposes as part of a continuing program to improve the environment and reclaim abandoned strip mined areas in that area.

The committee's action, while recognizing the difficult budgetary problems we face this year, has attempted to keep the Land and Water Conservation Fund at a viable level for the coming year. Last year, the BOR spent \$202 million. This year, they will have \$212 million available for obligation. Hopefully, the Bureau will return next year with a more realistic budget.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill. It deserves the support of every Member of this House. It is the product of careful scrutiny by the subcommittee and the full committee. We did not accept the budget recommendations blindly. We added some and cut some, and the result is a flexible budget that addresses itself to some of the Nation's most critical needs. I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that members of the Appropriations Committee did not have the benefit of hearing witnesses before our committee testify as to the need for the \$145 million in appropriations for fiscal 1974 for the Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

The arts endowment alone has almost 8,000 formal and preliminary written requests for assistance, of which NEA can assist less than one-fourth. The humanities endowment can fund only 936 out of 1,844 highly rated applications—total applications 4,113.

The arts endowment has been especially successful in raising private and public moneys to match—and overmatch the stimulus of Federal money. They average \$3 to \$4 for every Federal dollar, and in many many projects have had spectacular results in funding programs which benefit areas which heretofore have never been reached with major cultural efforts.

For instance, the Arttrain—now touring in my Rocky Mountain area—a \$50,000 endowment grant, stimulated the raising of \$680,000 to send this unique 6-car art show and educational project into remote and rural, small town areas which have never had the benefit of such art work.

Tell of tour now in Rocky Mountain.

This will tour Southeastern United States soon.

The endowments have made extraordinary efforts to have their programs reach a broad spectrum of American society—they have stretched themselves as I pointed out during debate on the authorization bill—to reach isolated groups, the poor, the aged, the sick, in hospitals in prisons in homes for the handicapped. They have provided seed money to start local theatre groups, dance groups, orchestras, which are still struggling to make ends meet. They have been particularly helpful in helping the modern dance groups become viable at a time when the public is demanding—in the wake of the increased leisure time and better incomes—more cultural programs.

The President had requested \$72.5 million for the arts endowment in fiscal 1974, not quite double the fiscal 1973 amount of \$40 million. Canada, with nearly 22 million people, spent \$26.5 million in 1972 compared to our \$29.7 million that year. Great Britain, with some 54 million people spent \$66 million. And West Germany, with 55 million people, spent \$134 million.

It is the hope of the group called the partnership for the arts, a private organization of citizens, that the United States by 1976 could be appropriating \$200 million, or roughly \$1 per capita for such expenditures.

Compare this goal, which will not be reached, if the Appropriations Committee does not in future years provide us with more money—with the per capita expenditures of: West Germany: \$2.42 per capita; Austria \$2 per capita; Sweden \$2; Canada \$1.40; Israel \$1.34 and Great Britain \$1.23.

We should be doing better in this area and I should like to emphasize that \$145

million would definitely have been a justifiable expenditure for the arts and humanities in fiscal 1974 for the richest country in the world.

To the critics who rationalize cutting this budget because the material needs of Americans have not been fully met, I counter with the argument that we should think for a minute of where our preoccupation with material things has led us. Are we nearer to the peace or understanding between nations? And do not the humanities—reading the great works of literature, history, ethics, and philosophy—do they not have something to say to the present condition of man in this country?

I agree wholeheartedly with witnesses who testified that "humanistic studies have as vital and unique a contribution to make to the amelioration of problems in our national life as do the sciences."

Yet we continue to spend over \$600 million for the National Science Foundation, \$17 billion for research and development. Our priorities are askew; the humanities have more to say to us—perhaps we would not be in the present moral crisis if we had spent more time on ethics, on learning truths from history.

I agree with Dr. Ronald Berman, the very able chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, who said in testimony that by the study of the great books of literature such as, say John Milton, Shakespeare, and all the rest, we are "challenged by moral imperatives" which demand that we conduct our private and public lives in the best way we know how.

This is what the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities are attempting—and believe me, such consciousness raising is drastically needed in this country.

Under the gifted leadership of Miss Nancy Hanks, the chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, the renaissance of the arts which already had begun has been stimulated further by Federal support.

There are programs in the Nation's schools which have met with fantastic success—the public is clamoring for the creative artists who visit schools for a week or more; it is anticipated that \$3 million will be available this coming year—a pitiful amount considering the need and the public popularity.

I have heard critics claim that the National Endowments benefit only the big cultural centers on the east and west coasts. Let me state emphatically that the programs of the National Endowment have given badly needed encouragement and new life to our efforts to enhance cultural opportunities in the sparsely populated Rocky Mountain region.

We do not begrudge any of the Endowment funds which are also assisting the arts in major Eastern centers, because we share the pride of all Americans in the world famous arts institutions which exist there.

But we join in the growing judgment of Americans from all walks of life that cultural development and enrichment of human life rate a higher priority—across

the board. The National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities have proven themselves to be very effective agents of response to this growing concern of our people.

Cutbacks will mean the State programs will suffer in their attempts to grow and strengthen the cultural activities begun at the grassroots level, and quite importantly, the planning for quality programs for the Bicentennial will also suffer. I regret that the committee has seen fit to cut this budget. It is my feeling that perhaps we in the committee, or the endowments themselves did not do their homework in informing the members of the Appropriations Committee of the very real value of these programs. For I believe that if you saw with our eyes and heard with our ears the tremendous work of these endowments, the Appropriations Committee would have funded these programs at \$145 million for the coming year.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee the gentlelady from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) for their efforts in increasing the amounts for the Arts and Humanities by \$24.1 million over 1973 appropriations. Naturally, I regret that the President's full budget request of \$145 million for 1974 was not granted.

As I tried to point out during the debate on the authorization bill, the need for programs funded by those endowments are very great in planning for the Bicentennial in 1976. The Endowments have been deluged by applications which have received the highest rating from their panels of experts and the endowments are anticipating continuation of those highly rated applications and the need for increased appropriations to help the Nation's communities in their preparation for celebration of its 200th birthday in 1976.

For instance, the NEH—the Humanities Endowment—planned to spend the largest share of its projected budget—\$28 million—for public programs. This would have been of immense benefit to the member districts in terms of educational projects in the humanities—educational and cultural films; public forums on important State issues; the availability of historical documents, books; new and scholarly papers on the Founding Fathers; courses by newspapers on the history of America, educational displays on the early days of the Revolution to help the overburdened museums get ready for the onslaught of visits; films which have been commissioned—television films which trace the historical development of the Revolution; another which is a biography of our revolutionary greats: the Adams family, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson—and many more.

This whole question came up, of course, when the authorization legislation was before the House. Amendments were offered to lower the amount authorized and the majority agreed with the

Education and Labor Committee that the amount for the Arts and Humanities Endowments for 1974 be the amount the President requested. I think this was an act of legislative responsibility, and while, as I indicated, I appreciate the increase in appropriations over last year by the committee, I do wish it would have been possible for the committee to increase that amount.

I would at this time urge that when the other body reports its appropriation bill, and if in its wisdom the higher figure is adopted than the House amount, the House conferees would look favorably on their reasoning and agree to that additional amount.

This is a time when money is well spent to rethink and restudy the meaning of our democracy to try to better understand our ideological roots and through the Arts and Humanities to stir once again our national pride and faith in ourselves as a people. In my mind the intangibles which the Arts and Humanities provide are just as important as road building, research and disease, and strengthening our economy, and from these expenditures I expect the quality of life of all Americans will be improved.

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

Mr. McDADE. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I would commend our chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington, for an outstanding job and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE), the ranking minority member of the committee for a well balanced, good job under very difficult budgetary restrictions.

I would like to address myself very briefly primarily to one area involving the Forest Service. This has to do with the budget request we received in our committee for the forest management in our national forests. The budget request was cut back shockingly, frankly, from last year, and our committee was able to restore some \$14 million for timber resource management, and of this \$14 million, \$7 million was for reforestation and \$5 million was for timber stand improvement. This cutback was particularly unacceptable in view of the high price of soft wood lumber and plywood. At a time when our supplies should be increasing they were cut back.

I would like to direct the attention of the committee to the language on page 31 of the report in which we point out the serious deficiencies in the management of the national forest lands by reason of lack of money. This is an area where we spend \$1 and we get several dollars back into the Federal Treasury. This is to produce a renewable natural resource, one that can be renewed over and over again.

We have nearly 5 million acres of national forest land capable of the commercial growth of timber, needing reforestation and lacking reforestation. Testimony is to the effect that approximately 50 years are needed to reforest the land. It says in the report:

With the additional funds again provided by the Committee, the Forest Service will be

able to make a beginning at catching up on the reforestation backlog.

I have in mind that we will have a program presented to us of approximately 10 years duration which will permit us to reforest most of the easily reforested backlog. This program perhaps will cost \$100 million to \$150 million a year average for the 10-year period of time, but if we undertake to do so we will be doing a job which fulfills a commitment to our children and will make money for the Federal Government. It is just that simple.

Again I would commend the members of the subcommittee and our leadership for the very good job in putting this bill together as well as the report.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman particularly for his activity in the subcommittee on the question of reforestation. I am new on the committee and it was appalling to me to learn from the testimony of witnesses that we really have no policy, no firm policy of catching up on those areas that need to be reforested most. As a matter of fact I believe the testimony was that today we are as far behind on reforestation as we were 5 or 10 years ago. We are just barely preventing this backlog from growing even more.

I want to thank the gentleman and our distinguished chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington, for their interest in this and for the tremendous efforts both have made. We on the subcommittee have insisted that a policy be developed which will show the total cost and the items that will be included in a 10-year period of accelerated reforestation, so we can begin to catch up.

I thank the gentleman for his remarks and for his yielding to me.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman for his interest and strong support.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is obviously of interest not only to those of us who live in the West but also to the Nation and it is one of the critically important bills that we will be facing in this session.

I would commend the chairman of the subcommittee (Mrs. HANSEN) for what she has done once again in wrestling with a very difficult task and coming out with a balanced budget. Certainly, there are certain things that some of us would like to see increased and yet, measured against all the competing needs which were involved in the bill, I think represents a balanced and good allocation of the dollar. She has done her customary careful work with the members of her subcommittee, and we commend her as we do our colleague (Mr. McDADE) the ranking minority member, and other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, we are grateful for the terribly long hours on each side that do not strike close to home for all members

of the subcommittee unless they look hard at the fact that these needs properly are national problems, as indeed they are.

Particularly, I would like to commend my colleague in the well (Mr. WYATT) whom I know to be as knowledgeable on the problems with which the subcommittee deals as anyone in this Congress, and most particularly is this true in this area of the forest. The problems are complex problems. He has been alluding to certain of them, and I personally, knowing him as well as I do, and knowing his devotion to the problems of the forest and what we need to do in connection with them, am grateful for his being on the committee, as I am grateful for the exceptionally fine work I know him to do in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I would join with him in the remarks he has made about the praise due to the subcommittee for what has been done in connection with forest land management. The remarks about the need for reforestation are, if anything, too weak in what they say. The problems are immense. There is great need in this area, and the thing which I think many of our colleagues just do not realize is that we are here dealing with this type of renewable resource that will, if properly handled, not be a net outgo in funds to this Government, but will actually yield more dollars back to the general fund, back to the treasury, than we will be investing in these expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague in the well has made this point, and I seek to make the comment on this only to emphasize what he said. This is an investment of Federal dollars that will return not only the amount we invest, but will return more than that.

Mr. Chairman, there are a series of other things set forth in the report which our colleagues have read, which deal with State and private forestry cooperation, forest research, roads and the like. I commend the committee for what it has been able to add to the bill in those particular areas.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close with comment on two more areas outside the field of forest; one completely outside and one involved, but not in the management. First, in the area of log exports. As the report makes clear on page 9, and I say this largely for purposes of making the point clear to the secretaries involved, the committee expects the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to take steps to include provisions in timber sale contracts which will assure that the timber involved will not be exported or used by the purchaser as a substitute for timber he exports, or sells for export. The committee expects the secretaries to publish regulations to implement this limitation. The power to do this has been on the books for some time. The secretaries have failed to use that power, and I am delighted to see that the committee is speaking strongly and that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior are warned that this is something they are to do.

Mr. Chairman, the last comment is in this field of energy research, this immense problem the Nation is facing at the present time. As the committee points out on page 8, the committee recommendation provides substantial increases over the current budget for research problems relating to energy.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for this particular item in an area where obviously much more needs to be done than has been done.

Mr. Chairman, I close once again by commending the subcommittee, and most particularly Mr. WYATT, for their actions under adverse circumstances to present a very fine bill.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague from Oregon, who has been a strong supporter in this effort.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this committee has been at work because the gentleman in the well took time last year to come to southern California and to totally review the fuel modification program which is an important part of the forest fire protection expended in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I know the gentleman in the well took time to survey some of the problems we have in southern California on the management of our forests, and especially relating to a program of the Forestry Service known as fuel modification. This is basically a program to try to anticipate and prevent forest fires before they occur because of the very dry conditions we have in southern California during the fall months. Can the gentleman inform me what was done in the way of improving the money spent for fuel modifications? For every dollar spent, we are told by the Forestry Service that it, usually can save anywhere from \$7 to \$10 in eventual fire prevention control.

Mr. WYATT. Yes. I would tell my colleague that we increased the money approximately \$150,000, from an area in the neighborhood of \$534,000 to close to \$678,000.

I might say to my friend that in the opinion of most of us on the committee this figure is wholly inadequate, as the figures are in many other areas for the Forest Service, but in view of the pressures upon the committee and the necessity for us to keep within the total budget figure, this is all we felt we could do.

We hope the OMB will increase the figure in the future. I know that just in the Angeles National Forest, in which the gentleman is especially interested, we

could use the entire amount, and then some, that is available for the entire United States for these purposes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's comment that the committee was good enough to increase this funding, because it is a substantial preventive measure. It does greatly decrease the long-range fire hazard. For every dollar spent now it does, in fact, result in a substantial savings of dollars that would have to be spent should a fire break out.

I appreciate the gentleman's explanation, and wish to thank the committee for a wise allocation of funds. Our delegation from southern California is grateful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to join with my colleague from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) in praise of the gentleman in the well (Mr. WYATT). I am happy the gentleman serves on the subcommittee.

I was very disappointed on the amount of money provided for forest roads as this is so detrimental to the local governments involved, as well as the forest products industry. I wonder if the gentleman from Oregon could go into that subject a little bit and, more specifically, discuss why we recommend \$98.6 million for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities and cut back on roads on Forest Service lands?

Mr. WYATT. I would say to my friend from Idaho, and this should be a part of the record, that he should direct his attention to page 35 of our report. The committee has made it very clear that we do not agree with the policy of shifting heavy forest road construction to the timber purchasers, because it is going to reduce the share going to the counties and reduce the return to the Government. We do not agree with this policy.

We also direct that no funds be used to prepare for timber sales which require purchasers to locate, survey, or design permanent roads.

We have also said we expect a supplemental estimate or budget amendment to be submitted to the committee, providing both for the increased sales program announced recently and a more responsible road construction program, in light of the long-term needs of all forest users.

The amount which was eliminated for permanent forest roads was so huge there was no way we could deal with this meaningfully within the budget restraints. We are very well aware of it, and there is strong language in the report on that page on our position.

Mr. SYMMS. The gentleman does believe there is a possibility of increasing this?

Mr. WYATT. I would hope we would have a budget supplemental.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYATT. I yield to my chairman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I should like to say to the gentleman that the committee is seriously concerned about this proposal to transfer road construction responsibilities to the timber purchasers. When we transfer to the timber companies the responsibility for construction of roads we reduce the receipts to the Federal Treasury and also the funds to the States and counties. In addition, we are depriving the small timber operator of having an opportunity to participate in these timber sales, because it takes substantial capital to be able to purchase the timber and provide for the construction of the roads.

The committee is seriously disturbed about this, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) has stated.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 302]

Andrews, N.C.	Dorn	Murphy, Ill.
Ashbrook	Edwards, Calif.	Murphy, N.Y.
Badillo	Fisher	Nichols
Blatnik	Frelinghuysen	O'Neill
Breaux	Gibbons	Patman
Breckinridge	Hawkins	Powell, Ohio
Chisholm	Hébert	Reid
Clark	Hungate	Rooney, N.Y.
Collins, Ill.	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Conyers	Landrum	Steele
Danielson	McEwen	Stratton
Derwinski	Martin, Nebr.	Teague, Tex.
Devine	Melcher	Thompson, N.J.
Dickinson	Mills, Ark.	Yatron
Diggs	Minshall, Ohio	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 8917, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 389 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG), a member of the committee.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, first I express my admiration for the chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington (JULIA HANSEN). The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) guided the course of our hearings with thoroughness and grace. Her attention to the fine points of the Nation's natural resources budget, her deep sense of priorities, and her skillful han-

dling of the witnesses have earned her the respect of the committee.

The issues raised in considering H.R. 8917, the Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1974, are among the most important facing our Nation today. The work of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee represents a conscious effort toward achieving a balanced utilization of our scarce natural resources. These natural resources are getting scarcer all the time.

Several of the projects included in the 1974 appropriation for Interior programs are of interest to my constituents in the Baltimore area.

In anticipation of the American Bicentennial celebration in 1976, the National Park Service is undertaking to restore Fort McHenry. The Star Fort will be refurbished, the upper battery reconstructed, the moat outworks restored, and the interpretive programs of films, exhibits, dioramas, tours and ceremonies will be improved.

In Baltimore County, the Geological Survey will work toward completion of geologic and hydrological studies which will help local planning officials identify natural resources, potential groundwater supplies, and areas of contamination. Equipped with such knowledge, officials may plan more effectively for local growth.

With an estimated 1974 apportionment of \$971,000 in moneys from the Land and Water Conservation Fund being made available to the State of Maryland, a total of \$4.7 million in matching funds, including money carried over from previous years, will be available through the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for land and water resource protection.

There are several other matters of concern to Baltimoreans, Mr. Chairman, on which I would urge that careful study and appropriate action be taken.

The Maryland shoreline, its estuaries, beaches, marshes, and wetlands, which offer the finest recreational facilities as well as natural settings for both man and wildlife, are threatened by the prospect of oil drilling in the Baltimore Canyon area of the Mid-Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf, 40 or 50 miles off the Maryland coast. It is important, therefore, that the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Land Management, which have undertaken studies of the Baltimore Canyon, actively seek to protect Maryland's coast for the use and appreciation of our citizens.

The Chesapeake Bay and the Susquehanna River are two bodies of water extremely important to the State of Maryland—indeed to the Nation. The Chesapeake is Maryland's most valuable resource. The Japanese once pointed out they could feed the entire population of Japan from that estuary if they had to. So much of our economic well-being and recreational activities are irrevocably linked to the bay. The Susquehanna River may in the future become the main source of water for the Baltimore region. At present, the Susquehanna faces an enormous siltation and pollution problem. In order to adequately protect the future of Maryland's water re-

sources, I call upon the Geological Survey and the Office of Water Resources Research to undertake studies of the water quality of both the Chesapeake Bay and the Susquehanna River.

There are several issues of national importance upon which I would also comment.

Strip mining has increased, not only in Maryland, but all across the United States. As a result, much more landscape is being scarred by the scraping of minerals from the earth, leaving unsightly holes and terrifying erosion. Unless intensive efforts are made to restore and reclaim the land, the practice of strip mining must be stopped, or we must enforce an effective means of overcover where the strip mining has been completed. These actions must be taken, because coal is becoming an increasingly important significant energy source.

Under the energy crunch which the Nation now finds itself in, the most pressing need is an increased supply of fuels. In seeking new sources, the United States must step up research into the liquefaction and gasification of coal and other plentiful energy sources. In addition, it is high time that oil import quotas be lifted permanently, enabling an increased supply of oil to enter the country at competitive prices, a source which we can count upon.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion and in the opinion, I think, of others, the United States need not fear for any length of time any price fixing or oil withholding schemes among the oil exporting nations. Never has an international cartel successfully held together for a long period of time. A policy to admit more foreign oil would ease the current energy shortage and would help to preserve our rapidly disappearing domestic oil reserves, and make unnecessary some of the proposals to start drilling along the Continental Shelf, in Alaska, and in many other places.

Finally, amid soaring lumber costs and severe shortages in the national supply of lumber, I call for the administration to release the backlog of funds earmarked for better reforestation and timber management programs in the U.S. Forest Service. The cost of new homes is skyrocketing. Witnesses who came before us estimated that in another 8 or 10 years, the cost of an average home would be double what it is now, mainly because of lumber costs.

With this reality, the administration has, nevertheless, left millions of acres in the national forests unplanted after previous timber crops were harvested. Delaying reforestation as a measure against inflation is self-defeating, because balance of payments arise when we rely on imported lumber, and uncovered timberland poses an ecological threat to the rest of our national forests.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that H.R. 8917, the Interior appropriation for fiscal 1974, reflects a deliberate and conscious effort to achieve responsible management of our natural resources. I, therefore, recommend to my colleagues the passage of this important measure so

energetically, capably presented by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY).

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

Mr. VEYSEY. I yield to my colleague from California (Mr. MAILLIARD).

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and other members of the subcommittee for the very sympathetic hearing they gave to us when they were in the process of developing this bill, and to add to the colloquy I heard earlier this afternoon between my colleague from San Francisco (Mr. BURTON) and the chairman of the committee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mr. Chairman, I see by the committee report that the committee has directed the reprogramming of money in the land and water conservation fund to the extent of \$10 million for the purchase of land in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Just so that the record is clear, am I correct in assuming this will be \$10 million in addition to the \$5.9 million which was earlier reprogrammed, with the approval of the committee?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the answer is "yes." This is in addition to that which was previously reprogrammed.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I thank the gentlewoman.

The other point made, which I should like to reemphasize, is that I would hope whatever influence the subcommittee may have on the Office of Management and Budget, that we would together try to persuade them—I have had no success whatsoever so far—to utilize the device which was in the authorizing legislation of fixing the price of this land as of now by signing contracts and paying for it over a period of years. Congress wrote this in order that we not run into the trouble we ran into in years past, where we have set a legislative cost ceiling on a particular piece of property we were going to purchase for the public, and then we delayed the purchase so long the cost was escalated, so we had to come back and get a new ceiling in order to purchase the property. It is beyond my understanding why there is a refusal to use the device, whereby we could fix this year the exact cost of this property which the public is going to acquire.

If we delay and do not use this device, I fear we could end up, as in the case of Point Reyes, with the authorizing legislation inadequate to cover the cost of the property.

I would appreciate any help we can get in leaning on them as to the use of this excellent device the Congress provided.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks. I wish to assure him that all members of the subcommittee are deeply understanding

of the problems of creating this beautiful Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I am sure we will move forward as rapidly as possible. Indeed, we have moved rapidly into the acquisition of the necessary lands.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the gentlewoman from Washington, the very gracious and very capable chairman of our subcommittee, for extending to me, really, a very delightful experience as a new member of this subcommittee, and permitting me to participate in the decisionmaking and the hearings with this group. It has been a most interesting experience, a most worthwhile experience, and I truly have enjoyed it. I thank the gentlewoman.

To all the members of the subcommittee, including the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) I would extend that same gratitude and thanks.

Mr. Chairman, I can recommend this appropriation bill to the Members without reservation. It is below the budget, and that suits me, very well. It does deal with major concerns of our Nation.

I find myself in stronger approval of some portions of the bill than I am in other portions of the bill. I should like to just run down two or three concerns I do have about it.

While it is under the budget request figure, I do not feel that we have totally dealt with some of the problems that have come before our committee. I see the possibility, indeed the very serious prospect, that later on we will be called upon for a supplemental appropriation. That will be for just as real money as though it had been in the original bill, and we will have to deal with those needs.

The problem of forest lands, and dealing with the removal of aging or diseased—

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 303]

Ashbrook	Gubser	Powell, Ohio
Badillo	Hawkins	Rees
Blackburn	Hébert	Reid
Blatnik	Huber	Rodino
Breaux	Hungate	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Ichord	Sikes
Clark	King	Sisk
Conyers	Kuykendall	Stephens
Danielson	Landrum	Stratton
Derwinski	Melcher	Teague, Calif.
Diggs	Mills, Ark.	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	Minshall, Ohio	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	Murphy, Ill.	Udall
Fisher	Murphy, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Fraser	Patman	Whitten
Gray	Pike	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 8917, and finding itself

without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 386 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to my colleague the gentleman from California.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, I was making the point that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) had so carefully developed in the subcommittee. We are not doing a sufficient amount in terms of expenditure to really take care of our problems on our national forest lands in terms of removing diseased timber, burned timber, overage timber, and thus adding it to our supply of lumber available for construction so sorely needed in the United States today. We must furnish additional funds in this area.

We await a request from the Department for the appropriate amount of funding, and I feel that additional funding must be provided for this purpose.

In another area a request was made for a research slush fund of \$25 million for energy research. This had no support on the subcommittee, and I think appropriately so. Not that there was not need for a further effort in energy research, because we are caught up in an energy crisis at this time, but the committee was totally unwilling to pass out a blank check in this amount.

I assume that correct identification and description of projects will come to the committee and additional funds will be provided in this area.

Let me bring to the attention of the committee the fact that there are some additions in this bill to the research and development in geothermal energy. I refer to energy removed from the ground. This is a promising new form of energy which is particularly exciting in the Western United States but not confined to that area. It is found in several forms—pure steam, steam and hot water, dry hot rock formations, and geopressed form. It is available now, the closest in timespan of any new source of energy. It is environmentally acceptable as compared to all other forms of energy. It is the lowest cost form of energy available not only in terms of initial investment in plant and equipment but also in operating costs. In my own State of California if we could fully develop our geothermal potential it would mean a savings of over \$2 billion a year to the consumers of power in that State.

I will insert in the Record an article which appeared yesterday in the New York Times noting the coming on line of a geothermal power generating facility in Mexico, just across the border from my district, which will soon be powering the factories and lights in northern Mexico.

We should be doing the same thing. We are not moving rapidly enough to develop this energy source and it is not solely for lack of money in a bill such as this. I think it is for lack of desire and

lack of organization within the Department of Interior to bring about the necessary implementation of a program which we need sorely at this time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VEYSEY. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Brown).

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for what he has just said about this important subject. I think the Members of the House should know about the very fine work he has done in encouraging the use of this new energy resource. I personally commend the gentleman for that work and join with and associate myself with the remarks he has made.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. Brown) for his comments.

It is estimated that by year 2000, geothermal energy could provide 395,000 megawatts of power in this Nation. That is in excess of the total power-generating capacity of the United States today. This is an enormous resource which we have and which we must use. They are doing it in Mexico, in Russia, in New Zealand, in Iceland, and in California to a limited extent, where one-third of the energy for the city of San Francisco is now coming from geothermal sources. I would like to see us work much more effectively at the development of this needed resource at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the importance of geothermal development cannot be downgraded or overlooked. The potential in this country is tremendous.

I submit an article which appeared only yesterday in the New York Times. It tells an exciting story of geothermal development in Mexico, and it is indicative of what we can do here if we put the necessary effort into it.

The article follows:

MEXICO SEEKING ENERGY FROM GEOTHERMAL AREAS

(By Richard Severo)

CERRO PRIETO, MEXICO, June 23.—On a savagely hot patch of desert in Mexico's Baja California, the energy needs of nearly half a million people are being met without the use of gas, oil or coal and with virtually no pollution. For the people of Baja and the Mexicali Valley, the energy crisis has become someone else's problem.

The energy is geothermal—steam trapped at 7,500 feet below the surface at a temperature of 675 degrees and piped to the surface where its power is channeled to turbines.

19 WELLS IN COMPLEX

Mexico's Cerro Prieto plant started operation in April and by the end of this month will be providing at least 50,000 kilowatts; within three months it will have an output of 75,000 kilowatts, according to Bernardo Dominguez, the engineer who is resident superintendent.

The 19 producing wells that make up the Cerro Prieto complex are 22 miles southeast of Mexicali near the Cucapah Mountains. The complex is the biggest operating geothermal facility in the Americas and one of the largest in the world—New Zealand, Japan and Italy also have major projects.

The complex is being watched closely by energy-conscious United States scientists who know that in geological conditions similar to Mexico's which might permit massive geothermal development, exist in the western region of the United States.

Robert Rex of the University of California's Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, thinks that in California's Imperial Valley alone, it would be possible to produce 20,000 to 30,000 megawatts of electrical power. He said that Cerro Prieto is currently tapping less than 1 per cent of the potential of the Mexicali Valley, which abuts the Imperial.

Mr. Rex laments that the United States has not yet developed its geothermal energy.

Dr. L. Trowbridge Grose of the Colorado School of Mines says geothermal potential now exists in Nevada, Oregon, New Mexico, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, Utah, Washington and Wyoming, in addition to California.

Jorge Guiza, head of the Mexican Government's Department of Geothermic Resources, is very cautious about making predictions as to where this new development will take Mexico, but he noted that at its present level, Cerro Prieto is saving Mexico's 800,000 barrels of fuel oil a year.

Mr. Dominguez estimated that by 1983, Cerro Prieto will have the capacity to provide electrical power to the estimated 2 million persons who are expected to live in this area.

Under Mr. Guiza's direction Mexico is pushing geothermal exploration in 123 different places, some of them in Central Mexico. The Mexicans may thus provide such energy to many millions of its citizens, including those in rapidly growing Mexico City, which is having difficulty keeping up with the energy needs of its more than 8 million residents. Mexico City's population is growing at an estimated 800,000 a year.

Although Mexico imports less than 5 per cent of her annual petroleum needs and has large deposits of oil, the Government is pushing research into other forms of energy. "Oil reserves are limited," said Mr. Guiza, "and even if they were not, we would certainly prefer energy sources that do not pollute."

The Mexicans are developing their own geothermal technology as they pursue the delicate and sometimes dangerous task of tapping subterranean steam. "This is one instance where we are really benefiting from the Mexican experience," said Dr. Andre Simonpietri, science officer with the United States embassy in Mexico City and a close observer of Mexican geothermal progress.

Conditions for exploration are ideal. Around Cerro Prieto—which means "dark mountain," four geological faults lie beneath the earth's surface—the famed San Andreas as well as the Imperial, San Jacinto and Cerro Prieto's faults. Cerro Prieto itself is a dark basalt mound that was an active volcano 30 million years ago.

"The volcano is dead, but the earth is still hot," said Mr. Guiza. He explained that the faults have allowed underground water to come into contact with hot magma.

Layers of sandstone and shale sit over the deposits of hot water and shafts must be dug with great care, lest the steam escape through lateral fissures and come to the surface in a great eruption.

The drilling area looks like something from another planet. Pipes emerge from wellcaps—called "Christmas trees"—and snake across a desert where it is frequently 128 degrees in the shade.

"Mexicali has its own Disneyland," says Mr. Guiza "and it is called Cerro Prieto."

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'NEILL was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I would

like to notify the House of a change in the schedule. House Joint Resolution 542, the war powers legislation, will not be taken up later today but will be taken up when we return from vacation.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to also notify the House if the second supplemental is again brought before the House tomorrow it will be my intention to again offer the no-bombing-in-Cambodia resolution and will ask the House to stand by our previous stand.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased with the remarks of my colleague from California (Mr. VEYSEY) concerning geothermal energy.

The gentleman should be complimented for his leadership in advancing the utilization of geothermal steam in southern California. We were the pioneers of this field in northern California and recognize the great value and potential of this resource.

The subcommittee has also shown its awareness of the geothermal potential and I fully support its efforts in this regard.

Also, Mr. Chairman, let me take this opportunity to express my strong support for H.R. 8917 which appropriates funds for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and her subcommittee continue to demonstrate a remarkable and effective ability to develop a balance between the funding limitations we must maintain and the important and clearly demonstrated needs these funds are intended to meet.

I have discussed many of the items included in this bill on a number of occasions with the gentlewoman and she has always shown the highest interest in helping to advance our proposals.

The same is true for the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE), my friend from Oregon (Mr. WYATT), and the outstanding staff of the subcommittee. They have gone far beyond the norm in their assistance to me, to my constituents, and to the many others who follow the work of the subcommittee.

I would like to speak briefly, Mr. Chairman, on several specific items in the bill in order to bring the attention of the House to them.

First, the committee has again recognized the invaluable work of the California Rural Indian Health Board in meeting the medical care needs of the Indians of our State.

I strongly support the \$2 million in earmarked funds for CRIHB. I am concerned, however, that these funds may be impounded by the Office of Management and Budget as was the case last year. I urgently recommend that this policy not be continued and that these vital funds not be diverted from this work.

Second, the Forest Research Laboratory at Humboldt State College in Arcata, Calif., is funded by the bill for the full amount of \$800,000.

As a longtime proponent of reforestation, forest improvement and updating our forest management programs, I believe this scientific facility must be constructed without delay.

Finally, and in line with the forest research lab, I am pleased that the committee has given a higher priority to reforestation activities and that it has taken the initiative to place a restriction on the export of timber from public lands.

Reforestation needs more money than is included in this bill as well as greater incentives for small private landowners to become involved, but I believe we are making progress in a field that has been too long neglected. The subcommittee obviously shares this view and has recommended a substantial \$7 million increase above the budget request for reforestation.

The export question is more complicated and requires our continuing efforts toward administrative, legislative, and diplomatic means to deal with it.

All of these items deserve the full support of the House, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) for the \$600,000 she put in this bill, at my request, for the Atlantic salmon fish hatchery at Bethel, Vt.

The proposed hatchery is not in my district; it is way out of my district, but the gentlewoman knows I have taken a great interest in the Atlantic salmon. This fish has fought a very hard battle to survive; first against the netting by the Danes, and people in the Greenland and Iceland areas, and then against pollution and the nettings at the mouths of the rivers of Canada.

Finally, after a great deal of work, we have a treaty signed by the Danes and the Canadians. For all intents and purposes, the Canadians are no longer netting, and the Danes have agreed to reduce their netting year by year, eventually cutting it out entirely. Before we achieved this agreement, however, this severe overfishing had dangerously depleted the numbers of this great fish. Therefore, we now have to work together to try to supplement the Atlantic salmon population. By this appropriation of \$600,000 for the hatchery in Bethel, Vt., we are going a long way toward helping to restore the Atlantic salmon on the Atlantic seaboard.

This hatchery will produce 500,000 smolts a year, which will be put into the Connecticut River.

At one time that river was one of our finest Atlantic salmon streams. Unfortunately, it became polluted, as did many of our other rivers. But now it is being cleaned up and we are working with the electric powerplants to see that fish ladders are built on the river. When this hatchery is completed, the smolts will be provided and hopefully we will have

salmon again in the Connecticut River.

The Members may wonder why the gentlewoman from Washington has taken such an interest in this. In the last 2 months, it has been my privilege to visit her State. I fished for steelhead salmon in the Klamath River, which runs through her hometown. I might say it is one of the most beautiful and scenic places in the world. I can understand why the gentlewoman is such a beautiful woman; everything out there is beautiful. I recommend a visit to that area to anyone in the House and in the country. It is just breathtaking.

Mr. Chairman, I fished also in Washington's Quinault River near the Quinault Reservation, an exceptionally beautiful stream. I fished in many other places of great natural beauty in that area, so I can see why the gentlewoman from Washington has taken such a deep interest and gone forward in helping us with this needed appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) who has taken a great interest in this particular project, for working with the chairman of the committee to make this hatchery a reality. I hope the other body will go along with it, and when the money is appropriated that the administration will spend it. At that time, I hope the three of us, and all the members of the committee, will go up to Vermont for the opening of that hatchery.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I again wish to commend the gentlewoman from Washington, and the subcommittee, for the very fine job they have done on the bill under difficult circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has done a good job under difficult circumstances. I would like to direct a question to the gentlewoman from Washington regarding the matter that concerns me before I begin my remarks.

My question is, Madam Chairman, can she inform me of the status of wildlife refuges, particularly with their visitors and the secondary uses, such as recreation? I am troubled that there is not sufficient money here for the administration of those refuges, and I would point out that under law, before refuges may be opened for these appropriate and secondary uses, that there must be an administrative certificate by the Secretary indicating that there is sufficient money on hand for the administration of the refuges.

Does the committee in any way intend to change that law or to make possible the opening of refuges for these secondary uses without that certification?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I may say the committee is as disturbed as the distinguished gentleman from Michigan about the entire refuge problem.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife recommended reductions in the recreation uses of wildlife refuges. The committee cannot agree with this policy because if some youngster should drown at a beach, or if there is an accident of some kind because of lack of adequate supervision, it will be a terrible tragedy. You will note that the committee placed in the bill an additional \$250,000 for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for recreation management on wildlife refuges. We urge that before the Department proceed with this kind of policy, they should consult with the proper committees in the Congress and should work with State and local governments to make suitable agreements.

Mr. DINGELL. I would advise the gentlewoman that that legislation has already been written by the committee having jurisdiction over the refuges, and we have provided that unless they can show on an annual basis there is sufficient money to administer and to protect the refuge for its principal purpose that these secondary uses may not be allowed.

I should like to turn with the gentlewoman to the question which troubles me next, and that is the question of refuges and the closure of refuges. There are a large number of refuges under this bill for which there will be no money for administration. I am sure the gentlewoman is aware of that. I am satisfied the gentlewoman is as critical of that kind of practice as I am. Can the gentlewoman comment on that subject?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes. We believe that when the Government has acquired land and opened a refuge it should properly manage that refuge. You will note that we have placed in the bill an additional \$750,000 for general wildlife refuge management.

Mr. DINGELL. I thoroughly agree with the gentlewoman.

I should like to direct the attention of the gentlewoman to a further point, which is that in the committee report \$100,000 has been deleted from the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife request for funds. The reduction relates to the "preparation" of environmental impact statements required in connection with the Bureau programs under section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act.

I note that this relates to the "preparation" of impact statements. I am troubled, but I assume that the gentlewoman has made the judgment that there is sufficient money for them to make the impact statements as required by law. Is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman is correct. There is a great deal of money for environmental impact statements.

Let me point out to the gentleman from Michigan that this bill contains something in the vicinity of \$60 million for the preparation and review of environmental impact statements. There has been an unconscionable amount of paper which has been going into some of the reports.

Let me give the gentleman one interesting figure, because I am sure he is as

concerned about the environment as I am. Each Sunday issue of the New York Times uses wood from 20,000 trees and 175 acres of land. Even if 25 percent of the newspaper is recycled, we can still imagine the amount of trees involved.

We believe the Department of the Interior should lead the way. They could single space some of their statements and economize in a way that will not jeopardize the environmental impact statement preparation.

Mr. DINGELL. I do wish to draw the attention of the gentlewoman to the point that troubles me now; that is, I assume that this is not intended in any way to be a restriction on the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to make comments on environmental impact statements, also required by law, and this does not relate to that.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Not at all. I can assure the gentleman that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries has done an outstanding job on environmental impact statements. I am sure they will continue to do so. This would in no way jeopardize that operation.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentlewoman.

I am now concerned with the question of the basic operation and maintenance needs of the national wildlife recreation system. I recognize that the gentlewoman received inadequate requests, and I do not attempt to direct her attention to this more forcefully, except to say that I believe she has done about the best she could with that with which she had to work.

I should like to make some further legislative history at this time, and I wonder if my good friend the gentlewoman from Washington would agree with me that it is the intent of the committee that there could be no transfer of the total management responsibility on any refuge or transfer of jurisdiction or transfer of any refuge to any State or local jurisdiction without the approval of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies and the appropriate legislative committee of the Congress; namely, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the committee agrees with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am sure that the committee had no intention of doing this. I have received communications personally, and I have been assured they have no intention of doing this. In spite of the fact some of the regional areas are talking about this, we still have assurances that we will not get into the problems the gentleman points out.

Mr. Chairman, I became concerned about this matter when I received numerous reports of plans to shift the

management of wildlife refuges from the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to the States or other Federal agencies after being told in the subcommittee hearings that the Bureau had no such plans.

I made an inquiry to Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish, Wildlife and Parks—Nathaniel P. Reed—about these reports and received a prompt and reassuring reply from his office. So that there can be no misunderstanding that the Congress is not approving or authorizing any shift in administration or management of wildlife refuges by passing this appropriations bill, I would like to quote from the letter I received and relied upon dated June 8, 1973, and signed by Douglas P. Wheeler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Fish, Wildlife and Parks; Assistant Secretary Reed and Spencer Smith, Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; reaffirm their statements to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies:

You may be assured that the Bureau has no plan or intent to transfer any National Wildlife Refuge, or the administration of any such area, to any State agency.

I would like to add that since I received Secretary Reed's letter, and notwithstanding the letter, I have continued to receive reliable reports that regional offices of the Bureau have continued to plan for the shifting of management and administration of refuges to the States and other Federal agencies.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS) for his contribution.

I am disturbed again, Mr. Chairman, about the level of funding for the anadromous fish program. I note that the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) has again done a good job, even though there are inadequate budgetary requests from the administration, and I would be glad to yield to her for a comment on this subject.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman is well aware, in 1973 the amount was \$2,333,000, and this year it is \$1,833,000 for the anadromous fish conservation program for grants in aid to States.

If I might say just one thing to the gentleman from Michigan, I wish he would join the committee in telling OMB that they are so shortsighted in the management of our natural resources and that they are very shortsighted concerning this country's future.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would thoroughly agree.

Mr. Chairman, I will now direct the attention of my good friend, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) to the problem of refuge acquisition funds.

As the gentlewoman knows, there are two funds involved here, the first of which is the accelerated wetlands acquisition program. I notice there are no funds in the bill and none was requested. I personally happen to think that this is outrageous.

Mr. Chairman, I am not critical of the efforts of the gentlewoman from Wash-

ington (Mrs. HANSEN) but I would be glad to yield to her for further comment on this subject.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes. Mr. Chairman, there is an estimated \$7 million to be available from receipts from the Federal migratory bird hunting stamp fund to continue the wetlands acquisition program. This is a permanent appropriation and the committee does not act on it each year.

However, there is no money provided in the budget for the accelerated acquisition program, as the gentleman has stated. The committee was unfortunately faced with severe budget constraints.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would now like to direct the attention of the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) to the problem of migratory bird stamp receipts.

As I am informed by the Department of Interior, there was approximately \$10 million in receipts from duck stamp sales last year. I am informed that there is \$7.1 million which is authorized or which was requested and which was appropriated in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I note here that the law is so phrased that the \$7 million or, rather that the \$10 million in duck stamp sales constitutes an earmarked fund. It is my view that to spend less than the \$10 million is illegal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has expired.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would note that this constitutes in my view as a chairman of the subcommittee which handled the legislation which authorized all recent earmarking of funds and price increases in duck stamp prices. I also speak as the author of all the recent legislation relating to migratory bird stamp sales—and first at \$2, then raising the price to \$3, and finally to \$5. Those were earmarked funds, and after duck stamp prices were increased to \$5 and earmarked for the migratory bird conservation fund, this constitutes an illegal impoundment of what are essentially trust funds.

I wonder if my good friend, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) would comment on that.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the committee felt the same way, and we had quite a dialog on this subject when departmental witnesses were before the committee.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

CONCERNING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Mr. Chairman, I note in the committee's report on H.R. 8917 that a reduction of \$100,000 has been made in regard to the request by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. The reduction relates to the "preparation" of environmental impact statements required in connection with the Bureau's programs by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act.

I am concerned about this reduction. I think it is ill-advised. However, since it only applies to the "preparation" of impact statements, I believe that its effect on the Bureau's program will not be too great. The Bureau prepares only about 100 such statements annually. This represents only a small proportion of the total Bureau workload under this section of NEPA. The principal area where the Bureau spends a great deal of time and money is in the review of environmental impact statements prepared, not by the Bureau, but by other executive branch agencies.

It is my understanding that the Bureau reviews over 90 percent of the impact statements prepared by these Federal agencies. It is essential that when the Bureau conducts this review, they do so in a timely fashion and with complete thoroughness.

My subcommittee is currently investigating the activities of the Interior Department and the Environmental Protection Agency to determine whether there is in fact adequate funding and personnel to carry out this review responsibility under NEPA. Thus, my colleagues will understand my concern over this \$100,000 reduction in H.R. 8917.

But since, as the committee report stresses, this reduction does not and cannot affect the Bureau's review of impact statements, I have decided not to seek an amendment to restore this sum at this time. I hope, however, that the committee will agree to its restoration if the Bureau makes a good case in the Senate for it.

Once again, I want to stress to all here today and to the Bureau that it is my understanding that none of this reduction would be applied to the Bureau's costs of reviewing impact statements. That review, which is certainly an awesome task, must continue unhindered so as not to undermine NEPA. I also want to stress that if my investigations prove that further appropriations for this function are needed, I will urge that they be included in any supplemental appropriations considered during this session of this Congress.

CONCERNING THE NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL REFUGE SYSTEM

Next Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to basic operation and maintenance needs of the national wildlife refuge system.

In an audit report recently issued by the Department of the Interior, it was concluded that the national wildlife refuge system is seriously underfunded. It found that many existing facilities are badly in need of repair, some of which are literally falling apart; increased costs of utilities, material, supplies and contract labor for maintenance functions have eroded base appropriations; and new programs have created additional demands on a diminishing dollar base, resulting in overcommitment for resources in both funds and manpower. To fully achieve the output potential of the areas within the system, it was estimated that an annual operation and maintenance base of \$34 million would be needed.

Mr. Chairman, in order to insure that these refuges continue present levels of

production, I appeared before Chairman HANSEN's subcommittee and requested that an additional \$5 million be added to the Department's request. I note from pages 23 and 24 of the committee report on H.R. 8917 that the Appropriations Committee increased the budget estimate by the following amounts: \$750,000 for general wildlife refuge management; \$250,000 for recreation management on wildlife refuges; and \$25,000 for Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this program, I would like to call to the attention of the Members certain language contained on page 24 of the committee report which gives me great concern. I refer to the following language of the report:

The budget proposal for 1974 included significant curtailments in National Wildlife management and fish production from warm water hatcheries. The basis of these reductions, in large part, was that these activities could be transferred to the State or local jurisdictions involved. The Committee is concerned that on-going programs will be abandoned before adequate arrangements can be made for funding from other sources.

The Committee directs that before any on-going programs in the refuge or hatchery systems are transferred to other jurisdictions, the Committee be consulted.

Mr. Chairman, I think it could easily be interpreted from the language of the report that the committee would not object to the transfer of jurisdiction over refuges to State or local jurisdictions provided the committee was consulted before such transfers actually took place. I certainly hope this was not the intention of the committee.

Personally, because of recent budgetary restrictions, I would have no objection to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife temporarily entering into cooperative agreements with certain States for the purpose of obtaining assistance in the management of certain activities in certain refuges, such as the management of resident wildlife, including big game and upland game species; and the management of hunting and fishing activities in such areas. However, I would object most strenuously to the turning over of total management responsibility or the transfer of units of the system to State or local jurisdictions.

In a recent statement carried by the press, Assistant Secretary Reed stated that the Department has no intention of turning wildlife refuges over to States. In fact, he said, the Department has no authority to turn over refuges to States.

CONCERNING THE ANADROMOUS FISH PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, I would like next to discuss the anadromous fish conservation program.

This program authorizes the Secretaries of the Interior and Commerce to enter into cooperative agreements with the States for the purpose of carrying out programs to conserve, develop, and enhance the anadromous fishery resources of our Nation and the fish in the Great Lakes that ascend streams to spawn. For the period ending June 30, 1974, there is authorized to be appropriated \$10 million to carry out the purposes of the act, with approximately one-

half of the authorization to be used by each of the Secretaries.

Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention that for fiscal year 1974, the States had indicated to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife a need for \$4,120,000 but only \$1,605,000 had been included in the appropriation request. I appeared before Chairman HANSEN's subcommittee and requested that the appropriation for this program be increased, at least \$500,000 to a total of \$2,105,000 for cost sharing, the same level as in recent years. Needless to say, I am disappointed that only \$1,833,000 was finally included in the bill for this important program. Naturally, this action will require a cutback in planned programs, a reduction in trained and experienced personnel with losses to program accomplishments and uncertainty for the future. This is just not fair to the States as well as to the abused anadromous fish resource.

CONCERNING THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

Next Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss a matter that is of particular distress to me. I refer to the land acquisition program under the migratory bird conservation account.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment and as a Member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I am greatly concerned over the lack of funds with which to carry out this program. This program has not been adequately funded since the Wetlands Loan Act was passed in 1961, which authorized a total of \$105 million to be appropriated on an advanced basis to the migratory bird conservation account over a 15-year period. Through fiscal year 1973, \$81.4 million of the \$105 million authorization has been appropriated, leaving a balance of \$23.6 million to be appropriated over the remaining 3-year life of the program. The moneys advanced under this act are added to the annual receipts from the sale of duck stamps and are available for expenditure for wetland and refuge acquisitions.

Mr. Chairman, it is folly to make cuts in this program in the face of rapidly escalating land prices and despoliment of waterfowl habitat everywhere. Postponements now may very well be permanent, either because the habitat is gone, priced beyond reason, or is being rapidly diverted to other uses, such as for residential and commercial development programs.

Mr. Chairman, because of my concern over the inadequate funding of this program, I appeared before Chairman HANSEN's subcommittee and requested that \$7.5 million be added to this program for fiscal year 1974, which would be in keeping with advances made in prior years. Much to my great sorrow, the Appropriations Committee failed to appropriate the first penny for this program for fiscal year 1974. I think a tragic mistake has been made.

To add insult to injury, the Office of Management and Budget has taken steps to place further constraints on this program by placing a limitation on the level

of expenditures. This action, Mr. Chairman, has resulted in the impoundment of duck stamp receipts and I will briefly explain at this time the actions taken by OMB which resulted in the impoundment of these funds.

The budget presented to the Congress for the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Fund for fiscal year 1973 showed that estimated obligations of \$14.4 million would be incurred. It was estimated that the fund would receive \$7 million from the sale of duck stamps and it was requested that \$7.1 million be appropriated under the Accelerated Wetlands Acquisition Act. It was estimated that \$3 million in unobligated funds would be carried over from fiscal year 1972 and that there would be no unobligated funds available at the end of fiscal year 1973.

The requested appropriation of \$7.1 million proved. The latest estimate by an official of the Department of the Interior is that receipts from the sale of duck stamps total \$10.7 million for fiscal year 1973, or \$3.7 million in excess of the budget estimate and that about \$1 million in unobligated funds were carried over from fiscal year 1972. If the estimate of receipts proves to be correct, \$18.8 million would be available from the fund for obligation in fiscal year 1973.

It is my understanding that, for fiscal year 1973, an obligational ceiling of \$12.1 million has been placed on the fund by OMB and as a result the fund will carry over about \$6.7 million in unobligated funds into fiscal year 1974.

It is my further understanding that OMB has placed an obligation ceiling of \$9 million on the fund for fiscal year 1974. No appropriated funds were requested and no funds were appropriated for the fund for fiscal year 1974 and it is now estimated by Interior officials that duck stamp sales are expected to be \$10 million for this fiscal year. If the Department of the Interior's estimates of receipts for fiscal year 1973 and 1974 are correct, then the obligation ceilings imposed by OMB will result in the impoundment of \$6.7 million at the end of fiscal year 1973 and \$7.7 million at the end of fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, the obligation ceiling makes no distinction between appropriated funds advanced to the migratory bird conservation fund by specific congressional action and receipts from the sale of stamps which are automatically appropriated and available to the fund. Since \$7.1 million was advanced to the fund for fiscal year 1973 and an estimated \$6.7 million will be impounded at the end of that year, it may be assumed that the funds impounded at the end of fiscal year 1973 will be advanced funds. However, since no advance has been requested or appropriated for fiscal year 1974 and it is estimated that the funds impounded at the end of fiscal year 1974 will increase to \$7.7 million, part of the impounded funds at the end of fiscal year 1974, if the estimates are correct, will apply to receipts from the sale of stamps.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out for the benefit of the Members that the information I have just presented on the impoundment of duck stamp receipts

was supplied to me by letter today by the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, the Comptroller General of the United States, in response to my request to him of March 30, 1973, to audit the migratory bird conservation account with a view toward determining if duck stamp receipts had actually been impounded by OMB.

Mr. Chairman, the impounding of these duck stamp receipts by OMB is in my opinion an illegal action. This body must make it clear that these trust receipts are to be expended as intended by the Congress, without OMB interference.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the many nice things that have been said about this legislation, I am reluctant to come up with a sour note, but, nevertheless, I feel that I must.

It was just 2 weeks ago this House acted on the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities. This was, as you know, a very detailed debate that was carried on in the House. There was much discussion and many amendments. Finally, the House, by a 5-to-1 majority, passed this legislation. What we passed was a bill calling for \$153 million for the arts and humanities. This was the amount of money that had been budgeted by the administration for this legislation.

The arts and humanities reaches all sections of this country; it is not a bill that favors one section of the country over another.

However, the committee has made a cut of nearly \$46 million from the amount that we passed in the House just 2 weeks ago. In other words, a cut of nearly 30 percent.

I am on the committee that put this bill together, and the impact of this cut is going to be quite broad, it will affect a number of programs. It will affect museum programs that were laid out for this coming year; it will affect funds to State art agencies for community councils, which is a part of a new program; it will affect the expansion of art programs involving heavily the Nation's black, Indian, Chicano, Appalachian, and other regions and people who have traditionally been missed by this program. There is a whole list—and I will not take the time of the House at this time to list one project after another—that will have to be grossly curtailed or in some cases eliminated.

The same thing is true in the humanities. It is a shame, I feel, that this one area which reaches out so deeply into our country and affects for the good so many people would be cut so severely.

I am not going to offer an amendment during the amending period to reinstate this money, because I feel the Appropriations Committee has made its decision, and I will not challenge it on the floor of the House.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. May I

say to the gentleman this was one of the most difficult decisions the committee had to make. Unfortunately, this was the single major agency in our bill where full funding was requested. I want to mention however, that although there is a reduction, the committee has provided about a 30-percent increase over the amount of funds appropriated last year.

Funding for the Indian programs contained in this bill received only a 3.3 percent increase. In forestry the committee provided an increase of only 5 percent. For energy research programs there is an increase in this budget, which is for the whole United States, of only 23 percent.

We do deeply regret this reduction, but at the same time in the allocation of funds, how do you explain the fact that you will grant 100 percent funding in one instance and in another instance grant a small or no increase?

It is very unfortunate that this bill had to be confined to a budget limitation considering the 27 agencies funded by this bill.

I want to remind the gentleman that the States art councils were granted all of the budget increases that were requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

If the gentleman will yield further, let me say, the reductions will have to be allocated on the determination of the foundation, and I hope they will be as wise as possible.

I want to join the gentleman in his regrets, but I just wish there were more money available.

Mr. PEYSER. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman.

It is still my hope that these cuts can be restored by the Senate and in conference.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for the cut it made in the Arts and Humanities, and say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) that if a reduction was to be made, a grossly severe one would be the kind to make.

I note, however, that the Arts and Humanities will have an increase next year of some 32 percent in salaries and expenses. Such an increase, in view of the Government's financial crisis and inflation, is unreasonable.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the Chairman of the Arts Endowment, Miss Nancy Hanks, explained to the committee that the most reliable kind of management of these programs is only possible through a very careful surveillance. I think the gentleman from Iowa will agree that the money that is expended needs to be audited carefully, and watched care-

fully. That is the reason for the increase.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a newspaper article, a United Press news-story which indicates that there is being created in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior an assistant for the arts. And apparently she has already been selected, a woman by the name of Pamela Susan Coe, 30 years old, who is to be assistant to the Secretary of Interior for the Arts.

I wonder if the committee had any indication of this?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will yield to the gentleman in just 1 minute.

Her function in life from here on out apparently will be to create Federal cultural centers across the land in phased-out military facilities, as well as seashore parks, and atop trails, wherever atop trails may be.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa that the young lady is an assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. GROSS. She is now an assistant to the Secretary?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. She is now an assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently she is one of the reasons why the expenses and salaries are going up 32 percent, since she is to be paid \$32,000 a year.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, if the gentleman will yield further, that I am sure that is not the reason the expenses are going up. I may say, that the National Park Service and other components of the Interior Department have many programs throughout the country that deal with the arts. These include the Wolf Trap Farm, Ford's Theater, the Summer in the Parks program, the Carter Barron Amphitheater, and many other programs, including some involving Indian arts and crafts. I think that the young lady will probably earn her money very handily.

Mr. GROSS. I would ask the gentleman from Washington if her committee is prepared to finance all these new culture centers across the land, atop winding trails, in abandoned air bases, Army bases, and so on and so forth?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield further, there is no money to fund winding trails beyond the regular programs of park and forest trails.

Mr. GROSS. My understanding, according to this United Press news dispatch, is that the cultural centers will be located atop winding trails as well as the inactivated air bases, Army bases, naval bases, and so on and so forth.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield further, I must say that the Secretary has not been before the committee for the rather elaborate program the gentleman from Iowa has detailed as the result of the reading of a press release.

I can only warn the gentleman that

sometimes press releases from various sources are not fully accurate.

Mr. GROSS. Can I assume now that the committee has approved the \$32,000-a-year job for Pamela?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. She is on the payroll.

Mr. GROSS. She is on the payroll now?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. All ready to go.

Did the committee approve hiring 40 recognized artists to paint pictures of Government projects? Is that a part of the arts and humanities? Or is this something new?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I did not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. GROSS. Forty recognized artists to paint pictures of Government projects—is that a part of the arts and humanities program, or is this something new that would come under Pamela's jurisdiction?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That item was not reviewed specifically by the committee. I would point out to the gentleman from Iowa that some of the best art we have in America is the result of the WPA art program.

Mr. GROSS. I should hope we are not returning to the days of the old WPA.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I also should like to commend the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican, and the entire subcommittee for doing an outstanding job on this bill. However, there is one thing that does disturb me, and that is that on April 1, 1971, I introduced a bill, H.R. 7088, with 24 cosponsors. That bill was reported out later on February 3, 1972, by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and then was passed on February 7, 1972, by this House by a vote of 361 to 8. I might read to the Members the last part of the bill where it says:

Appropriation, section 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2.25 million to carry out the provisions of this Act.

I should also like to read to the Members section 1 of the act, Public Law 92-326:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the preservation from imminent destruction the last remaining Tinicum marshland in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with its highly significant ecological features, including a prime habitat for many species of wildlife and a feeding and resting place for migratory wild fowl,

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to establish a Tinicum National Environmental Center and administer the same as a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is 1,200 acres lying within the metropolitan area of Philadelphia, the fourth largest metropolitan area in the United States. The Tinicum Marsh at one time consisted of thousands of acres. It is now down to a maximum of 1,200 acres. Much of the marshland has been

used for the construction of a large part of the Philadelphia International Airport. Every square inch of these 1,200 acres is owned by corporations who, through community pressure and the fact that the Congress did pass this act in the last Congress, have shown restraint and have not used the land for construction purposes.

A landfill has been stopped at the suggestion, and only the suggestion, of a Federal judge who is hesitant to see this case go to litigation. From each side this 1,200 acres is receiving tremendous pressure. One corporation has offered to give the land they own, while another corporation, namely Westinghouse, when I-95 was constructed through property owned by Westinghouse settled for something like \$15,000 per acre. They have offered to sell this land, their remaining land, the marshland to the Department of the Interior at a substantially lower amount than they received from the condemnation, and 90 percent of it was Federal money. So we do have a time limit.

If we drew a radius around this entire marsh of say 12 miles we would encompass approximately 6 million people and if this Tinicum area is properly developed it will not only provide a wildlife refuge and a stopping and feeding place for tens of thousands of wild fowl but will also provide a place where people can go and actually see nature. I would hope we could preserve this.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have no amendments. I have no quarrel with this bill. On the contrary, I have appreciation and understanding for the great significance of this bill and for the work required of the members and staff of the subcommittee. I doubt that it is generally known, but this is one of the most comprehensive of all the appropriation bills in that it covers so many agencies; some of very great importance. Nobody questions the first-line essentiality of the Forest Service or the various programs involved in Indian Affairs or the National Park Service or the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife or the Bureau of Mines or the Youth Conservation Corps to say nothing of the Department of Interior itself. These are names selected at random from the many agencies which come under the jurisdiction of this very important subcommittee.

This has frequently been called the "all-America bill," and in truth it well justifies the title. Anyone who loves the outdoors or who appreciates the grandeur of America's resources or seeks the preservation and protection of our country's assets must be proud of the distinguished manner in which this committee exercises and lives up to its responsibilities.

Now in particular let me pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the committee. There have been many who served with ability and distinction as subcommittee chairmen of appropriations and as chairman of this subcommittee. I question that there have been any who presided with more dignity and

ability and more effectiveness than JULIA HANSEN. I want the record to show that I, as an outdoorsman who loves America and its great natural resources and its beauty, am appreciative and proud of the way that JULIA HANSEN has carried on the very essential work of this subcommittee. She is a great lady—a great Congresswoman. She is ably supported by an outstanding subcommittee and staff. They deserve the full support of the committee and the House on their bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it is rare that we can bring to Congress an appropriations bill which is in effect, a money making proposition. We have here today the Interior and Related Agencies bill for fiscal year 1974. As you know, the legislation contains appropriations for a variety of Department of Interior agencies, plus the U.S. Forest Service within the Department of Agriculture.

Legislation which the Appropriations Committee has reported to the floor adds up to some \$2,269,000 in new obligational budget authority. With carryovers and so forth and other funds, the spending program for fiscal year 1974 would add up to about \$2.9 billion. At the same time, we have revenues which would be generated by agencies funded by this legislation totaling a little over \$2.9 billion. This fact to me demonstrates the wisdom of the wise conservation and utilization of our God-given natural resources.

We need these resources for a variety of things, including recreation of all types, ranging from intensified high use areas to wilderness. We also need these resources, however, for timber production and the legislation before us reflects a timber harvest of 13.1 billion board feet. This is equivalent to the construction of about 1.1 million average size homes.

We have heard a great deal about the need for new homes and adequate housing for our people and we must recognize that to build these homes we need timber.

Again, turning to other areas of interest we have soil, water conservation in the various Department of Interior agencies. We have improvement of our grazing conditions, the husbandry of our all too scarce mineral resources which are so important to our technological society and contribute so much to our high standard of living.

All in all, I think, that the investment is a wise one and I would like to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), and the chairman of the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), for an outstanding job.

We have heard quite frequently, discussions about the "free-spending Congress." Yet here we have a bill in which we have met our responsibilities and reduced the spending recommendations submitted by the administration by nearly \$5 million. The committee in its wisdom has increased some of the funds over and above what was recommended by the President and in other areas they have reduced the recommendations.

A review of these increases and de-

creases reflects very accurately the great consideration for the committee and I hope the Congress, for what I believe, and my colleagues I am sure believe, are the human areas of responsibility.

The biggest increase over the budget in this bill is for Indian education, welfare and health services. We have made over the past 16 years substantial progress in providing for these native Americans, but there is much to be done and it is our hope that through realistic funding, as is recommended by this committee, we will continue on with this effort.

The next major item of increase is in the national forests. The President has called upon the Forest Service to increase its production of timber in order to help face up to the high cost of lumber in the retail market and also the high cost of home construction. If we are going to accomplish this goal we are going to have to spend the money to do it. Therefore, I am pleased to note that the national forest program would be expanded under the recommendations contained in this bill.

The third major area of increase is in the land and water conservation fund. A program which the administration has tried to phase out. This is a program which the Congress has found to be successful in providing adequately for our recreation uses for all people and I think, that its a beneficial program which the Congress should continue.

The other areas of increase represent efforts to solve the energy crisis which we face today and certainly all of us know how important that is.

At this point I would like to single out a specific recommendation made by the committee, this calls for an allocation of \$4,030,450 for the acquisition of lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Forest Service would be utilizing these funds out of the land and water conservation fund. It is our hope that with this start of an acquisition program we can make major strides in protecting the fragile soil structure in the basin and thereby not only enhancing the preservation of this scenic resource but also halting and reversing the pollution and erosion problems which we face there.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this fine bill and commend the committee for an excellent job.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8917. This bill recommends that \$2.3 billion be appropriated for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1974. This is 1 percent less than last year's appropriation and 2 percent below the administration's budget request. It is a reasonable appropriation for a well-managed Department that administers many vital areas of national commitment.

There is included within the allocation for the U.S. Forest Service a line item of particular interest to me, and the people of my district; \$200,000 is earmarked for the specific purpose of expanding the recreational facilities at Mount Rogers National Recreation Area near Abingdon, Va. The funds will make it possible to complete construction of a very desirable portion of the park. In addition, by util-

izing funds already appropriated for Job Corps and Manpower Training personnel, who will perform the work required, this appropriation will result in improvements worth nearly a million dollars.

The proposed improvements will greatly enhance the esthetic value and practical use of the Mount Rogers Recreational Area, and will provide many happy hours of relaxation for nearby residents and visitors alike. Recent years have seen a new awareness of nature's beauty and healing properties. Consequently, more and more people are taking advantage of any opportunity to leave behind the burden and worry of everyday existence to seek solace in simpler things.

I urge my colleagues to vote favorably for H.R. 8917 to enable this and other worthy programs to continue through the next fiscal year.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Interior Department Appropriation for fiscal year 1974 (H.R. 8917). I am especially pleased by the inclusion in this bill of an appropriation of \$6.2 million for Gateway National Recreation Area. This appropriation represents a real and substantial commitment for the development of Gateway.

Gateway is a project which is of great importance to my constituents, because it will provide desperately needed recreational facilities.

I want to commend the distinguished gentlelady from Washington for her efforts to insure that this project is speedily completed.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentlelady from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and her committee for several of the provisions contained in the interior appropriations bill which she has brought to the floor.

I am particularly pleased, Mr. Chairman, that the bill before us recognizes the importance of the role played by the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Mrs. HANSEN has brought us a bill which contains an appropriation of \$346,606,000 for the Forest Service, an increase of \$19,247,000 over the budget estimate. This certainly indicates that the Appropriations Committee recognizes and supports the work done by the Forest Service in preserving our environment and insuring maximum timber production from our forest lands.

The committee has also recognized the need for reduction of U.S. log exports, while encouraging reforestation and timber stand improvement. There are, I believe, sound steps toward solving the impending crisis which the United States faces in the availability of timber products for our own use. We will never meet the national additional housing goals set by Congress unless we plan for additional lumber needs.

As chairman of the Forests Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee, I share the concern expressed by Mrs. HANSEN's committee over the fact that the Forest Service expends an estimated \$20 million yearly to pick up after visitors and repair damage done by vandals in the national forests. This is an expense that could be avoided. If the public were

more careful in the use of these lands and were concerned over their environment, additional funds could be used for critical forest management programs.

Finally, I would like to commend the gentle lady and her committee for recognizing the importance of the Land and Water Conservation Fund in preserving our environment and insuring adequate outdoor recreational opportunities for future Americans. The bill before us appropriates \$71,223,000 for this purpose, an increase of \$16 million over the budget estimate. I am especially pleased Mr. Chairman, that the committee has set aside \$16 million of the funds appropriated for the States to be apportioned through a special account to those States who have fully obligated all previously apportioned moneys, including the funds otherwise apportioned for fiscal year 1974. I certainly share the committee's feeling that these States, including my State of Louisiana, which have taken advantage of the funds appropriated under this program in previous years to preserve and protect their environment while insuring outdoor recreational facilities for their people should not be penalized.

Mr. Chairman, these provisions which I have discussed are in the best interests of the American people. I shall cast the sixth District vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4-11 as supplemented by Public Law 92-347), including \$5,223,000 for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation during the current fiscal year, and acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the State concerned, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2 of said Act as amended, to remain available until expended, not to exceed \$71,223,000, of which not to exceed \$66,000,000 shall be available for payments to the States to be matched by the individual States with an equal amount.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIAMS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS: Page 12 strike lines 1 through 6 inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "State, or Federal agency, concerned, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2 of said Act as amended, to remain available until expended, not to exceed \$73,473,000, of which (1) not to exceed \$66,000,000 shall be available for payments to the States to be matched by the individual States with an equal amount; and (2) not to exceed \$2,250,000 for the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, what I am doing with this amendment is simply adding the \$2.25 million which would

be necessary to acquire the Tinicum Marsh and to convert it into the Tinicum Environmental Center.

During my remarks in general debate, I called attention to the fact that this is the last remaining tidal marshland in Pennsylvania. There is nothing similar to it anywhere else in the country within a metropolitan area. I did remark that we were getting tremendous cooperation from Mr. Richard Griffith, Regional Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, which takes in this part of Pennsylvania and in fact runs all the way from Boston in New England, down to West Virginia. He has said that this is one of the most important projects that he has had to handle in recent years.

I can only say this: I just referred in passing to some of the pressures that are being brought to bear on this 1,200 acres of land within the metropolitan area. Another company involved is the Tinicum Real Estate Holding Co., which is a subsidiary of the First Pennsylvania Bank.

Mr. Richard Griffith of the Department of the Interior, Regional Director, and I have had meetings with the officials of these corporations, and they have agreed to cooperate. We have managed to keep this land open for a period of over 2 years. I can tell the Members that we do not have much chance of continuing to keep it open.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in regard to Tinicum Marsh. It is just across the line from my district in New Jersey. It is very important to preserve this last piece of marshland in Pennsylvania. Everything else is taken up. There is no place for the wildlife to go, no place for the ducks to go, on the eastern flyway, in the rest of that area.

New Jersey quite recently passed a new bill protecting our wetlands across the coastal areas. It is too bad we did not have the foresight to do the same as Pennsylvania, because they have the only piece left over in Tinicum Marsh. It is now paralleled by I-95 highway.

We do need further wildlife sanctuaries. This is very close to the city of Philadelphia. It is a very desirable tract to be kept in the itinerary of the Tinicum land.

I commend the gentleman, and I shall support him when he brings his amendment to a vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his comments.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that a part of this marsh does lie within the city of Philadelphia itself. In fact, city hall is approximately only 9 miles from the marsh.

In addition to all of the benefits we would gain by properly providing for our wildlife and migratory waterfowl, section 3 of the authorization bill makes this statement:

The Secretary shall construct, administer, and maintain at an appropriate site within the Tinicum National Environmental Center hereby authorized a wildlife interpretative center for the purpose of promoting environmental education, and to afford visitors an opportunity for the study of wildlife in its natural habitat.

The only reason I bring this proposal up at this time, rather than waiting for the possibility of having the committee put it in next year, is that the fact that next year may be too late and this land might not be there.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to rise in opposition to the acquisition of land which is very valuable to an area, but unfortunately the Office of Management and Budget did not this year see fit to provide the committee with a proper land and water conservation fund budget. I believe it was a grave mistake.

We have made a very sincere attempt to assist the States to maintain their programs. We have provided an additional \$16 million for this purpose.

I am not going to support and cannot support this additional \$2,250,000. We receive hundreds of requests. The committee had over a billion dollars worth of requests for budget increases. We had to turn many down simply because there is just not enough money.

I would say to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that he should reserve his request until the Office of Management and Budget decides the natural resources of this country should be preserved and sends to us a proper budget.

If we adopt this amendment, then some other Member will have an amendment, and very rapidly we will be over the committee budget ceiling.

I do hope my colleagues will vote against this amendment.

Mr. WARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I merely wish to support the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) in his request for consideration of this very valuable area which should be a national park. I am quite familiar with the area. It adjoins my own district.

I well recall the efforts to preserve this area when I was in the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It required the relocating of the U.S. Highway I-95. It has encountered a number of problems with the Philadelphia International Airport. After many years of struggle we have reached a point where some action can be taken by the Federal Government to preserve this unique area, unique not only in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and adjoining States but indeed unique in the Nation.

Indeed it is unique for the Nation, and I would hope it may be saved.

I might say parenthetically that I well understand the concern of the Chairlady, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) concerning amendments to this bill ad item, but our interest is in but a single situation here.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conceive of

OMB refusing to cooperate in this particular instance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WARE) yield?

Mr. WARE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to repeat that OMB is not running this Congress, and the only reason I am bringing this point up at this time is because it could very easily be our last chance.

Part of the deal that Westinghouse made in their condemnation procedure with the State for the construction of I-95 was to have an access road built into the marsh so they could fill and construct on a major part of these 1,200 acres.

We are not going to let that happen, but we are not going to relinquish this last remaining marshland in Pennsylvania as a wildlife refuge and for the enjoyment of at least 6 million people in the immediate vicinity and of those who appreciate nature.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Members the significance of this vote concerning the Tinicum Marsh.

My colleague, the gentleman from Delaware County, Pa. (Mr. WILLIAMS) makes a crucial point, I think, when he says that if something is not done about this now, the chances are that nothing will be done at all, and that this land may be lost. It is the last tidal marsh in the State of Pennsylvania. It is extremely important from a wildlife point of view; it is important from an ecological point of view.

Mr. Chairman, this may be the last chance the House will have to do something about this project.

I am always most reluctant to ask the House to disagree with my friend, the Chairman of the Committee here today, but this is an emergency situation.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREEN) yield?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREEN) has pointed this out, because as we all know, the pressure will be severe to acquire this marshland for industrial purposes rather than to keep it intact for environmental protection that it will be impossible to save that land in another 2 or 3 years.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, The gentleman from New Jersey is correct and makes some of the points I was about to mention when I yielded to him. There are other important reasons for action now.

This land is right next to the Philadelphia Airport, and I am sure there is tremendous commercial interest in this land.

I have been in and around the area; my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) and I have even taken boat trips through this marsh.

Mr. Chairman, one can see right from the water there literally garbage and rubbish being pushed inch by inch over this area, and it is just a question of time as far as survival for this marsh is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, once again I rise to urge the members to support this amendment and have this treasure for recreation and ecological reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, including teletype rentals and service, and not to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$15,495,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 23, line 18, strike the period and insert the following: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation under this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of any special assistant for field coordination."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which reads as follows:

Page 23, line 18, strike the period and insert the following: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation under this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of any special assistant for field coordination."

Mr. Chairman, several years ago the Interior Department established the position of field coordinator or representative and stationed one in each of eight regions of the Nation. For some time these coordinators did little and were of little value to the Department or the public. But they were costly. Their budget exceeds \$400,000 annually. Gradually, however, several of them began to take on added responsibilities and became little czars. They often overruled other departmental officials. On several occasions the House Committee on Government Operations and my subcommittee objected to this practice.

Finally, it came to my attention that the Interior Department until recently had also been supplementing its appropriation for field coordination by requiring that the various constituent agencies of Interior provide funds, personnel, and services to Interior's field representatives. Last November I called this matter to Secretary Morton's attention, and at the same time again objected to the fact that the field representatives were in a number of cases overruling the recommendations of Interior's bureaus regarding various environmental matters. On January 4 Secretary Morton advised me that he was going to streamline the field coordination function, and on April 9, 1973, he issued an order reorganizing the Secretary's field offices.

The order provides that the personnel detailed by Interior agencies should be

returned to those agencies, and takes from the field coordinators certain functions. But at the same time the order changed the title of "field representative" to "special assistant to the Secretary" and provided that each such special assistant "will have one or more staff assistants."

However, it did not prohibit these new special assistants from utilizing bureau personnel, services, and funds. It did not prohibit them from overruling the bureaus on various matters. Moreover, a review of the departmental manual which sets forth the duties and responsibilities of these special assistants raises a serious question as to whether the public should be spending nearly half a million dollars annually for this purpose.

Several weeks ago, I called these facts to the attention of the Appropriations Committee and urged that these field coordinator positions, which are not required by any law, be abolished. At the very least, I urged that the committee specify in the appropriation act that Interior's constituent agencies shall not be allowed to supplement appropriations for these special assistants by providing funds, personnel or services to them.

Today, I am pleased to note that the Appropriations Committee, to its great credit, has wisely reduced the budget of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior by \$400,000 and specifically disapproved the Department's "proposal to add eight staff assistant positions for the Secretary's regional field representatives." See House Report 93-322, June 22, 1973, page 29.

This is a progressive step in the right direction. It will save the taxpayers money and will improve efficiency in the Department.

But I am concerned that the Interior Department may attempt to continue this useless coordination role using other departmental funds as it has done in the past. Unfortunately, the committee's bill and report does not preclude this possibility. My amendment will prevent this. I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), the chairwoman of the subcommittee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on page 29 of our report the committee makes it quite clear that the request for the additional eight staff assistant positions for the Department regional coordinators was not approved. In addition to that, the committee has reduced the salaries and expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, the committee has reduced the salaries and expenses for the Office of the Secretary by \$400,000. So I believe that the legislative intent in this matter is quite clear. I have no doubt that this legislative intent will be honored by the Department of the Interior. I might add further that I know of no agency of the Government that follows the committee report as me-

ticularly as does the Interior Department.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the amendment is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the committee did discuss this entire matter, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) is aware. We informed the Interior Department that the committee was not agreeable to this proposal, as the report states.

I do not think the amendment is necessary, but I know the gentleman feels he must offer this amendment.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I would say that I do not believe this amendment is at all necessary. As a matter of fact, I hope the amendment is voted down.

We try to deal with these matters, and to see that the Secretary of the Interior has the necessary assets to do his job, and at the same time balance the requirements that our committee has to watch in the budget, and to see that that money is used properly.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see that there is any reason to take a great deal of time on this subject. I will just add again that we have tried to deal with this in the report, and we have discussed these things with the Secretary. So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Washington will yield further, I think that the committee has made a good case that the purpose of the amendment is to make sure that the intent of the committee is carried out.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902 and D.C. Code 4-204).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 26, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"Sec. 106. None of the appropriations made in this title shall be available for any advisory committee, council, board, or similar body which is not established by, or pursuant to, law, unless such committee has been established in accordance with section 9(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (86 Stat. 770) and its charter has been filed in accordance with section 9(c) of said Act."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was to have been printed in the RECORD last night but was not printed because of the lateness of the meeting, although permission was extended.

The amendment simply does away with

the payment of the cost of advisory boards, panels, and commissions which are not established by law. Had it not been for the rule under which we are functioning today which denies me and other Members of Congress the right to attack legislation in the bill now before us, I would be seeking to reach the same result through the device of a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the first annual report of the President on Federal advisory committees, dated March 1973, indicates that as of December 31, 1972, the Department of the Interior had a total of 126 advisory committees, of which only 78 were established by, or pursuant to, statute. The total cost of these committees is over \$472,000 annually, according to the President's report.

Some of these nonstatutory advisory committees are:

First. The Industry Advisory Committee on Coal Exports which was established in 1964 by secretarial memorandum and consists of six members, all from the coal industry.

Second. The Industry Advisory Committee to the Defense Electric Power Administration which was established in 1966 by a Secretary's memorandum. It consists of 11 non-Federal members, all of whom are public and private power executives.

Third. The National Petroleum Council, established in 1946 by secretarial directive, and consisting of over 100 executives from petroleum companies and related industries and law firms, plus the vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

It is interesting to note that, in a statement setting forth the purpose of the National Petroleum Council, which is attached to the Interior Department's annual report of agency advisory committees concerning this Council, the Council states that—

Membership is drawn from all segments of the petroleum and natural gas industries. The Council is supported entirely by the voluntary contributions received from its members.

Yet, astounding as it may seem, in answer to question K on the Interior form which asks what is the estimated "total annual cost to the United States to fund, service, supply, and maintain" the National Petroleum Council, Interior's report gives a figure of \$30,000. Apparently the National Petroleum Council is unaware that it is using Federal funds to carry out its activities. Or is it possible that the Interior Department is unaware that the Council claims that it is funded entirely by "voluntary contributions"?

Fourth. The Emergency Advisory Committee for Natural Gas which was established in 1962 by secretarial directive. It has 26 members from various gas companies, such as El Paso Natural Gas Co., and, at least one member, the chairman of the board of Continental Oil Co., who is also on the National Petroleum Council.

Fifth. The OECD Petroleum Advisory Committee, which was established in 1962

by secretarial directive and has 11 members, all from the petroleum industry.

It is interesting to note that one committee—the Natural Energy Committee—was terminated in September 1972. It was established in September 1970, "to conduct a study to provide the Secretary of the Interior with data upon which national energy policies could be developed." It never met. Yet, according to Interior's report, \$50,000 was available for this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DINGELL was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, on June 22, 1973, when the Committee on Appropriations reported H.R. 8917, no mention was made in that bill or the committee's report—House Report 93-322—of June 22, 1973, about any of these advisory committees. Nor does H.R. 8917 specify an appropriation item for these committees. Apparently, the Interior Department funds these committees out of general appropriations to the Department or its constituent agencies. They do not want us to review that funding. So it is buried in the bill.

The act of March 4, 1909—31 U.S.C. 673—specifically forbids the use of any "public moneys, or of any appropriation made by Congress for the payment of compensation or expenses of any council or other similar body, or—for expenses in connection with any work or the results of any work of any council or other similar body, unless the creation of the same shall be or shall have been authorized by law."

The Federal Advisory Committee Act—Public Law 92-463; October 6, 1972—which applies to all advisory committees, unless otherwise specified by law, provides in section 9(a) a procedure for the establishment of such advisory committees "by law." Until this is done, however, the 1909 law prohibits these committees from expending Federal funds.

My amendment will provide that none of the funds appropriated by this bill may be used for these committees unless they comply with the 1972 act.

I urge adoption of my amendment in order to reduce Federal costs, cut back on the proliferation of unnecessary advisory committees, and most importantly, comply with the congressional mandates of the 1909 and 1972 acts.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to identify some of the committees which, under the gentleman's amendment, would probably fall by the wayside. These apply only to the Department of the Interior. In addition, the committee has a compilation of data relating to advisory committees of the U.S. Forest Service which goes on for 627 pages. The advisory committees for Interior where there is no specific authority are as follows:

Indian Education for Health Committee	\$8,000
O & C District Advisory Boards	5,000
O & C Advisory Board	4,000
Industry Advisory Committee on Coal Exports	
National Advisory Board for Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	10,000
Industry Advisory Committee to the Defense Electric Power Administration	1,000
Advisory Committee on Water Data for Public Use	6,000
Advisory Panel for the USGS National Center for Earthquake Research	5,000
Committee on Minority Participation in Earth Science and Mineral Engineering	7,400
National Park Service Midwest Regional Advisory Committee	6,000
National Capital Memorial Advisory Committee	100
Advisory Board on the San Jose Mission National Historic Site	280
Wolf Trap Farm Park Advisory Board	
National Park Service Western Regional Advisory Committee	7,500
National Park Service Pacific Northwest Regional Advisory Committee	7,500
National Park Service Northeast Region Advisory Committee	6,000
Historic American Engineering Record Advisory Committee	4,000
Natural Sciences Advisory Committee	2,500
Historic American Buildings Survey Advisory Board	4,000
Emergency Advisory Committee for Natural Gas	8,000
OECD Petroleum Advisory Committee	3,500
National Petroleum Council	30,000

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to several provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act which the gentleman refers to. In the first place, the very first sentence in the Act states that—

Congress finds that there are numerous committees, boards, commissions, councils, and similar groups which have been established to advise officers and agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government and that they are frequently a useful and beneficial means of furnishing expert advice, ideas, and diverse opinions to the Federal Government.

It seems quite clear to me that Congress did not say that all advisory committees are bad. Yet the gentleman's amendment would affect both the good and the bad without discrimination.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I would call the committee's attention to section 5 of the act. That section places clear responsibility on the committees of Congress to review the need for advisory committees. It states that in exercising its legislative review function, each committee shall take appropriate action to abolish, revise, or merge advisory committees. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the appropriate place to review this network of committees is in the legislative committees where the process can be careful and selective.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point the committee's attention to section 14 of the act which says that "each advisory committee which is in existence on the effective date of this act shall terminate not later than the expiration of the 2-year period following such effective date unless **** certain conditions are met. The act, therefore, pro-

vides for the orderly termination of advisory committees.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Federal Advisory Committee Act is a good piece of legislation. It provides for an orderly, thorough review of all committees and for the orderly termination of those that are wasteful or unnecessary. The act was enacted on October 6, 1972, and became effective on January 4 of this year. Let us give the act a chance before we start using the meat-axe approach to its implementation. Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE).

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state to the Members of the House that I share the opinion of the gentlewoman from Washington. The Committee on Government Operations has enacted a specific statute to try to deal with this problem in an orderly and effective process.

I regret to say that I must disagree with my distinguished colleague from Michigan on this amendment. I think he is wrong here in not separating the good from the bad and not trying to do it in an orderly manner.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the last two speakers.

Last year, Congress passed legislation which would abolish all advisory boards in about 2 years unless they were extended by act of Congress, all boards that do not have a specific termination date in legislation creating them.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose there was to get rid of deadwood type advisory boards and put on Congress a specific burden to continue those performing a viable service and which should be continued. Two weeks ago, this House approved a continuation of the National Historic Advisory Council, because it was meeting in connection with our national historic program. Several of these other advisory councils performing important services with regard to the operation of our national parks, and I feel as to those that the Interior Committee, which studies and deals with the national parks, should have an opportunity to consider them individually as to whether they should be abolished or not.

Mr. Chairman, they should not be abolished by an amendment in this manner.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise here to attack or support advisory committees, but only to support the proposition that funds within an appropriation of this type should only go to advisory committees which are authorized by law. It seems to me that this is a very simple proposi-

tion. That is all this amendment says, as I read it.

Mr. Chairman, had this matter come before us without certain waivers of points of order, these advisory committees could be stricken out. This appropriation for advisory committees could be stricken out on a point of order.

It does seem to me that if the advisory committee is worth maintaining under Executive order, then somebody ought to be willing to put up the money from some previously appropriated fund.

To provide for advisory committees that are not established by law seems to me to be beyond a proper use of funds under this bill. I am not against advisory committees generally, but it does seem to me that the authorizing committee should justify the expenditure and look into the question before advisory committees are permitted to be financed by governmental money.

I support the amendment.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to agree with the gentleman from Texas on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan. If there is anything we have too much of in this Government these days it is more advisory boards and committees.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for taking the floor.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I certainly agree on this point. It does seem to me if it is a good advisory committee it ought to be able to sell itself to the authorizing committee.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; purchase or rental of two passenger motor vehicles; purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees; \$55,438,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we also are surfeited in this Government with people on whom we spend a good many millions of dollars for studying things of one kind and another.

I note the Appropriations Committee has approved an increase in counterpart funds to the tune of \$1 million to sustain Smithsonian Institution do-gooders in the globe-trotting style to which they have become accustomed. At \$4.5 million, this year's request favors archeol-

ogists who are supposed to bring you a report on such projects as "The Cultural, Economic, and Social Impact of Rural Road Construction" in Poland at a cost of \$85,000 for fiscal year 1974. Incidentally, the same fellow wandered about the paths of Poland last year and managed to spend \$30,000. If nothing else, he learned how to soak Uncle Sucker for another year at an increase of \$55,000—page 29.

Biology, earth science, and museum enthusiasts did not fare as well as the archeologists this year. They will have to be content with the same level of funding received last year.

I can only wonder what led Congress to provide authority for such as this:

A project in Yugoslavia which will purportedly tell all there is to know about what hermit crabs say to one another. That costs \$5,000 in Yugoslav currency—page 62.

Over the years, the biological rhythms of catfish and flatfish which inhabit the streams of India have been under the looking glass of American braintrusters. Not satisfied with the \$8,000 received last year, the flatfish experts want another \$4,000 to continue their studies—page 38.

Another project to again receive the Smithsonian's favor is the "Ecology of Hoolock Gibbons" which, we are told, is studied because like man, it "mates for life." I suggest that before the mating experts spend another \$5,000 in India, they might give further study to the concept of and increased divorce at home—page 40.

I will wager that it will take some explaining if the equivalent of \$6,000 is spent to study bisexual frogs in Poland. I am sure we could not get along without that one—page 54.

Last year, \$15,000 was spent on the "Comparative Bioenergies of the House Sparrow" of India. I see they wanted another \$3,000 for it this year—page 41.

I am somewhat stymied by a proposal to spend \$5,000 to compare the similarities between American and Indian whistling ducks—page 46—but I note that lizards are also well provided for. While the experts want to spend \$3,000 in search of Indian lizards—page 47—Yugoslav lizards must be less plentiful as it will require \$15,000 to find them—page 60.

You may recall the Smithsonian sent a man to India last year to survey the tiger population. I fail to notice a request for continued funding for that project this year, and I was wondering if he returned alive. At any rate, this year researchers will be receiving \$35,000 to chase wild boars in Pakistan. We have already spent \$73,000 on that, and some \$50,000 to conduct "A Survey of the Wild Sheep and Goat Population" also in Pakistan which cost \$10,000 last year.

Mr. Chairman, from the collection of moss in Burma—page 32—to the collection of art high in the Himalayas of Bhutan—page 16—you will find Uncle Sucker an easy catch for researchers waiting to lure a sponsor.

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

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein. This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1974".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SEIBERLING

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEIBERLING: Page 41, after line 18, insert the following new subsection:

SEC. 303. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be expended for any expense in connection with any lease, permit, approval, or other action hereafter authorizing surface coal mining on any lands within any area of the National Park System; the National Wildlife Refuge System; the National Wilderness System; or the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, including "study rivers" designated under section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment.

The committee report notes that the Interior Committee of the House is considering and has been for some time considering legislation concerning the control of the strip mining of coal. That legislation is still working its way through the subcommittee, but it seems to me there is one thing we can do to make perfectly clear the position of the Congress with respect to the lands where, as a matter of policy, the executive branch departments do not authorize new coal strip mines but where the Congress has never expressly ratified that policy.

All this does is to say that the funds we are appropriating here shall not be used for granting any additional permits, other than those that already exist, for strip mining coal in national parks, national wildlife refuges, national wilderness systems, or areas set aside as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. It does not prevent anybody from doing so who already has rights to mine the coal, and it does not affect any minerals other than coal, but it does make it clear that Congress backs the policy already in existence with respect to those areas.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I am pleased that the gentleman from Ohio has offered this amendment to ban strip mining in certain areas. I hope that eventually the Congress in its wisdom will vote a complete ban on strip mining everywhere. Mark my words, that day will come. This amendment really does not go far enough, it seems to me, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio. It does not cover national forests, and there is strip mining going on in the gentleman's own State in the Wayne National Forest in Ohio. There are 24 permits for strip mining, covering 1,800 acres in the Wayne National Forest. The amendment does not cover deep mining which causes great damage in the areas that the gentleman is interested in protecting. It seems to me the gentleman's

amendment really ought to be extended to cover those areas, but I enthusiastically support it nevertheless and strongly urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SEIBERLING. It does not go far enough, I agree. And I might say I also feel that, in the end, we will come to realize that a phaseout of coal strip mining is in the national interest, both from an energy standpoint and an environmental standpoint. I also appreciate the advice and assistance the gentleman has given me on this amendment. It has been most helpful.

The reason why it does not cover national forests is a purely technical one, which is that there is money in this bill to authorize experimental work on reclamation of strip mining of coal in national forest land. Since, under the House rules, we cannot have legislation in an appropriation bill, I was unable to draft an exception which would cover that particular provision in the bill. For that reason, and in deference to the wish of the distinguished chairwoman of the subcommittee (Mrs. HANSEN) that I not propose action which would block that experimental work, I eliminated the reference to national forest land. However, I am sure she will agree with me that, by deleting the reference to national forests, we are not thereby approving the principle of surface mining of coal in national forest land.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I did discuss the amendment with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, and I think he will recognize there is \$1,700,000 in this bill for Project SEAM, which is a research and demonstration program devoted to finding better ways to reclaim surface-mined areas.

There is also experimental work going on in Berea, Ky. There is also a continuing program going on in Utah in the dry, arid lands. It would seem to me that it would be irresponsible to cut off this research given our present energy crisis. At the same time, as the gentleman knows, the Interior authorizing committees in both Houses are marking up strip mine regulation bills. This amendment, which proposes to prohibit surface coal mining in the National Park System, the National Wildlife Refuge System, the National Wilderness System, and the Wild and Scenic Rivers System certainly does no violation to this needed research.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this subject up, and the wording the gentleman has used. I certainly have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full 5 minutes, and I will try not to take even 1 minute. However, I want the record to show, and I want the Members to know that strip mining is taking place now in the national grasslands of the State of Wyoming.

The Members in the Congress created

the national grasslands in the interim while I was not in the Congress, and the time that I came back. So I now wish to make it a matter of official record that strip mining is going to take place in the national grasslands.

Mr. Chairman, I know that we cannot change the amendment to include them, but I do take the floor at this time so as to have this made a matter of record for the balance of our Congress, so that the Members and the proper committees can work upon it.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Wyoming on his remarks. The gentleman from Wyoming is absolutely right. This merely points up the fact that the only solution to the giant rip-off involved in strip mining is for the Congress to enact a complete ban on this assault on our land, forests, waters, and soil. We hear a great deal about the "energy crisis," and some of my colleagues ask me: "How can you favor a ban on strip mining when the Nation faces an energy crisis?" The answer to this question is very clear: There are only 45 billion tons of coal available which can be strip-mined economically with current technology. Even the most rigidly conservative estimate of the tonnage of deep-minable coal which can be extracted economically with current technology would place the figure at 356 billion tons—which is eight times as much deep-minable as strip-minable coal.

A recent study made for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs places the ratio of deep to strip coal at 30 to 1. In any event, it is vital if we are to meet the energy crisis to stockpile our strip-minable coal reserve underground to be utilized if needed after we have used up our deep-minable coal reserves. This is why I have introduced H.R. 1000, and companion bills, which phase out the strip mining of coal in steep, contour areas within 6 months, and phase out the deep mining of coal within 18 months in relatively flat areas.

This is why I consider the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) as a very constructive step in the right direction, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the hour is late. I believe that this amendment is absolutely worthless. It purports to ban strip mining where none exists, and it does not address itself one iota to the areas where it does exist. It borders upon the ludicrous, but it does not violate, of course, the spirit or the efforts of our committee in overseeing the national public lands. It is inconceivable that strip mining, for example, would ever occur in a national park.

In that spirit, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment but, as I say, I do not think the amendment does any good.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 8917) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 4, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

YEAS—405

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Armstrong
Ashley
Aspin
Bafalis
Baker
Barrett
Beard
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Blester
Bingham
Blackburn

Boggs
Boland
Bowen
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carey, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio

Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Clay
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conlan
Conte
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Culver
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.

Daniels, Dominick V.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gunter
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hanrahan
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Hogan
Hollifield
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Huber
Hudnut
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord

Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keating
Kemp
Ketchum
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lott
Lujan
McClary
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKinney
McSpadden
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mailliard
Mallory
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvisinsky
Michel
Milford
Miller
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Owens
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Poage
Podell
Powell, Ohio
Pryor
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pritchard

Quile
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rarick
Rees
Regula
Reid
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncalio, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousslet
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Schneebell
Schroeder
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Shuster
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steed
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Studds
Sullivan
Symington
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Treen
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vessey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall

Wiggins	Wolf	Young, Fla.
Williams	Wright	Young, Ga.
Wilson, Bob	Wyatt	Young, Ill.
Wilson,	Wyder	Young, S.C.
Charles H.,	Wylie	Young, Tex.
Calif.	Wyman	Zablocki
Wilson,	Yates	Zion
Charles, Tex.	Yatron	Zwach
Winn	Young, Alaska	

NAYS—4

Collins, Tex.	Landgrebe	Mathis, Ga.
Gross		

NOT VOTING—24

Ashbrook	Derwinski	Mills, Ark.
Badillo	Dorn	Murphy, Ill.
Blatnik	Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.
Bolling	Fisher	Pike
Breaux	Goldwater	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Hays	Sisk
Conyers	Hungate	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	King	Thompson, N.J.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Evins of Tennessee

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hungate.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Murphy of Illinois.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Danielson with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Pike with Mr. Sisk.

Mr. Badillo with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. King.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hays.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION AND PERSONNEL AND STUDENT STRENGTH

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5383) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels and construction of shore and offshore establishments, to authorize appropriations for bridge alterations, to authorize for the Coast Guard an end-year strength for active duty personnel, to authorize for the Coast Guard average military student loads, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 10, insert:

"AIRCRAFT

"For procurement of a long range search and rescue helicopter, \$3,000,000."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "\$72,510,000" and insert "\$75,260,000".

Page 4, after line 19, insert:

"(27) At a location between San Francisco, California, and Astoria, Oregon: Establish helicopter search and rescue station."

Page 4, line 21, strike out "37,482" and insert "37,607".

Page 5, line 3, strike out "4,000" and insert "4,006".

Page 5, after line 17, insert:

"Sec. 6. (a) Section 1 of the Act of June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1544, 46 U.S.C. 367), as amended, is further amended by deleting the entire third sentence and substituting in lieu thereof the following sentence: 'The exemption in the preceding sentence for cannery tender or fishery tender vessels shall continue in force for five years from July 11, 1973.'

"(b) Section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 404), as amended, is further amended by deleting the entire last sentence and substituting in lieu thereof the following sentence: 'The exemption in the preceding sentence for cannery tender and fishery tender vessels shall continue in force for five years from July 11, 1973.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, to authorize for bridge alterations, to authorize for the Coast Guard an end-year strength for active duty personnel, to authorize for the Coast Guard average military student loads, and for other purposes."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentlewoman be good enough to give us a brief explanation of the Senate amendments?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I shall be happy to.

Mr. GROSS. The request is to concur in the Senate amendments?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I should appreciate a brief explanation of the Senate amendments, as to whether they are germane and whether the figures in the bill were increased or decreased.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. All the amendments the Senate added are germane.

The first Senate amendment would add an additional \$2 million to the authorization bill for a long-range search and rescue helicopter which would be suitable for basing at Alaskan Coast Guard facilities such as Cordova, Alaska. There was nothing in the House bill for this. The amendment is germane, and the added \$3 million cost is justified by the search and rescue and safety aspects of the helicopter.

The second amendment would add an additional \$2,750,000 to the bill for the construction of a helicopter search and rescue station to be located at a suitable point between San Francisco, Calif., and Astoria, Oreg. Also, an additional 44 personnel will be added to the Coast Guard end strength levels to man this base.

The reason for this amendment was that the north coast of California is inadequately served by the existing Coast Guard installations located at San Francisco and Astoria, and flight time from these installations is excessive, especially in view of the growing number of boating incidents.

The amendment is germane, and the

added cost would appear to be justified by the additional safety and surveillance capability provided.

The other amendment was in response to the Coast Guard attempt to close 6 of the 23 search and rescue stations in the State of Michigan, which has 3,177 miles of coastline and an avid boating population. The Senate authorized an additional 46 personnel to keep 3 of these 6 stations in operation.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, Senator MANGUSON added two amendments on the Senate floor. The first amendment increased the year-end strength of personnel from 37,572 to 37,607. These figures include the personnel for the base in California.

The present authority exempts six cannery and fishing tender vessels used in the salmon and crab fisheries in the States of Oregon and Alaska from certain inspection requirements of the Coast Guard. This authority expires on July 11 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, the original exemption was afforded these vessels because they differ significantly in construction and operation from the general class of vessels included in the inspection requirements.

The Coast Guard is presently developing separate requirements for these vessels, but they have not been completed. Thus the Senate voted to extend this exemption for 5 additional years.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is germane and would not result in any additional cost. The Coast Guard supports the amendment, and it was added at the insistence of Senator MANGUSON.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) for her explanation.

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) yield for another question?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FROELICH).

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentlewoman, is there any language in this amendment regarding those six stations that remain open that happen to be in Michigan?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No, they did not name the stations referred to that remain open. But they are supposed to be in the State of Michigan, because of the boating activity in that area.

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, there is just as much boating activity in Wisconsin.

Does this specifically limit it to Michigan?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that it limits it to the State of Michigan. They were going to close 23 stations, and of that number these six will be kept open.

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, unless that is a general amendment that allows the House to work its will, I will be forced to object.

The House committee included a 30-day study that would have permitted after the study the priority listing with the increase of the \$600,000 in the appropriation bill to apply on a priority basis, rather than limiting it to any particular States.

If this amendment in the Senate limits this just to the State of Michigan, I am forced to object to that specific amendment.

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

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask, will some Member please inform me whether this applies just to the State of Michigan and thus making the 30-day study by the House committee of no value?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FROELICH) yield?

Mr. FROELICH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the only thing that we know, the amendments were insisted on by Senator GRIFIN of Michigan, and although the Coast Guard does not particularly support these amendments because of the indirect cost relating to the Coast Guard budget, they, nevertheless, passed the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN)?

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to that particular amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FROELICH) has an objection under consideration to the specific Senate amendment.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FROELICH) yield further?

Mr. FROELICH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that while these six stations are in the State of Michigan, it depends upon the result of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN)?

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, I am forced to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

USE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6330) to amend section 8 of the Public Building Act of 1959, relating to the District of Columbia, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 607) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Notwithstanding the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 or any other provision of law, the Armory Board (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Board'), created by the Act of June 4, 1948 (D.C. Code, sec. 2-1702), is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the conduct in the Robert F. Kennedy Stadium authorized

by such Act of 1957 of major league football, baseball, and softball, and motorcycle races, rodeos, musical concerts, and other events, and to increase the seating capacity of such stadium by an additional number of seats, not to exceed eight thousand, and at a cost not to exceed \$1,500,000. Notwithstanding such Act of 1957, or any other provision of law, the Board is further authorized to borrow such sums as may be necessary to provide for the additional seating authorized by this subsection in accordance with the following terms and conditions, which terms and conditions shall be effective during the period that any of such sums so borrowed remain unpaid:

"(A) 50 per centum of all revenues from professional football derived from such additional seats shall be used solely for the purpose of repaying the sums borrowed for such seats.

"(B) 44 per centum of such revenues shall be paid to the team operating under the trade name of the Washington Redskins, or its successors; and

"(C) 6 per centum of such revenue shall be subject to the provisions of section 6 of such Act of 1957.

"(2) In no case shall the National Football League or any team within such league (other than the aforementioned Redskins team or its successors), during the period within which any part of such sum so borrowed pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection remains unpaid, be considered as being entitled to, or as acquiring any right in connection with, any part of the revenues attributable to the additional seats authorized by this subsection."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell us about this?

Mr. GRAY. I will be delighted to if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. There are no substantive changes, I will say to my good friend from Iowa, but because of the question he raised earlier about the assurances that no Federal or District of Columbia moneys would be involved, the Senate report contains very clear language, and I will quote:

There will be no Federal or D.C. guarantees or underwriting of any obligation undertaken by authority of this bill.

In addition to that, the Senate wrote in an amendment stating that the District of Columbia during the time of the repayment of the loan would get 6 percent of all the revenues, which should aggregate \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year to the taxpayers when all 8,000 seats have been installed. When the loan has been repaid the regular percentage of 12 percent would accrue to the District of Columbia. I am sure the changes are in full agreement with the gentleman's taxpayers and their best interests since the bill requires no underwriting on the part of the Federal Government. When all seats have been installed it will provide about \$800,000 in additional revenue to the District of Columbia each year and an additional 88,000 people will be allowed to see games there.

We wrote in the report that at least 11,000 seats must be offered to the general public each season; that is, 1,000 per game for 11 games.

As I said when the bill passed the

House, this is an all-American bill. We provide improvements through the sale of tickets, thereby letting the people who use the seats pay for them. At the same time the Government will receive a lot of free revenues.

Mr. GROSS. What number of seats is being provided?

Mr. GRAY. The 1,000 new seats can be installed this year if we get the bill passed and signed soon and the loan closed and then 7,000 removable seats will be put in for the 1974 season, or a grand total of 8,000.

Mr. GROSS. There is no obligation whatsoever on the part of the taxpayers of this country or the District of Columbia?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And there is no obligation on the part of the Federal Government at any time in the future to guarantee the financing through the Armory Board. Is that correct?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is eminently correct. Plus it is written and spelled out in the report—\$1.5 million is being put up by the bankers of the District of Columbia with no faith or credit being furnished either on the part of the District government or the Federal Government. The Armory Board and the District of Columbia bankers are depending solely on the sale of tickets to recoup the money.

I think we should highly commend the banks in the District of Columbia who are willing to take part in this important community project.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is assuring us that neither he nor anyone else on behalf of the Committee on Public Works will be back here asking us to finance the seats if they do not pay out?

Mr. GRAY. An unequivocal yes, I will say to the gentleman.

This gentleman will not be back asking the taxpayers for any money since the Redskins fans are knocking the doors down to buy the tickets. They could sell all of the seats in advance if they wanted to.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because I support this bill; I wish to address myself to any Federal obligation this legislation might incur. It is the position of the House Committee on Public Works and likewise of the same committee in the other body that this bill in no way commits either the Federal Government or the District of Columbia to assume any obligation, either now or in the future, incurred as a result of the borrowing authority granted in this legislation. This position is clearly spelled out in the Senate report on H.R. 6330; it is in the legislative history in that Chamber, and it is certainly part of the legislative history in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the other body has improved on this measure and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, supplementing my previous remarks, I want to reiterate the

words appearing in the Senate report. They are as follows, and I quote:

There will be no Federal or District of Columbia guarantee or underwriting of any obligation undertaken by authority of this bill.

That is exactly what the House intends. That is our construction of the language of the bill itself and we expect that the sole security for any loan incurred under this legislation for these purposes shall be the receipts from the sale of these seats.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois about a point that may be understood, but I do not have that information.

Who will be available now to have these 8,000 seats that are being provided?

Mr. GRAY. I will say to my friend from Texas that there are approximately 15,000 people on the waiting list for these 8,000 tickets. The Redskins wanted to take all of the people on the waiting list and provide them with the new seats, but we said no, there are a number of people who are not financially able to buy a season ticket; therefore, we should offer at least 1,000 seats per game on a first-come, first-serve basis. That will be done.

That will insure that 11,000 people will be able to see games each season by putting that many tickets on sale at the window on a first-come, first-serve basis.

Mr. PICKLE. Then the other 7,000 tickets will be for people whom the Redskins management chooses to sell tickets to?

Mr. GRAY. Those who have been patiently waiting for tickets.

Mr. PICKLE. So if a person is not on the waiting list now, this will not enable them to get a ticket, will not help them at all.

I might say that I have not been able to buy a ticket out there in years. So, if a person has not made an application in advance for tickets, there is no chance for them. For instance, a Member of Congress or anyone else, so they would have to make application and possibly they could be one of the 7,000?

Mr. GRAY. I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, that we hope that all the Members of this body, or anyone else that would like to have tickets can do so, and go ahead and write a letter and ask to be put on the list, because we have asked the Redskins to review the present ticketholders and find those who have large blocks of tickets plus the scalpers and cut down on their numbers. Mr. Ed Bennett Williams, the president of the Redskins, has assured me this is being done, therefore by next season or no later than 1974 we may have several thousand additional seats to offer the public in addition to the 8,000 seats authorized in this bill.

So I do not want to discourage anyone from writing a letter to the Redskin management asking to buy a ticket. We will do everything we can to see that

there is an equitable distribution of tickets.

Mr. PICKLE. If the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) were to make an application for four tickets, would his name be just put in the pot?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman from Iowa or the gentleman from Texas wants to attend a game see me in the cloakroom and I will give you my ticket.

Mr. PICKLE. Had the gentleman thought about drawing lots, or some other means of distribution?

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY)?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 8860

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 8860.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. W. C. SCRIVNER

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today Mrs. W. C. Scrivner of Belleville, Ill., is being inaugurated as the 1973-74 president of the Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association.

As a resident of the 23d Congressional District of Illinois, Mrs. Scrivner brings national recognition to the area. I am proud of her fine accomplishment.

At this point, I include her biography and her inaugural address:

BIOGRAPHY

"The ground swell of humanism has not escaped the attention of our Woman's Auxiliary, for part of our thrust this year will deal with nutrition and child abuse. To accomplish this and the rest of our goals will require an active, growing membership, inspiring committee leadership and member participation."

With these words, Mrs. Willard C. Scrivner, 1973-74 president of the Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, challenged auxiliary members to active participation in meeting community needs.

Installed at the 1973 convention in New York City, Mrs. Scrivner set the year's priority programs: better nutrition for all ages, with emphasis for the aging; children and youth, with special emphasis on child abuse; and safety, with emphasis on street and pedestrian safety, hazards of flammable fabrics, dangerous toys, medicine and poisonous household substances.

Long active in auxiliary work, Mrs. Scrivner has been national first vice president, a director, chairman of the home-centered health care committee and North Cen-

tral Regional vice president. She was president of her state auxiliary, as well as serving as vice president, a district councillor, a director and chairman of the revisions and resolutions committee. A member of her county auxiliary since 1934, she was president of that organization in 1952-53 and has served many chairmanships.

"It seems the good life must begin with improved health education translated into proper nutrition and health habits to carry our people through life," she has said. "Attaining and supporting the good life will depend to a significant degree on community commitment."

Mrs. Scrivner has herself been active in numerous community activities, in addition to her auxiliary work. These have included Red Cross activities for more than 25 years; activating a parent's organization in Signal Hill School and serving as vice president for two years; being the first woman to be elected to her area school board; activating the Home Care Association of St. Clair County; being a member of the National Investment Clubs of America; and being a member of the Child Care Association of Illinois. She was appointed to the White House Conference on Aging by the Illinois governor in 1972, and presently is a member of the Board of Directors of the Belleville chapter of the American Red Cross.

Born Ruth Shaw in East St. Louis, Ill., Mrs. Scrivner attended Washington University School of Nursing in St. Louis, Mo., where she received her R.N. Further education was pursued at Washington University and Missouri University, from which she received a bachelor of science degree. Her career has included teaching medical nursing; being supervisor of men's medical at Barnes Hospital in St. Louis; teaching basic nursing to freshman nursing students; teaching clinical microscopy; and teaching basic nursing principles to freshman medical students.

Mrs. Scrivner first met her husband at a church picnic. Later, when she was a nurse and he a student at Barnes Hospital, their paths crossed again, and they were married in 1931.

Dr. Scrivner, a gynecologist and obstetrician, is 1973-74 president of the Illinois State Medical Society. He has been a member of the board of trustees of that organization since 1963, and has served on and been chairman of its maternal welfare committee, and has been chairman of the ethical relations committee. A member of the St. Clair County Medical Society, he was president in 1948, has been chairman of and active on many committees and serves on the executive committee. Dr. Scrivner is a member of the AMA's Committee on Health Care of the Poor; was president of the Southern Illinois Medical Society in 1962; president of the American Association for Maternal and Child Health in 1967; and is a member of many medical and civic organizations. He is the author of 22 published scientific and educational articles in medical journals.

The couple has two children, Peter C. Scrivner, administrative assistant to Congressman Melvin Price in Washington, D.C.; and Roger M. Scrivner, an attorney in Belleville, Ill. Both sons are married and have children.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

The honor and privilege of being your president is appreciated and the responsibility of the office duly recognized. Today is the day for assuming responsibilities beyond my personal capacities, but with the help of you and 90,000 members under divine guidance, the task will be done. Captured by the rich tradition of our organization over the past 50 years by outstanding leaders preceding me, my hope and endeavor

will be that the organization will not have suffered as a result of my stewardship.

As your President, I shall be ever mindful of contributions of those before me while being currently beneficiary of our organization's prestige and achievements.

While visiting NASA last January, I noticed this quotation of Robert H. Goddard, Father of Rocketry, inscribed on one of the walls—"It is difficult to say what is impossible, for the dream of yesterday is the hope of today and the reality of tomorrow." This is certainly applicable to our organization in its ongoing forward movement. If it took leadership only, we'd be in Utopia today, but we all know real progress can only result from combined efforts of all our members.

While recognizing the talents, ideas and contributions of individuals from all sections of this great country, it would seem the most fruitful results occur when the group action prevails. With biased attacks by government, news media, and consumer, it behooves us to present a united front to our critics. We do not have the time nor can we afford prima donnas or splinter groups if we are to maintain effective leadership in protecting and improving the health of our fellow citizens. (Remember, the banana that leaves the bunch gets skinned.)

Special tribute is due Mrs. Robert F. Beckley (Huldah) for her dedicated service, for it is my feeling our 50th anniversary year was one of consolidation with encouraging prospects for tranquil progress this year and hopefully, the future.

My sincere thanks to all members of the Woman's Auxiliary to the Illinois State Medical Society and to Illinois State Medical Society for their interest and efforts in preparing me for this national office. Steeped in convictions that we can do more when united and through strength we can—and will be more successful, I earnestly plead we herd our efforts for unity, strength and effectiveness. Strength and effectiveness with a purpose should be our goal.

Somehow, the idea that there is a "crisis in our present health care system" has been accepted by many people. Some critics in and out of government falsely maintain organized medicine has restrained medical school enrollment and physician supply. Yet the facts are physician supply is increasing about 3 percent per year while general population increase is less than 1 percent.

In almost every instance organized medicine directly or indirectly, through various activities including legislative persuasion, has been instrumental in increasing our nation's medical schools from 85 to 110. Furthermore, it has been estimated by a reliable source that an adequate number of physicians will be obtained by 1980. It would seem desirable to separate fact from fallacy. For health care, including distribution of physicians, is a responsibility of all our citizens while medical care is a major responsibility of the medical profession.

It seems there is a strong desire and uniting effort among physicians to tell their view and provide workable solutions to improve health care with quality medical care at acceptable costs. The quiet men and women of medicine were further stimulated to have the story told as it really is and not as portrayed on the NBC TV program. (It behooves the media to remember when you throw mud you lose ground.)

As an auxiliary this is but one example of a part of our obligation to know the facts in order to refute misrepresentation by our critics. We must be informed—involved—articulate, 90,000 strong through national, state and county auxiliaries.

An official physician survey revealed improved communication and public relations among their top priorities. Just think what

a P.R. job we could do if every eligible physician's wife joined our ranks. The two words "Information" and "Communication" are often used interchangeably, but they signify quite different things. Information is giving out; communication is getting through.

We are confident our committee chairmen are equal to the challenges of their appointments and we know your officers and board members will fulfill requests from our policy making House of Delegates.

While we enjoy separate organization status, we shall hold steadfast to our traditional relationship with the American Medical Association. Functioning through our programs and projects, the doctors' wives and widows shall endeavor to serve as catalysts, leaders and opinion-makers along the general guidelines and policies of the AMA.

The time honored role of the volunteer will enable us to best serve as leaders in our respective communities. Each project and program in our several communities should not become our sole responsibility if we had planned well and been good catalysts.

Our official ongoing programs will be fully supported while we measure our efforts in new areas of community involvement in assessing our effectiveness and our resources. Our fiscal conscience will require proposals for new ventures and involvement of our organization to be accompanied by a plan to finance.

We desire individuals and committees to be sufficiently familiar with our policies and guidelines to avoid those inexplicable lapses of communication which plague all organizations from time to time.

Physicians are adaptable, flexible and in a unique position to detect health needs, propose meaningful recommendations as exemplified by Medicare, a plan for financing health care. The medical profession is on record favoring practical preventive medicine and health education, has fostered physician placement and pilot program to ease the rural and inner city problems.

While unity calls for a degree of conformity to protocol, we shall maintain sufficient flexibility to recognize the minority opinion and the right to dissent to the outer perimeter of safety to insure our unity.

While we hope never to overlook or underestimate the brilliant and apparent contribution emerging from our ranks, we firmly believe our auxiliary, the public, our communities will benefit most from a skillful orchestration of all our efforts rather than the temporary blinding light of a shortlived super star, for wearing your halo too tightly gives others a headache, too.

To our critics we may well say, blaming the medical profession alone for health care deficiency is as plausible as placing the blame for inferior education and leaky toilets on teachers and plumbers. And we may quite properly add—what new medical system will reverse highway deaths, inner city homicides—what new medical system will change those teenagers with their drug culture—what new medical system will keep psychotic parents from battering their babies to bloody pulp—certainly none of the systems existing in less democratic countries than America have achieved these objectives.

Our tasks as an auxiliary are many—our goal is clear—to aid the medical profession in its objectives and work for improvement in the quality of life through better health care for every American.

CONCERNING INTRODUCTION OF THE ANTIARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious and least understood problems facing elderly and handicapped citizens is the large number of architectural and transportation barriers that thoughtlessly stand in their way.

Today, along with Congressman BURKE of Massachusetts, I am introducing in the House the Antiarchitectural Barriers Act of 1973. This bill, which is virtually identical to legislation introduced in the Senate by Senators PERCY and DOLE, provides tax incentives to encourage owners of commercial buildings and transportation facilities to remove existing barriers from the paths of the aged and disabled.

The exact number of mobility-limited individuals in the United States is unknown, but several estimates underscore the immensity of the situation. According to the National Center for Health Statistics, there are approximately 6 million physically handicapped persons whose mobility is restricted as a result of a chronic or long-term medical condition. This group is of major national concern because greater accessibility to private buildings and public transportation is likely to bring about significant changes in their lives.

Elderly citizens constitute the largest sector of the population that regularly experiences difficulty with structural barriers. These 16,500,000 Americans are unique among the handicapped because their restricted mobility is as much a product of the natural process of aging as of illness or injury.

The Department of Transportation estimates that there are at least another 4.6 million people at any one point in time who are temporarily disabled by a serious but short-term sickness or injury. Still others live with less obvious handicaps such as heart disease, respiratory difficulties, and vertigo suffering. When all of these groups are added, they total approximately 44 million people who would benefit immeasurably in social and economic opportunities if architectural barriers were eliminated.

Throughout the 20th century, mobility-restricted persons have been forced to overcome a melange of environmental barriers which most able-bodied individuals take for granted. These barriers include the presence of such impediments as:

Doors too narrow for wheelchairs or too heavy to open for an individual using crutches;

Long stairways too steep for the sufferers of respiratory disease;

Obstructions in the paths of the blind;

Inadequate restrooms with toilet stalls not wide enough for the wheelchair-bound.

Despite these formidable barriers and the large numbers of citizens affected, many people remain unaware that any problem exists. In one nationwide survey, two-thirds of all persons interviewed said they had given the matter little or no thought.

Nevertheless, I am convinced that the American people, if they understood the problem, would move quickly to provide the handicapped, the elderly, the heart patients, and the temporarily incapacitated

tated their right to equal opportunity. Indeed, the same survey indicated that about 60 percent of those questioned view barriers as a serious problem, two-thirds feel more should be done to overcome them, and 75 percent approve the use of tax money to overcome them, and 75 percent approve the use of tax money to eliminate them.

There is no question in my mind that a barrier-free environment is possible, for the cost of creating such an environment would not be substantial. The General Services Administration estimates that the average increased cost for barrier-free renovations is less than 1 percent of total cost.

Yet, greater accessibility to buildings for the aged and disabled is only one aspect of the solution to the overall problem. Even if we assume that the buildings are usable, the handicapped individual must still have a means of getting there.

Private transportation, with expensive hand controls in automobiles, is the answer for only a small percentage of the disabled. Many individuals are simply unable to maneuver hand controls. The blind, the deaf, and the poor are automatically prevented from pursuing this option.

Very few mobility-limited individuals can even afford private transportation. As a group, the mobility-restricted are generally income-poor. According to the Department of Transportation, nearly 60 percent of the Nation's chronically handicapped earn less than \$3,000 per year. In addition, 30 percent of all Americans aged 65 or over live in households which fall below the poverty level.

Thus, for the vast majority of aging and handicapped citizens, public transportation is the only alternative. But, here again, systems of transportation are usually not designed to provide accessibility for the disabled. Few find boarding a bus easy; those in wheelchairs find it impossible. The steps from platforms to trains or curbs to buses are sufficiently high to present a barrier not only to the elderly and handicapped but also to the undersized and small children. Subway stairs and turnstiles pose formidable obstacles for those with crutches, heart disease, or respiratory illness.

For these and other reasons, it is not surprising that the National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped found that transportation is the most serious problem encountered by the disabled. Nor is it any wonder that the President's Task Force on Aging stressed:

It is as important for the Nation to develop or have developed special transportation arrangements for older persons as it is for the Nation to meet their income, health, and other needs.

Looking at the potential benefits of a barrier-free environment, only 36 percent of our Nation's chronically handicapped population, aged 17 to 64, are employed, compared with 71 percent of the nonhandicapped population of the same age. If the Nation's architectural and transportation barriers were removed, it is estimated that 13 percent of

the chronically handicapped population of working age—some 200,000 people could return to work.

The minimum annual economic benefits that would result from employment of this group has been estimated at \$824 million—a sum which overwhelmingly offsets the cost of this bill. These estimates omit the benefits of time savings for the severely handicapped or the benefits of easier access to educational and vocational training. They also avoid consideration of all transfer payments, such as larger tax revenues and lower welfare payments.

And, of course, in the end, no cost-benefit analysis can ever account for the psychological advantages of self-sufficiency, the social benefits of equal opportunity, or the human costs of continuing to permit existing barriers to further handicap the handicapped.

In closing, I think it is appropriate to quote some remarks by Dr. Henry Betts of the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago:

Centuries ago, parents of deformed or handicapped babies in Sparta abandoned their infants on the hills, and the Eskimos still abandon their aged on icebergs. We're supposed to be the most progressive of societies. But by designing the vast majority of facilities and services to meet the needs of the "average" young, able-bodied American, by creating an environment with architectural barriers which limit the mobility of millions of Americans, we have taken the disabled and aged off the hills and the icebergs and imprisoned them in their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is time to take the aged and disabled out of their homes so that they are no longer handicapped in the activities of daily living. The anti-architectural barriers bill would help America take a large step toward a barrier-free society in which commercial buildings and public transportation are no longer out of reach for the elderly and handicapped.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE OVERQUALIFIED

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the current session I introduced H.R. 388. This measure would, if enacted into law, make it an unlawful employment practice under the equal employment opportunity provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to discriminate in employment because of a person's overqualification for the job. The bill is pending before the Committee on Education and Labor.

A letter that I recently received from a Government economist contains some interesting comments on the subject of discrimination against potential employees because of overqualification. I would like to place some excerpts from it in the RECORD:

My own impression is that this form of discrimination is quite widespread, and more serious in recent years when large numbers of professional employees have been out of work, who previously commanded very high

salaries—salaries which frighten off potential employers.

A situation which comes closer to home is that in my own . . . office, where promotions have inverse relation to any standards of ability—education, years of experience, or even native intelligence—for the very powerful reason that our director is afraid of competition! . . . In private industry I imagine [that phenomenon] would be disastrous, but in government it can happen much more easily without detection. Maybe that can be remedied by legislation, but it would be of a different nature—in the reform of the Civil Service.

The prospective employer may be prejudiced against the overqualified applicant for a number of reasons, including fear of losing one's own position in the organization to the new subordinate. . . . A very common and justifiable fear is that an overqualified applicant simply would not stay around long enough to justify the expense of his salary when so much of his short stay is spent in learning job duties and skills—a stay which may be for only three months, or six, or eight. . . . If a man has been making \$30,000 a year, and is hired at \$18,000 there is very real concern that all too soon he will leave for a job at \$25,000 or \$30,000 or \$35,000, which the present employer is in no position to match.

One idea may be of some merit: adding to the non-discrimination provision a further one that an employer may require an employee to sign a service contract for 12, 16, or 24 months. . . .

A similar situation pertains to pending legislation on pension plan security. . . . A law basing pension vestment rights parity on age would add to the employer's bias against taking on the older employee.

The points raised by my correspondent are certainly meritorious. While it would be rather difficult to remedy the situation in private industry, even with legislation such as my bill, it seems to me that Government administrators could do a lot to improve matters in the executive agencies without new laws.

A person in authority who discriminates against an applicant for employment because he is afraid that a new employee might get his job should be overruled by higher authority. Part of the tremendous overstaffing in Government may be due to the hiring of two people simultaneously so each can knife the other instead of the boss.

Mr. Speaker, neither Government nor private industry can afford to lose the talents of people simply because they are overqualified. More mischief is wrought by those who are underqualified.

TRIBUTE TO HERBERT G. KLEIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a special order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, Herbert G. Klein has been a true "good guy" in a White House which—in the eyes of this partisan, at least—does not boast an overabundance of his kind.

While other key aides have sought to isolate the President, Herb has worked against often formidable odds to open and maintain channels of communication between the news media and Mr. Nixon.

After more than 4 years as director of executive branch communications, Herb Klein is returning at the end of this week to private life, as a vice president of Metromedia, Inc. His departure has been noted in some of the most glowing press reviews given any official of this or any administration.

Obviously, the newsmen, most of them, like Herb.

I believe it is fitting that I as a former newsmen and member of the loyal opposition, should have reserved this time today to discuss Herb and his accomplishments. I have been Herb's friend since we were fellow-students at the University of Southern California.

In San Diego, Herb is best known as the able former editor of the city's morning newspaper, the *Union*. Though the paper is, like Herb, unabashedly Republican in outlook and views, Mr. Klein saw to it that the handling of news about partisan officeholders and seekers was made scrupulously fair.

Nationally, Herb's star has always been tied to that of Mr. Nixon.

The two men met, and became friends, back in 1946, when Herb was news editor of the *Alhambra Post-Advocate* and Mr. Nixon was preparing to win his first election to Congress.

Four years later, Herb went to work for Mr. Nixon when he successfully ran for the Senate against Helen Gahagan Douglas. This was a particularly bitter campaign, the forerunner of others to come. After 2 years as a Senator and 8 as Vice President, Mr. Nixon tasted defeat against John F. Kennedy for President in 1960 and Edmund G. "Pat" Brown for Governor of California in 1962. Herb Klein was at his side both times, and emerged from the harsh process of losing, still a man of strength and principle.

As a Democrat, I am not really in a position to comment that Herb's influence may have waned during and after the campaign which led to Mr. Nixon's installation in the White House.

But I do know that the working newsmen of this town have seldom had a better friend in the "palace" than Herb Klein. He never gave up trying to provide some access to his difficult and aloof client.

Evans and Novak in their column published today credit Mr. Klein with "superb missionary work among the media." Even Mr. Nixon may not be fully aware of the extent of Herb's services to him, as well as to the media.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I should be very happy to yield to the father of the Freedom of Information Act.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me say that during the first 2 years of Klein's service to the President and to the Nation here in Washington, it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Information, a role I had filled for some 14 years previous to the beginning of this administration. I found that I was able to work with a sense of continuity toward the objectives shared by the members of both parties on that

committee. We enjoyed the cooperation of Herb Klein. It was openly given, and I commended him then.

Now, as he leaves Government, I think it should be acknowledged on the record that he performed well. His service has been distinguished, and I give him my best wishes as he moves on into other fields.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a former San Diegan, and also a close personal friend of Mr. Klein's.

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate very much the gentleman's yielding, and I appreciate his bringing to the attention of the House, the remarkable career of Herb Klein. I appreciated his remarks and those of the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) that reflect the bipartisan regard and respect here in Congress for Herb Klein.

I first met Herb Klein when I was in San Diego as a quarterback for the San Diego Chargers and I came to have a high regard for Herb and his work and I appreciate the influence he had on my career both on the gridiron and here in the House of Representatives.

I would just say to the gentleman in the well how grateful I am that he has taken this time so I and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can express our appreciation to a great American, Herb Klein.

When it was first announced that Herb Klein was leaving his post as the President's Director of Communications for the executive branch, effective July 1, as I said in my speech here in the House on June 5 "that while I am very pleased for Metromedia and for Herb and his wonderful family, I also viewed, with deep regret, Herb's leaving public service."

I also observed that no man has done more to symbolize honesty and integrity in public life and that Herb has been for all a shining example of the fact that you can be successful and still not sacrifice your ideas and principles.

Herb Klein, more than anyone else, helped me get started in political life and, as grateful as I am for that, I am even more grateful for his friendship and counsel. His distinguished career as a newspaperman and his great efforts on behalf of President Nixon have been an outstanding demonstration of service to his country in both private and public life.

Aside from these feelings, I think of Herb as much more than just one of my best friends, or a gifted, dedicated, and selfless public servant.

In the judgment of many of my friends in the newspaper, radio and television profession, Herb is frequently characterized by the highest compliment journalists sparingly employ.

He is, they say, "a newsmen's newsmen." What greater tribute to a professional.

Herb enjoyed that rare reputation as a working journalist before he assumed

the responsibilities as the President's Director of Communications.

During his long and busy tenure at that post, Herb never forgot that he was, first and foremost, a communicator between the executive branch of the U.S. Government and the people of our Nation.

Herb crossed and criss-crossed our country and the oceans, talking to newsmen, world and local government leaders, getting them to open a vein on local, State, national, and international concerns. In exchange, he communicated the views of the White House and the U.S. Government on a wide variety of programs and policies. The concept of the new federalism to make Government more responsive at the local level, expanded foreign trade, reassuring allies, building bridges and closer, peaceful ties with the Soviets and Chinese and other activities, contemplated and being implemented, were simply and factually conveyed by this gifted man.

In this role as the President's communicator, Herb not only brought the Federal Government closer to the people but, through the information he gleaned from newsmen and others, brought the concerns and thinking of the people back to the White House.

And, at times when some in Government were critical of the press or segments of the press warned that the traditional rights to gather news were being jeopardized, it was Herb who calmed fears and apprehensions, real or imagined, with his enduring confidence in both a free system of government and a free press.

From his experience as a newsmen, he knew the press can never be intimidated. As a public servant, he steadfastly maintained his faith in the traditional and basic soundness of the American system.

As a veteran newsmen and with a depth of historical understanding, he maintained an even keel, maintaining a constant and true course as an unsurpassed communicator against winds and waves of controversy he had faced, logged and charted soundness of the American system.

With his background as a veteran newsmen and with an extraordinary depth of historical knowledge, Herb brought healing and healthy understanding to the traditional, friendly adversary relationship between public servant and those responsible for informing the public.

Mr. Speaker, Herb Klein, who has devoted his lifetime to date to perfecting the art of communication, has enjoyed the best of worlds in his chosen profession. He has, by talent and effort, performed superbly for his country and an informed public.

Now that he has returned to the media, the publishing field with Metromedia, Inc., we look forward to the continuing contributions of Herb Klein, a great American and by his side, his lovely wife Marge.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from California who I believe represents a portion of the district where

Herb Klein's newspaper career got started.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from San Diego (Mr. VAN DEERLIN) for yielding to me, and most especially for taking this appropriate time to express appreciation for a job well done by Herb Klein. As the gentleman from San Diego has already indicated, Herb Klein began his career as a newspaperman with the Alhambra Post Advocate, a Copley publication in Alhambra, Calif., which is in my district. It was, incidentally, as a reporter for the Post Advocate that Herb first became acquainted with the now President, Richard M. Nixon, who was then the Congressman from that old 12th Congressional District. Herb has always been known for an excellent professional approach in his writing and general news media work. He gained a reputation at the executive branch, first while working for the Vice President and then more recently in his special job as Director of Communications at the White House, as an accurate and precise reporter of the facts. He has many times been lauded by his own peers in the news media for the highly responsible way in which he made sure that various agencies of the Federal Government were reporting the facts honestly and accurately to the public and to the news media. Although Herb has always approached his job with a quiet mannerism and has never tended to be flamboyant, everyone realized that he was most serious about making sure that the facts about the Government were presented in an accurate and fair manner. We will all miss him here in the Congress of the United States because he was always accessible in helping Members of Congress obtain documented statements and full information at all levels of the executive branch. Herb Klein's parents reside in Alhambra, Calif., which is a town shared by myself and my colleague, GEORGE DANIELSON. I know that they must have a tremendous sense of pride in the outstanding manner in which their son has served the President and his country; but, even more important, they can be immensely proud that Herb Klein has abided by a higher sense of principle than most people would expect of a Government official. I am sure that his parents are extremely pleased about the dignified way in which he has always handled himself under tremendous fire and pressure. Now, as Herb enters once again into the world of private business, with one of the larger firms in the field of communications, we can do nothing but wish him the greatest success and express our regrets that he will no longer be around Capitol Hill to keep Members of Congress, the public, and his fellow workers in the news media totally and fully informed.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURGNER), a fellow San Diegan.

Mr. BURGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, with mixed emotion I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a fine American and personal friend as he

leaves the executive branch of Government to enter the private sector. The Government will lose a spokesman of refreshing candor and high professional competence. For this reason it is with deep regret we bid farewell, officially, to Herb Klein. But for Herb personally, and his devoted wife, Marge, it will be a new and exciting life—with its own problems and rewards. But commonsense would tell most anyone that this particular transition from public life must be akin to being reborn, although I hasten to add I have never heard a single word of complaint from Herb Klein about the immense burdens of his public responsibility.

In these troubled times, one could well ponder or reflect upon the one most desired quality with which a public personage need be endowed. I would suggest that the one quality needed most today and in the immediate years past is stability. And stability is Herb Klein. Yes, there are other words—fidelity, trust, faithfulness, credibility—to name a few, and Herb Klein is richly endowed with them all.

I have known Herb politically and personally for more than 20 years. I remember with sometimes unfortunate clarity my first campaign for the State legislature. It was 17 years ago when I finished a rather poor second in a primary campaign for my party's nomination for the State assembly. Since second place in politics is the equivalent of last place in any other contest—not only did I find this rather humbling, but I learned I could count my friends in high places almost on the fingers of one hand. Herb Klein was one of those friends. Although, due to his political experience and wisdom, he knew what I apparently did not know; namely, that I had no realistic chance to win, nonetheless, he took the time, the patience, and the interest to encourage and counsel a would-be politician. As I look back, I firmly believe I learned more from that losing campaign than I did from all the others I won.

Anyone who reads the newspapers and magazines, who follows the commentators, listens to radio, or watches television with even modest perception knows the official and personal difficulties of Herb Klein's job in the past few years. But through it all—he remained steadfastly loyal to his boss, the President of the United States. He somehow maintained the odd notion that what happened to Herb Klein was somehow far less important than what happened to the Nation. The most current colloquialism in vogue for this trait is "class." And Herb Klein will take it with him wherever he goes.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has stated it with great succinctness.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to another member of the San Diego delegation (Mr. VEYSEY).

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from San Diego for yielding to me at this moment.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to join my other colleagues from San Diego and

with others who are engaged in this send-off for Herb Klein. It is a sad moment in a way, and yet a moment of rejoicing that we can remember the distinguished public service which Herb Klein has performed here. It seems to me that sincerity was always a hallmark of his operation as a spokesman for this administration, and I appreciated that above all else.

Herb has left his mark on journalism in the San Diego area, and I am sure will be long remembered there as he moves on into other fields.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose now, though, I will still get the question from people in San Diego about, "When is Herb Klein coming back," or "Is he coming back," or they perhaps will cite him as an example of how, if we let someone go on a leave of absence to take another job in Government, he never gets back.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall indeed yield to a man who, even though he represents another county in California, is well known in San Diego (Mr. PETTIS).

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am proud to rise in praise of Herb Klein, a man I have long admired and respected.

It was with deep regret that I learned Herb was leaving as Director of Communications for the executive branch, a post especially created for him and in which he has performed with distinction. The same distinction that has highlighted his career over the years—from copyboy to reporter, from editorial writer to editor in chief, from press secretary to White House Director of Communications.

Herb has been called the newspaperman's newspaperman.

Throughout his career, Herb's personal beliefs and loyalties have served to reinforce his strength of character and talent and to uphold, rather than detract from, the rights of a free press and the press' responsibility to the public. This was true whether he was asking a question or, in more recent times, fielding one. It did not matter that the press did not always agree with Herb on the issues. They respected him and he earned that respect and the good will of his fellow journalists because he was and is a responsible professional.

Now, he is returning to private enterprise to carry on his profession as a vice president for the Metromedia Corp. of Los Angeles. He will be sorely missed by those of us in Government who know and like him, but especially by the members of the Washington press corps who worked with him.

So I say good luck, Herb, and all best wishes for success in your new position. You deserve the best.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join in the tribute which our colleagues from Cali-

fornia is paying to Herbert Klein on his impending retirement from the White House. Other speakers have alluded to the superior qualities of Mr. Klein in the political arena, in the field of communications, and in his general ability. I would like to touch on one phase of Mr. Klein's human quality which has not been mentioned.

Last Sunday, a group of six students, winners of my "Week in Washington" program, had the honor to visit the studios of the National Broadcasting Co., where Mr. Klein appeared on the televised program "Meet the Press." The West Virginia students included Ronald McKenzie, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Ronnie McKenzie of Roderfield, W. Va., and a student at Welch High School; Samuel Lee Groseclose, son of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard S. Groseclose of 1565 Stewart Street, Welch, and a student at Welch High School; Clarence Keith James, son of Mr. and Mrs. Zephniur James of Delbarton and a student at Burch High School; Philip Cary Christian, son of Mr. and Mrs. Tracy Christian of Nemours and a student at Branwell High School; Thomas Edward Gunter II, son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas E. Gunter of Oceana and a student at Oceana High School; and Keith Browning, son of Mr. and Mrs. Luther Browning of Amherstdale and a student at Man High School.

Herbert Klein took time out to shake hands with these six West Virginia students, and hold a brief discussion with them. They all appreciate the courtesy on the part of a busy man. I am glad to join in paying tribute to a man who thus displays human qualities as well as professional competence.

All of us appreciated the graciousness of Mr. Klein.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the names of these students in the RECORD. They had an amiable conversation with Mr. Klein, unveiling a side of his personality which all of us in the Nation's Capital appreciate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the dean of the San Diego County delegation, Bob Wilson.

Mr. BOB WILSON. I thank the gentleman.

I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from San Diego giving me this opportunity to say a few words about a man I claim as my dearest friend in Washington, a man I served with for 20 years in Washington, and whom I have known for longer than that.

I first met Herb Klein, as a matter of fact, in 1950, when he was working with the then Congressman from Whittier, Calif., Richard Nixon, who aspired to the job of Senator from California. Herb, having been a newspaperman in his area, up in Alhambra, had gotten to know Mr. Nixon. They were both veterans of the Navy and they both had a rapport that became important and obvious through the years.

I can truthfully say that I have known

no one in Washington over these years who has had more integrity, who has worked in a more dedicated fashion on behalf of his boss, Mr. Nixon, and country than Herb Klein.

I had the very great privilege of working with him intimately in the campaign of 1956, when I was campaign coordinator for Mr. Nixon who was then running for reelection as Vice President, and Herb Klein was the press officer. Herb had given up his job as editor of the San Diego Union, a very fine job in San Diego, and had come back to help Mr. Nixon in his campaign for reelection.

I really got to know then how beautifully Herb Klein understood people and how capable he was in working with people, and particularly the tough-minded and sometimes unbelievably arrogant members of the press, with whom he had to deal. Herb had an ability to smooth over the problems that the press continually ran into during the campaign of 1956. He ended up as a sort of hero of that campaign, because of the way he smoothed over the problems the press faced during the rather difficult tours and campaign appearances the Vice President made.

Mr. Klein returned after 1956 to go back to San Diego. He got a beautiful home on the La Jolla coast, where he could look out across the Pacific Ocean, and where he had a beautiful swimming pool and recreational area, and had the most important newspaper job in San Diego.

Then when Mr. Nixon asked him again in 1960 to become his press officer he gave up his job and gave up his beautiful existence in La Jolla and came back here to Washington to serve with him as press officer and his confidant in the very difficult campaign of 1960.

I had the privilege—I guess one would call it that, although it was somewhat sad, too—to go with Mr. Klein and his wife, Marge, after the very narrow defeat in 1960 down to the Caribbean to spend a few days after the election. Herb was completely disconsolate with the idea that his hero had lost the election, yet he took it in stride.

Again he went back to San Diego and resumed his job with the press as editor of the San Diego Union until a few months later, when Mr. Nixon asked him to help in the campaign for Governor in 1962. Herb took a leave of absence at that time and helped Mr. Nixon in his campaign, which again was not successful.

Mr. Speaker, all during this time I know, from having been intimate with both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Klein during that time, that Herb never gave up on the feeling that Mr. Nixon was a leader who was destined for greatness in our country, and he willingly gave up his own aspirations and his own comfort and future in order to benefit Richard Nixon.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California (Mr. BOB WILSON), yield?

Mr. BOB WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I have great admiration and affection

for the gentleman now speaking, and I appreciate his remarks.

At this point I just wish to make the statement as someone who played professional football for 13 years that I have great regard for competition and team play.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from San Diego mentioned the number of campaigns that Herb went through. I think there were something like six national Presidential campaigns. Some were lost and some were won, but to my way of thinking Herb Klein never lost; he won all the time, because the people with whom he came in contact and the people for whom he worked came out a winner, because of having Herb on their side.

Mr. Speaker, Herb Klein is a winner. Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his remarks.

Herb is a team player, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) knows the importance of being a team player. Herb completely dedicated himself to the President in his campaign in 1960, and then again in 1968 and, of course, in 1968 he joined that team in a very successful endeavor and became the Director of Communications for the President.

Mr. Speaker, Herb is, as I mentioned before, a very dear friend. He taught me many things including how to skindive, back in the 1940's, many years ago. I had lived on the ocean most of my life, and I never realized before the beauties of exploring the depths of the Pacific Ocean.

Herb taught me how to dive for abalone and lobster, and so forth, off the San Diego coast. We have been checked out with the UDT Team in Key West, and we have dived in Puerto Rico and in the Virgin Islands.

Herb is really a tremendous athlete.

Mr. Speaker, his wife Marge and their two beautiful daughters are very dear friends of mine. It is a pleasure for me to pay tribute to Herb this afternoon.

Again I join all of my colleagues, as well as those who have submitted their remarks for the RECORD, in paying tribute to Herb Klein, who I think is one of the greatest characters and one of the finest persons who ever came to Washington to serve his country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a portion of my remarks an article entitled "Nixon-Klein Years: from Congress to the White House" which is an article from the San Diego Union; and also an article from Time magazine entitled "So Long to Old Herb Klein."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the material referred to is as follows:

[From the San Diego Union, June 24, 1973]
NIXON-KLEIN YEARS: FROM CONGRESS TO THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON.—A bit more than 24 years ago, Herbert G. Klein was news editor of a Los Angeles newspaper and occasionally called on for extra duties outside the office as a reporter.

One on such occasion, overworked editor-reporter Klein met Richard Nixon, a bright-eyed and hell-bent-for-leather young Re-

publican who wanted to be elected to Congress. Klein wrote stories about Nixon and between campaigns, they became close friends.

"I remember one time when we were sitting around talking," Klein recalled. "He was wondering whether he should get out of politics and I had the same concern about my future in the newspaper business."

As they say in both trades, things didn't work out half bad for either.

Klein is bidding his last farewells to government after resigning as White House Director of Communications to become a vice president of Metromedia, Inc., in Los Angeles.

The resignation also literally marks the end of the political trail in the association between Klein and President Nixon. Although saying he has no future interest in returning to government service, Klein added he was leaving the Nixon staff without discontent.

"I've been happy here and feel I've done a good job and I feel the President thinks so, too," Klein said in an interview.

As a Metromedia executive, Klein will be returning to Southern California where his parents, brother and two daughters reside. He also will be returning to his first professional love—newspapering.

Metromedia is the nation's largest independent television network but is diversified in other fields such as outdoor advertising, direct mail and motion picture production. The firm intends in the next few months to buy newspapers and Klein, when he joins the company July 2, will advise on acquisition and staffing.

"I didn't seek a job from anyone," Klein said, "but I felt this was the most challenging of the 22 I seriously considered."

In an interview which touched on a dozen subjects relating to President Nixon, Klein made these observations.

Concerning changes in the Nixon temperament today from that first congressional campaign:

"He has always had a quiet, informal sense of humor . . . there is a stronger sense of maturity now. . . . He's never lacked courage to make a decision . . . all of the problems have matured him."

On the high and low points of the Nixon political career:

"The campaigns of 1960 and 1962 would have to be the low points. They were for me and I think everyone else who had worked for him."

"Looking back I think in a lot of ways those defeats were ordained in a way of speaking . . . it was best that he became President when he did because many of the things which have been done now could not have been done then."

His personal high career points in the good and bad Nixon years:

"The two trips to Russia will be difficult to forget. The first (when Mr. Nixon was vice president) brought the confrontation with Nikita Khrushchev. The second brought the agreements with the Soviet Union on trade and arms policy."

During the talk, Klein said he wanted to "clear up" only one point that he indicated had been misconstrued after he joined the Nixon staff in 1969.

"I never wanted to be press secretary and there never was a feud between me and Ron (Press Secretary Ron Ziegler) over that. I thought I could do more in the job I wanted to set up. I have no regrets about the results."

Klein established the Office of Communications in the early months of Mr. Nixon's first term. Its main function, he said, was to provide as much clear information as possible to opinion makers throughout the country. As a former newspaper editor, Klein said he was frequently aware of "information gaps" at the local level.

"I remember often the challenge of trying

to write a 12-inch editorial based on the information contained in a six-inch wire service story," he said.

Although criticized at one time in Washington, Klein's plan to hold regional news briefings for area publishers, cabinet members and senior White House staff was considered fully successful and a heavy contributing factor in media support Mr. Nixon received in his 1972 campaign.

Klein also is responsible for the publication of "Fact Sheets" on dozens of policy matters where the Administration has taken a position. Depending on the importance of the issue, Klein's staff has sent these often voluminous documents to between 2,000 and 20,000 writers and editors throughout the country.

In doing so, Klein said he received more television exposure himself during six years in the Administration than any other White House employee, including the President.

Klein also prides himself on probably knowing more reporters and editors than any other individual in the country.

"I believe the overall quality of journalism in this country is better now than it has ever been," he said.

Klein leaves Washington with an excellent bill of health from the reporters and editors he consulted here daily. The senior correspondent for Time magazine noted his resignation in a lengthy and laudatory article. This was more than 10 years after he was characterized by author Theodore White in "The Making of the President, 1960" as the man most singly responsible for allegedly poor press relations in that presidential effort.

Klein said the opportunity to be near his family and live again in Southern California were overriding factors in making the decision to join Metromedia.

One daughter, Mrs. Robert Mayne lives in Glendale and another, Mrs. Thomas Howell in the Ocean Beach suburb of San Diego. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Klein, live in Alhambra where he obtained his first newspaper copy boy job in 1940.

Klein eventually became editor of that newspaper and filled other news responsibilities with the Copley organization before becoming editor of the San Diego Union in 1959.

Klein said he expected to sever virtually all of his political ties after leaving Washington. However, he plans to offer "informal assistance" to former White House colleague Robert Finch in his anticipated run for the governorship in 1974.

During that General Election, Klein said he also would attempt to do some liaison work for the Republican National Party in California.

Otherwise, he said, it would be work, "some skindiving, a little golf and tennis."

Klein is now 55 and has added a few pounds here and there but shows no signs of losing the energy he was noted for in the early newspapering and campaign days.

When running the editorial office in San Diego, it was well known to associates that Klein would always return a phone call. One former assistant recalled:

"If you called him on Monday, he might get back to you on Wednesday or maybe Thursday. If not then, it would be safe to stay by your phone on Friday."

After settling down with Metromedia, Klein said he also would like to assist the journalism school at his alma mater, the University of Southern California, on some of its projects.

"It's just going to be nice to be home," he said.

SO LONG TO OLD HERB KLEIN

He is really not that old (55) nor is he vanishing from view. He is leaving the White House as Communications Director for a job in television, which will keep him in public matters.

But for 27 years he has been a considerable chunk of Richard Nixon's better nature. And that role is coming to an end.

His is a rather remarkable story. He was, these last years, abused and downgraded and ignored by Nixon and his supermen and yet he has stayed loyal, kept his honor, and goes off as one of the President's few remaining displays of decency and good humor.

He wasn't as efficient as the iron man H. R. Haldeman. Herb Klein kept his files in his coat pocket or somewhere, and like most ex-reporters he ignored flow charts and organization tables. What he had was an understanding that democracy and its government are untidy and considerably inefficient, and there isn't a hell of a lot you can do about that without destroying their soul.

Old Herb would listen to conflicting views, now and then admit mistakes had been made and take phone calls from critics as well as friends. He always figured it was a big wide world out there and a lot of people had something to say. The know-it-alls like John Ehrlichman found that sort of notion close to heresy.

When they finally pushed him farther and farther from the Oval Office he hardly complained. He took to the road supporting Nixon in the editorial offices and the newsrooms around the country. He brushed up against a lot of people in those journeys, and he made a lot of friends. Now when one travels and comes across these men and women, whether in the big metropolitan dailies or those dusty one-horse shops where the editor can be found feeding the presses, they ask with some concern if Herb got caught in Watergate. When they are told no, they almost always smile and say quietly, "I didn't think so. I like Herb."

He was no saint. Nor was he the best White House aide in all history. But he was an oasis of consideration and sympathy in a Teutonic desert of heel clicks and "Yes, sirs."

There are not many men on the beat here who haven't had a thoughtful moment or two and a few good laughs with Herb. Up in Alaska campaigning with Richard Nixon in 1958, he joined in a little dog-sled race and ended up in the snow, much to everybody's delight. In 1960 he knew that most of the men he had to deal with were a lot more sympathetic to John Kennedy than to Richard Nixon. He took it with good grace and for the most part kept his temper as he tried to get a fair shake on the front pages.

Once he sent out letters of complaint about the treatment Candidate Nixon was getting, and then he had second thoughts and called them back. At the Waldorf Astoria bar he bought the drinks for all those offended and went back to his old rut of being decent to people.

Once when Lyndon Johnson was doing a little campaigning out in California and had stopped at El Toro Marine Corps Air Station to send more troops off to Viet Nam, Herb showed up in the stands just to look over the President, the likely opposition for Nixon, who was gearing up to go again. Herb wrangled a handshake with L.B.J. like any tickled tourist, wished the President good luck and went off with a smile.

He has peddled the old Nixon propaganda with a straight face and given some of the dullest speeches on record, but he has always been there to listen when people, small as well as big, needed somebody to talk to when the rest of the White House was buttoned up, which was most of the time.

Herb still has some political mileage in him. But he probably has seen the pinnacles. Last year some of us were standing in the magnificent Hall of St. George in the Kremlin on the final day of Nixon's Moscow summit. All Russia's elite were there, cosmonauts and marshals, diplomats and artists, the Politburo and the KGB agents.

They played *The Star-Spangled Banner*, and then Nixon and his Soviet hosts walked

down the length of the huge hall. It was a splendid moment.

As the President passed, there in view across the room was Herb Klein. He looked like he had slept in his suit, or maybe hadn't slept at all in those frantic days. But his face had the same kindly look, and there was a smile and a lot of pride and warmth beneath the surface. The thought occurred to us then, and again last week, that here was one of the few men around Nixon who gave more than he took.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, "Who's Who In America" lists him as Herbert George Klein but everybody knows him as just plain Herb, which says a lot about the fine guy that Herb Klein is.

Herb Klein has come a long way since his days as a cub reporter on the Alhambra, Calif., Post Advocate in 1940, and I venture to say that with his ability he will still go a long way. Herb's list of credits is almost too long to review, but for those who think of him as a politician's press secretary or White House Communications Director it is important to note that he has always been a newspaperman's newspaperman. He rose swiftly in journalism, becoming news editor of the Alhambra Post Advocate and special correspondent for the Copley Newspapers in 1946, a Washington correspondent in 1950, and then, successively, an editorial writer, associate editor, executive editor, and editor of the San Diego Union. Herb has been active in the Republican Party since 1952, when he served as publicity director for the Eisenhower-Nixon campaign in California. He has since been closely associated with Nixon campaigns and has been a close adviser of the President.

Mr. Speaker, everyone who has ever known Herb Klein looks upon him as a man of great integrity and great capabilities. I have always prized Herb Klein's friendship, and I wish him the very best as he leaves politics for new fields. It is with the keenest of pleasure that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a real gentleman, Herb Klein.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SEAFARER'S INTERNATIONAL UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlemen from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, I have had the opportunity to discuss with Mr. Paul Hall, president of the Seafarer's International Union, its current battle with the Export-Import Bank. The issue is, of course, the export of U.S. jobs. The Export-Import Bank is contemplating supporting the export financing of nine U.S.-

built tuna vessels for Mexico. These vessels will then be used to compete with the U.S. fleet.

On the face of it, approval of such a loan would be obviously against the best interest of the U.S. fishing and canning industries and their workers for several reasons:

Encouraging the export of advanced U.S. tuna vessels to Mexico will provide greater international competition for already limited world tuna resources, thus potentially harming existing tuna fleets, including the U.S. fleet.

Much of the tuna caught by these vessels will be canned in Mexico and shipped to the United States, thus seriously affecting the U.S. cannery industry and its workers.

International tuna conservation laws, signed by both the United States and Mexico, have been repeatedly violated by Mexican vessels, with little, if any, response from the Mexican Government. More tuna vessels under the Mexican flag could destroy the fragile conservation treaties on the west coast that are the only safeguards against the destruction of the west coast tuna schools.

Mexico has repeatedly sought in the past to violate international law, to extend its fishing boundaries and to impose unfair work practices on foreign fishing vessels.

The west coast tuna industry is already overcapitalized, with a large number of boats and a fishing capacity that exceeds the available catch. By the Bank supporting further investment in new tuna vessels, the stability of the industry could be destroyed and the U.S. tuna fleet could be ruined by the fierce competitive struggle that would ensue.

Finally, the boats which Mexico would buy from the United States are the best in the world, but comparable vessels are not available elsewhere. Thus, to deny Export-Import Bank support for this loan may help to maintain the economic and competitive stability of the international tuna fleets operating on the west coast.

Mr. Hall was very clear in expressing his and the union's continued strong support for the Bank's incentives for export financing. The incentives produce U.S. exports which not only aid the developing nation recipients, but also U.S. industries and employees, the Nation's economy and the balance of payments. However, it becomes clear that at the same time, we must be sure that the equipment we seek to export does not result in the export of U.S. jobs or create unfair or detrimental competition for U.S. industries. Yet, by all appearances, these are the very effects the Bank's contemplated export financing of tuna vessels would have.

Such a loan must surely be in direct opposition to the well-being of the tuna industry, particularly at a time when the industry is already under intense competitive and supply pressure. U.S. tuna vessels, because of depleted tuna stocks, are able to fish less and less, and must range farther for resources. Imports are rising steadily from 312 million pounds in 1968 to 376 million pounds in 1971. U.S. canners are already leaving the mainland.

The jobs of thousands of workers are affected by this situation and could be lost entirely if an agency of the U.S. Government provides assistance to not only other fleets in direct competition with U.S.-flag vessels, but to a nation which has systematically ignored or flaunted major international fishing laws and conservation conventions.

I have today sent a letter to Mr. Henry Kearns, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, advising him of the above objections and encouraging his reconsideration of the proposed loan. I would encourage my colleagues who share like reservations to do the same.

For my colleague's additional information, I would like to read a summary of information made available to me regarding the proposed transaction. I find it a thorough briefing and recommend it highly.

On June 13, 1973, the Seafarer's International Union of North America learned from its affiliates on the west coast that the Export-Import Bank of the United States was contemplating supporting the export financing of nine U.S.-built tuna vessels which would be sold to Mexico.

The following day, representatives on behalf of the SIU contacted the Export-Import Bank and sought to confirm the details of the transactions and the background on why and in what manner the transaction would be supported.

Mr. John Corrette, the Counsel of the Export-Import Bank would only confirm that export financing for tuna vessels was contemplated and that they would go to the Government of Mexico.

When questioned about the factors the Bank considers in supporting the export of U.S. equipment, including the effect on U.S. industries and employment, the effect on U.S. conservation laws, and the country's proposed use of the equipment to be financed, Mr. Corrette only confirmed that these factors were considered. He further indicated that it would not be known what weight these factors were given until the transaction was approved, when it will then be too late to act.

Mr. Corrette suggested we communicate our views to the Bank and that they would be considered. However, he again indicated that we would be told nothing about the transaction or the effect of our comments until the transaction was either approved or disapproved.

In spite of the obvious handicap posed by the Bank's disclosure and comment restrictions, the Seafarer's International Union of North America decided to submit a brief describing the reasons for its opposition to this proposed transaction.

It is clear, however, that the closed and secretive operations of the Bank make it doubtful whether our comments will be considered or given any weight. This is especially true in that there are no established Bank guidelines for weighing the various factors involved in a Bank transaction.

CONTINUED SIU SUPPORT OF BANK EXPORT FINANCING

At the outset the Seafarer's Union wishes to make clear its continued strong support for the Bank's incentives for ex-

port financing. These incentives produce U.S. exports which not only aid the developing nation recipients, but also U.S. industries and employees, the Nation's economy and the balance of payments.

However, we must at the same time be sure that the equipment we seek to export does not result in the export of U.S. jobs or create unfair or detrimental competition for U.S. industries.

Yet, these are the very effects the Bank's contemplated export financing of tuna vessels would have.

EFFECT OF BANK LOAN ON WEST COAST INDUSTRY

The Seafarer's Union is convinced that this proposed transaction is not in the best interests of either the U.S. west coast fishing or canning industries.

This proposal comes at a time when the U.S. tuna fleet and U.S.-based tuna canning industry is struggling to survive.

U.S. tuna vessels, because of depleted tuna stocks, are able to fish less and less for tuna in nearby stocks and must range farther abroad for tuna resources.

U.S. tuna imports have risen steadily, from 312 million pounds in 1968 to 376 million in 1971. At the same time, U.S. canners steadily are leaving the mainland of the United States. Imports of canned tuna remain at high levels.

The west coast tuna fishing and canning industry is thus already under intense competitive and supply pressures. The jobs of thousands of SIU affiliated union members are affected by this situation and could be lost entirely if an agency of the U.S. Government provides assistance to other fleets in direct competition with U.S.-flag vessels.

The Bank's proposed financing of nine new tuna vessels will only exacerbate this grave situation. In addition, it will provide new and highly efficient tuna vessels to a nation which has systematically ignored or flaunted major international fishing laws and conservation conventions which it has signed.

MEXICO'S FISHERY POLICY

In the past, the small Mexican tuna fleet has been guilty of a number of actions designed to give its fishermen an unfair competitive advantage over U.S. west coast fishermen.

Among the illegal and anticompetitive practices of the Mexican Government and its fishing fleet have been:

Mexican fishing vessels have regularly violated the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission's—IATTC—tuna conservation regulations, even though Mexico and the United States are both signatories to the convention. These international regulations are designed to regulate the taking of tuna from offshore areas, so that tuna stocks are not seriously depleted. By overfishing these areas, the Mexican vessels are endangering the future livelihood of the tuna fishermen of all nations.

Mexican fishing vessels were recently given, at their strong insistence, a special exemption during the IATTC closed season to fish for tuna up to a 6,000-ton limit. This has helped to further deplete tuna stocks and gives Mexican vessels unfair access to cheaper supplies of tuna while U.S. vessels must travel long distances to less well-stocked fishing areas.

CXIX—1377—Part 17

In addition, it may be that Mexico will apply for even more special exemptions for these new vessels.

Mexican fines for violation of the IATTC by Mexican vessels are so small as to make violations of the convention profitable.

Mexico recently passed a law requiring that 50 percent of the crew of foreign vessels fishing in Mexican waters must be Mexican nationals, and that they must be hired in Mexico and paid the prevailing U.S. wage. Had this law been enforced as it was written, it would have caused a significant hardship to the U.S. fishing industry and its employees. When faced with the strong opposition of the U.S. fishing fleet, the Mexican Government held conferences with the United States to work out a compromise interpretation of the law that would not be as harmful to the U.S. fleet.

Mexico has voiced its support of a 200-mile fishing limit, which is contrary to international law and if imposed, would exclude U.S. fishermen from productive fishing areas in international waters.

To now reward Mexico for these policy and convention violations, through the sale of these new tuna vessels at favorable rates, would be both detrimental and shortsighted.

It would provide Mexico with the most modern tuna seiners in the world, which could then be used to gut the protected tuna stocks of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Convention.

In so doing, the Bank could also contribute to the destruction of the U.S. west coast tuna fleet and the American tuna canning industry.

EFFECT ON U.S. LAW OF THE SEAS POSITION

Another potential casualty of the Export-Import Bank's proposed financing of the tuna boats for Mexico may be the U.S. species approach to the Laws of the Seas Conference.

The U.S. fisheries position at this vital meeting is based upon the division of the species of fish into three groups. The Coastal State would control two groups, fish that spawn in the Coastal States' waters or live on the Continental Shelf. However, migratory species, such as tuna, which live in the waters of several Coastal States, would be controlled by International conventions, patterned on the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

This Commission, which is made up of many nations bordering the Pacific, is designed to regulate and preserve the Pacific tuna stocks.

Mexico's actions, in ignoring or flaunting the IATTC's rules and prohibitions, seriously undermines the international convention concept and demonstrates that it may not be workable when a nation chooses to violate it.

Unless some means can be found to enforce the convention and prevent the kind of violations practiced by the Mexican fleet, then the species idea as a basic law of the sea, may be doomed before it is implemented.

AVAILABILITY OF FOREIGN TUNA VESSELS

The Export-Import Bank also stated that if the export financing for these vessels were denied by the Bank, then

the Mexican Government would seek the vessels in a foreign nation.

This type of argument by the Bank is not based on hard facts or past experience.

Mexico would buy these tuna vessels from U.S. yards because they can be bought at advantageous rates, through Eximbank financing. If Mexico could obtain better terms elsewhere, it is likely that it would not buy the vessels in the United States.

Another strong factor in Mexico's desire to buy the vessels in the United States is the high level of technology and efficiency of U.S.-built tuna vessels. These vessels are rightly described as the best in the world, and are suited in every way to tuna fishing.

Mexico has experienced the poor quality and design of boats built in other countries. Recently Mexico purchased a group of Spanish vessels, which have proved to be of inferior quality and are more dangerous to operate than their American-built counterparts.

Thus, it is not merely for better financial terms, but also for quality and suitability that Mexico would buy tuna vessels from U.S. yards.

OVERCAPITALIZED INDUSTRY

A final reason why the Bank should not support the export financing of these vessels to Mexico is that it may involve the Bank in the financing of vessels which are a poor risk.

At the present time, the west coast tuna industry already has more equipment than the fish stocks can sustain. The IATTC now restricts the fishing time in certain tuna areas and boats must range far afield to find tuna.

Putting more vessels into this fishery only increases the risk of business failures of fishery depletion. Either eventually will signal the decline of this industry and, in retrospect, could make the Bank's involvement in this fishery a poor financial decision.

With the SIU's knowledge of this industry and with the expertise of our fishing affiliates, we are positive that the Bank's investment in this area is not prudent.

There are many other more fruitful areas for the Bank, where the opportunity is greater and the need more apparent.

SUMMARY

For these reasons, the Seafarer's International Union of North America urgently requests the Export-Import Bank not to support the export financing of tuna vessels for Mexico.

The proposed transaction would have a detrimental effects on the U.S. fishing and canning industry and on employment in these industries. It should be disapproved.

TRADE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is now meeting to draft the most far-reaching trade

legislation ever requested from the Congress by any President. This bill affects every citizen of the United States and the future well-being of this Nation. The issues are complex and technical. The policies are the subject of national debate. The information about these issues and policies is often subject to many interpretations.

The 25-member committee is now behind closed doors writing this most important legislation.

But who is in that room behind closed doors to advise the committee, to answer questions and to provide alternatives for the members' consideration? Apart from one or two committee staff technicians, every 1 of the 10 or more additional persons admitted to that private meeting is a representative of the President and an advocate of the President's bill and no other.

The President's technical staff is there to explain, defend, and shape the President's policies for the members of Ways and Means. That is their job—to represent the President's point of view.

Led by Ambassador William R. Pearce, from the White House, formerly from Cargill Corp.—an international export firm—there are at least 10 technicians from various executive branch agencies. There are representatives of the Commerce Department, the Labor Department, the Treasury Department, the State Department, and the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations—and so on. The source of information on the President's bill, I repeat, is the technical staff of the President. The Tariff Commission is represented, and so are some other agencies, but even the Congress is denied adequate staff representation.

The people who will be affected by this legislation, the Members of Congress who must decide how to vote on this legislation, the Ways and Means Committee members themselves, are not allowed to have their own staffs in that room to give advice or to raise objective questions. The President's men are taking up all seats surrounding the committee table in the small room where the bill is being written. The President's staff arrives daily lugging bulging briefcases and carrying piles of documents. The congressional members arrive without staff and with virtually no professional aid at their disposal. It is a totally uneven situation. It is unfair to them, to the Congress they represent and to the American people.

What will emerge from these closed sessions where the President's staff has virtually all the cards and all the answers on complicated, technical issues?

The President's trade legislation is a major request for unlimited powers to the President. The President's technicians will, no doubt, participate in the drafting of whatever language emerges for the committee. This is not a hopeful sign for the content of the legislation which will be reported, nor for the powers of Congress to control its own procedures.

Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I addressed my colleagues of my concern about the future of our international

trade relations. I referred to the announced intentions of Communist China to penetrate our economy through the leader export of mushrooms to the United States which could seriously affect our already substantially crippled Pennsylvania mushroom industry. Additionally I discussed the Japanese steelmaker's decision to construct a steel-producing plant at Auburn, N.Y., using American industrial development bonds.

Today I wish to address my colleagues on another aspect of the increasing complexity of the international trade problem. An editorial in last Friday's Wall Street Journal discussed the possibility of extensive investment in American companies by foreign investors. The editorial favored such possibility and concluded:

When the rest of the world has as much invested in the United States as the United States has invested in the rest of the world, mutual security will rest not so much on treaties or a symbolic military presence as on the clear perception that everyone is in the same boat.

There are voices that warn of dangers and pitfalls, voices we think should be heard and when necessary accommodated. But certainly not to the extent of barricading the borders. We're pleased to welcome the invasion of the United States by foreign investors and tourists. It's really the only kind of invasion to have.

At first blush this statement might appear to some as a plausible solution to our current international trade problem. But like all overly simplistic generalizations, it is fraught with many perils.

When we consider the many mistakes and miscalculations we have made in our foreign trade policy, it appears that the above-mentioned editorial is saying that all these mistakes and miscalculations will be remedied by allowing and encouraging foreign investors to invest in American companies.

I certainly do not accept such an illogical line of reasoning.

Instead I think we should analyze the reasons for this sudden flurry of activity by foreign investors and determine the causes that brought about the climate that currently favors such activity.

In so doing we notice that a substantial supply of "cheap dollars" in foreign countries have combined with the existing depressed state of our stock market to make investment in American companies extremely attractive to foreign investors.

Obviously, our unfavorable foreign trade balance and the recent devaluation of our dollar substantially contributed to the problem. And the fact that we are still somewhat in the dark as to the identity of the persons and organizations who were responsible for the sudden \$6 billion flow of funds into Germany which was the final straw which led to the recent devaluation, only indicates how vulnerable our economy is to the machinations of international speculators.

In view of this, the proper course for this country to take is not to allow a further flow of the control of our economy into foreign hands but instead we should initiate the necessary action to

recapture the control that has already passed into foreign hands.

There is much evidence that foreign countries are not standing idly by and allowing their control of their economies to erode. As evidence of this, Canada is currently considering legislation which would restrict foreign investment in its domestic economy. France has already passed such legislation. Additionally, many other countries have nontariff trade barriers—another form of control—to bar the import of American goods. The addition of Britain, Ireland, and Denmark to the Common Market would appear to indicate that, for all practical purposes, three more European markets will be off limits for American goods. In connection with this I must allude to the fact that the Commerce Department has just disclosed that for the month of May the United States experienced a trade deficit of \$158 million. This should certainly bring into question the reason for the reported favorable balance of trade which was previously reported for the month of April.

The solution to our trade imbalance is indeed complex, and will require changes in many areas. But in the case of foreign investment in American companies we cannot remain passive while a flood of foreign investment seizes control of American companies. Once such control becomes a reality it would be an insurmountable task to effectuate a divestiture of foreign control. Accordingly I have cosponsored a bill with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, JOHN DENT, that was introduced on Monday of this week.

This bill would—

First, restrict investments by non-U.S. citizens in American companies to 35 percent of nonvoting securities or 5 percent of voting securities;

Second, would prohibit a non-U.S. citizen who currently owns more than the above-specified percentages from acquiring any more of such securities;

Third, would require the registration of non-U.S. citizens before they could acquire any securities in American companies; and

Fourth, would authorize the Securities and Exchange Commission to enforce these provisions by appropriate rules to be prescribed within 90 days of enactment.

The problem of maintaining our national security becomes even more serious in the event control of American companies passes into the hands of foreign investors. Additionally our ability to establish and maintain national priorities would be seriously impaired if we lost control of critical segments of our economy. Our present energy crisis points out the problem when we have to depend on foreign sources of supply. This is an instance where at the present time we have no reasonable alternative source of supply and are at the mercy of our foreign suppliers. We cannot afford to let the situation arise where our domestic companies and their employees would be at the mercy of foreign investors.

There may well be many more potentially adverse effects to our economy which would result from extensive for-

eign investments in our economy, and it is indeed astonishing to read in the same edition of the Wall Street Journal—previously mentioned—an article whereby former Secretary of Commerce Peter G. Peterson has recommended to President Nixon that “we look at programs to stimulate foreign investment here.” As a matter of curiosity, I wonder who is reading whose statement first, Mr. Peterson or the Wall Street Journal.

Needless to say this proposition is not received with complete equanimity by the entire American business community, as evidenced by the recent position taken by the officers and directors of the Ronson Corp. to resist an attempt by an Italian industrial firm to purchase a majority of Ronson's outstanding stock. Interestingly enough it appears that the Italian Government may well own up to 25 percent of the Italian company. What can happen when a foreign company owns American companies is limitless in possibilities, many of which could well have an adverse effect on our economy.

Once the offspring of American ingenuity, the multinational corporation has become the adopted child of every major economic nation in the world.

Multinationals actually have been around for some time but did not really come into their own until after World War II when American business quickly saw the rich markets to be realized in rebuilding shattered economies overseas. It recognized that reconstruction abroad also would enable the production of goods there at low cost for sale back home.

In recent years, however, American multinationals have had to make room for those from other nations whose economies have grown to maturity and who seek larger shares of international markets. The competition has become keen, opening the door to the possibility that out of the struggle will emerge giants—among-giants—supernational corporations which will wield massive political and economic power.

The time may come when a choice must be made as to which rules: the law of the land or the law of supply and demand.

Already there are predictions that by 1990 the world's economic development will make obsolete the individual economies of respective nations. With the coming of this single world economy, it is said some aspects of a nation's sovereignty will have to be transferred to a supernatural regulating authority.

There are opinions attributed to George Ball, former U.S. Under Secretary of State, in the New York Times magazine of March 18, and to Roy Ash, former head of Litton Industries and now President Nixon's Director of Office of Management and Budget, in the April issue of American Opinion magazine.

Mr. Ball is said to have proposed a treaty creating this superauthority which would charter multinationals and control them while also standardizing the regulations and taxes of countries where-in they are located. Mr. Ash reportedly believes we have reached the point where economic issues and their related effects can be considered only in terms of world destiny, not separate national destinies,

and “certainly not just as a separate go-it-alone destiny for the United States.”

I do not agree with the idea of an economic United Nations. I would no more place the economic fate of American citizens in the hands of such a global regulating body than I would place our sovereign rights in the hands of the existing United Nations.

Nevertheless, there are signs such a supernatural authority is on the way to becoming a reality just as there are signs the supernatural corporations are coming. And when one of these corporate cyclops invests in a country it will exercise tremendous political, economic and social influence. It will be a property owner, taxpayer, employer, and so forth. Yet, it will owe allegiance to nothing save its own board of directors.

An executive of Ford Motor Co. has been quoted as saying:

We don't consider ourselves basically an American company. We are a multi-national company. And when we approach a government that doesn't like the U.S. we always say, “Whom do you like? . . . We carry a lot of flags. We export from every country.”

Also, Textron, Inc., another multinational, has said it wants to do away with the “Made in U.S.A.” label. Instead, the company prefers a “made in the world—by people” stamp—because Textron believes we should think in terms of one worldwide economy.

The sovereignty of a nation requires it to be responsible for all that occurs within its borders, including its economy. But how can a government manage its economy when it cannot control all the factors within that economy? Multinationals require a smooth exchange of capital, goods and labor as though there were no national borders. Countries, therefore, become sales territories, not sovereign states. Which rules? The law of the land or the law of supply and demand?

Will the day come when the Constitution of the United States is superseded by a sales contract?

DEVELOPMENT OF GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the need for intensive action by the Federal Government to further the development of geothermal energy.

In several countries, including our neighbor to the south, Mexico, geothermal energy is seen as one of the most important new answers to the energy shortage.

And our geothermal fields, especially those underlying the Western States, the gulf coast, Alaska, and Hawaii, are estimated by experts to be among the richest in the world, if not the richest.

In 1970, the Congress passed the Geothermal Steam Act, which provides for development by private industry of federally owned geothermal resources through competitive and noncompetitive leasing arrangements. So far, we have not yet begun to lease those re-

sources, even though science tells us that the energy is there and that it is almost surely economical. In light of the current energy situation, I find this situation appalling and inexcusable, and I am happy to say that the committee report we are considering here today includes \$200,000 to expedite geothermal leasing through the Bureau of Land Management.

This legislation also includes \$300,000 for geothermal studies, through the geological survey, \$100,000 to study the problems of corrosion in the Bureau of Mines, and \$2,530,000 for geothermal investigations, by the geological survey.

Mr. Speaker, three agencies of the Federal Government have been involved in the research and development of geothermal energy resources; these are the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Science Foundation.

For fiscal year 1974, the Department of the Interior requested a total of \$4.2 million to carry out its geothermal energy program. The bulk of these funds—\$2,530,000—are intended for the U.S. Geological Survey. The USGS proposes to utilize these funds for: First, supervision of the geothermal leasing program; second, geologic, geochemical, hydrologic, and geophysical studies for prelease examination of promising areas and for improving exploration techniques; third, reconnaissance surveys in Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, and Alaska; and fourth, investigating the possible environmental impact of geothermal development. The Bureau of Reclamation has requested \$1,270,000 to be directed toward determination of the feasibility of geothermal resources as a new source of water through desalting geothermal brines. The Bureau of Mines requested \$200,000 to continue basic metallurgical research; their primary interest is in the recovery of mineral byproducts from certain geothermal steam resources. Finally, the Bureau of Land Management has requested \$200,000 to be used for analysis and selection of potential leasing tracts and development of a leasing schedule.

The Department of the Interior's request for \$4,200,000 is a decrease over the appropriations for fiscal year 1973. Last year, \$5,280,000 was appropriated to the Department; the breakdown by agency for fiscal year 1973 appropriations was as follows:

U.S. Geological Survey-----	\$2,500,000
Bureau of Mines-----	200,000
Bureau of Land Management---	348,000
Bureau of Reclamation-----	1,432,000
Office of Saline Water-----	800,000
Total -----	5,280,000

You will note from this breakdown that \$800,000 in fiscal year 1973 funds were appropriated to the Office of Saline Water. These funds were dropped in the requests for fiscal year 1974.

The only other Federal agency receiving appropriations for geothermal resources is the National Science Foundation. In fiscal year 1974, they requested \$1,080,000; in fiscal year 1973, their appropriations were \$1,050,000. The Foundation has five projects underway, all of which are attempting to improve the ef-

fort to harness dry-rock and wet-steam geothermal resources.

The final agency concerned with geothermal resources development is the Atomic Energy Commission. In recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, AEC spokesmen explained that small-scale research projects on the development of dry rock technology had been carried out by the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory. However, no funds were directly appropriated for the purpose of geothermal research and development in fiscal year 1973.

In addition, it appears that no funds will be forthcoming during fiscal year 1974. The AEC did request \$4.3 million for geothermal R. & D. for fiscal year 1974, but these funds were to have come from the "central energy research and development fund" contained in the Department of the Interior appropriations request. As you know, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies did not approve this funds. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy subsequently requested \$4.7 million for geothermal R. & D. in the AEC Authorization Act (H.R. 8662), but according to staff members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works and AEC, these funds have been deleted from the bill as reported yesterday.

The following table presents a summary of the figure cited previously:

Agency	Fiscal year—	
	1973 ¹	1974 ²
U.S. Geological Survey	\$2,500,000	\$2,530,000
Bureau of Mines	200,000	200,000
Bureau of Land Management	348,000	200,000
Bureau of Reclamation	1,432,000	1,270,000
Office of Saline Water	800,000	—
National Science Foundation	1,050,000	1,080,000
Total	6,330,000	5,280,000

¹ Appropriated funds.

² Budget requests.

One cautionary note should be mentioned about the above figures. The fiscal year 1973 moneys represent appropriations to the agencies and the fiscal year 1974 moneys were taken from budget requests. Thus, the figures are not easily comparable. It could be inferred, however, that the Federal Government's commitment to developing geothermal resources has not increased.

PRETRIAL DIVERSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would permit a Federal court, upon the recommendations of the U.S. prosecutor to place certain persons charged with Federal crimes in programs of community supervision. This bill would authorize the courts to establish, within our present probation system, programs of pretrial diversion for certain Federal offenders.

A person would be eligible for deferred prosecution only on the recommendation of the attorney for the Government which then must be approved by the court. Such a person would have to agree to enter the pretrial diversion program and waive any applicable statute of limitations and his right to speedy trial for the period of his diversion. If the person fulfilled his obligations under the program for a period of 3 months to 1 year, the charges against him would be dismissed. Prosecution of the pending criminal charges could be resumed when the court found that the person was not fulfilling his obligation under the program.

The pretrial diversion concept has received support from the Judicial Conference of the United States, the American Bar Association, the Department of Justice, the National District Attorneys Association, and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. In 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice adopted a standard in its final report "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," which endorsed the concept of early diversion programs. It recommended that prosecutors undertake "early identification and diversion to other community resources of those offenders in need of treatment, for whom full criminal disposition does not appear required."

The ABA Section of Criminal Law supports the idea of pretrial diversion because it embodies provisions of the following standard for criminal justice:

THE PROSECUTION FUNCTION

3.8 Discretion as to non-criminal disposition.

(a) The prosecutor should explore the availability of non-criminal disposition, including programs of rehabilitation, formal or informal, in deciding whether to press criminal charges; especially in the case of a first offender, the nature of the offense may warrant non-criminal disposition.

(b) Prosecutors should be familiar with the resources of social agencies which can assist in the evaluation of cases for diversion from the criminal process.

THE DEFENSE FUNCTION

6.1 Duty to explore disposition without trial.

(a) Whenever the nature and circumstances of the case permit, the lawyer for the accused should explore the possibility of an early diversion of the case from the criminal process through the use of other community agencies.

There is an increasing awareness, Mr. Speaker, that prosecuting a person charged with a criminal offense need not be the only method of dealing with antisocial conduct. In some cases, it may not be in the best interests of either society or the accused to pursue prosecution. "Early diversion" may be a relatively new phrase, but the underlying concept is not new. Experienced prosecutors have long exercised their discretion to defer prosecution upon certain conditions, such as an arrangement with the accused to enter the military service or obtain new employment or some other agreement to embark on what can be considered a rehabilitative program. Deferred prosecution is not used extensively because prosecutors and the court do not have the time, the staff, the money, the facili-

ties, or the programs to handle such persons. Therefore, the prosecutors have little alternative but to prosecute and the court to sentence. Legislation is necessary in order to permit prosecutors and the courts to have the assistance of the probation office in order to evaluate cases before rather than after conviction.

In addressing the First National Conference on Corrections in Williamsburg, Va., in 1971, the then Attorney General John N. Mitchell said:

Let us recognize that corrections should begin, not with the prisons, but with the courts. Let us ask whether in every case we need to achieve "the object so sublime" of the Mikado's Lord High Executioner—"to make the punishment fit the crime." In many cases society can best be served by diverting the accused to a voluntary community oriented correction program instead of bringing him to trial. The Federal criminal justice system has already used this formula in many juvenile cases—the so-called Brooklyn plan. I believe this program could be expanded to include certain offenders beyond the juvenile age, without losing the general deterrent effect of the criminal justice system.

Deferred prosecution was first used by the U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York in 1936. At that time, the U.S. attorney and the chief probation officer were concerned with the handling of juvenile offenders and were seeking a method of avoiding the demoralizing influences of the court procedure on selected juvenile offenders, that is, young people with substantial backgrounds, good home influences, and no prior convictions. The decision whether to defer prosecution was made by the U.S. attorney on the basis of a complete investigation by the probation officer. This was the beginning of what became known as the Brooklyn plan. Under this plan, juveniles are interviewed in the presence of a U.S. probation officer who conducts an investigation and submits a preliminary report before the juvenile is formally charged in an indictment or information. This successful plan is presently used in many judicial districts throughout the United States and is considered to be an extremely valuable program of rehabilitation for juveniles.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is neither revolutionary nor will it be a panacea for the successful rehabilitation of all defendants, but rather it is a small step toward increasing the personal incentive of selected offenders toward rehabilitation without losing the general deterrent effect of our criminal justice system.

THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION VERSUS GARRISON PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, when the House considers the public works appropriations bill, Members will be requested to continue funding for the Bureau of Reclamation and, unfortunately, to continue the appropriations for some of their most questionable programs.

The Bureau of Reclamation has reached its point of diminishing returns, it has outlived its useful life. Today it creates more problems than it solves. Many of its programs have become pollution headaches. Many projects of the Bureau have caused the proliferation of agribusiness, helping the rich farmers get richer while the small farmers find survival more difficult. But the most important and damaging aspect of the Bureau's policies have been in the agricultural market distortions created by the Bureau's tremendous subsidies.

REPORT OF NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION,
JUNE 1973

The final report of the National Water Commission has confirmed my criticisms of the Bureau of Reclamation. The report points out that the primary weakness of the irrigation projects is that they have been too heavily subsidized by the taxpayers of America while providing benefits to only a very few. Water users on some Federal reclamation projects repay no more than 10 percent of the construction costs attributable to irrigation.

In some instances, as a result of irrigation projects, landowners receive large windfalls by converting their woodland or pastureland into cropland with little or no cost to the owner. The Commission also points out that certain projects have resulted in large increases in the production of certain commodities without any consideration of the demand for those commodities, or their effect on the total market.

As in any economic free market structure, commodity demand is the wisest director for investment in any production. But if lands are cultivated and crops are grown to benefit from a subsidy, the result will be a distortion of that product's price and marketability—not just for those subsidized, for all producers. This is exactly what has happened. Because of the price support programs utilized to maintain farm income, certain crops are grown on this federally irrigated land, increasing the production of price supported commodities—creating the need for even more price supports. The Commission has reported that despite knowing this fact beforehand, the Bureau has continued to undertake projects that were not economically sound. Thus the American taxpayer has had to pay twice: Once to provide for the irrigation subsidies, and second, to pay for the agricultural price subsidies.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission concluded that there would be no need in the next 30 years to continue federally subsidized water resource development programs to increase the agricultural land base of the country. In addition, the Commission made the following official recommendation:

Legislation should be enacted to require full repayment of costs of federal water resource development projects that result in increases in production of food and fiber.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that the problems of the Bureau of Reclamation have not been a recent revelation to the rest of the country.

Earlier this year, on the CBS televi-

sion show "60 Minutes," Mike Wallace detailed the abuses of the taxpayers' money in federally constructed irrigation projects. Through interviews with farmers in the Southwest, it became quite clear that large agribusinesses were making a fortune off the new projects, while small farmers claimed they were not receiving sufficient water and were losing their farms.

The roots of that problem are quite clearly the result of unenforced, broken laws. In the 1902 Reclamation Act, one of the most important sections states that no one may be entitled to the Bureau of Reclamation's water on more than 160 acres of land. This provision was never actively enforced. Now the giant farms scream. "You cannot stop our water or all of our crops will fail." This is a dilemma that could reasonably be solved by the forced divesting of illegally irrigated acreage.

GARRISON DIVERSION PROJECT

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will have an opportunity to move in the direction of the Commission's recommendations. The Bureau of Reclamation appropriation includes an irrigation project for North Dakota: The Garrison Diversion project, that should be removed from the bill.

The Garrison Diversion unit is an immense project designed to divert and impound Missouri River Basin water for irrigation purposes. The project will reap widespread damage if it continues.

IMPACT ON FARMERS

Through inundation and construction rights-of-way, 63,000 acres of productive farmland will be lost directly as a result of the project, and a substantially greater amount will be lost along the canal routes. The project's promoters claim it will help the small farmers, while a number of small farms are already being lost to the construction. It is also difficult to understand how the small farmer will benefit when the average cost of the irrigation sprinkler equipment needed in the project area is about \$30,000 per 160 acres—far above the financing capacity of the small farmer. This will create a possibly absurd situation of "water, water everywhere but no capacity to use it." The two largest farm organizations in the State, the North Dakota Farmers Union and North Dakota NFO, have both recently passed resolutions asking for a moratorium on construction and land acquisition and an independent analysis of the project. If the farmers do not want this project then who does?

IRRIGATION NEED QUESTIONABLE

The land this project will be irrigating is already productive land. It would be tragic if this project results in increasing the water and land salinity on thousands of acres of fertile prairies already producing good crops. And many think this problem is likely to develop. I would only warn those who support this project of the disastrous consequences of the increased salinity of the lower Colorado. That similar Bureau project has already destroyed substantial amounts of fertile land in northern Mexico and the United States side of the

border. The Bureau of Reclamation has not yet released any results of studies which would clearly identify and eliminate the possibility of such "salt destruction" in the Garrison project area.

DECEPTION OF THE BUREAU

The Bureau of the Budget twice rejected the proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation on the Garrison project, and it was only successfully approved on a cost-benefit ratio by attaching enormous fish and wildlife benefits to the project—benefits which to a large degree were concocted. They claimed that this project would create 16,000 acres of wetlands—instead by their own recent admission, there will not be again but instead a loss of 17,450 acres of wetlands. Many people who originally supported this project are now "signaling thumbs down."

The Garrison project is typical of too many other Bureau projects. It is time that the American Congress and the American taxpayer reexamine these programs—programs which have over \$5 billion in unfinished construction pending. I hope that my colleagues will join with me in supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) in striking the appropriation for the expansion of the Garrison project. Only if we in the Congress give more careful study to the benefits and costs of these projects, will we be able to prevent the waste of the taxpayer's money, the disruption of our Nation's agricultural economy, and the degradation of our environment.

PECULIAR PARANOIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, peace movement people sometimes used to wonder if they were getting paranoid when they felt they were being watched. Now that the country is learning the extent of the spying that actually went on, it is apparent that the real paranoia was inside the White House.

James Wechsler's column in the New York Post today reflects on this phenomenon:

NIGHTMARES

On one point the testimony of most of the witnesses heard so far in the Watergate hearings is remarkably consistent. It is the cumulative portrait of a White House obsessed with a brooding belief that antiwar demonstrations were part of a massive revolutionary conspiracy furtively sponsored by George McGovern and Larry O'Brien under alien direction and threatening a leftist coup.

Until yesterday the stories told generally omitted any clear reference to President Nixon in describing the agitated apprehension that prevailed in high places. It remained for John Dean to offer the unforgettable image of the President personally insisting that one lonely picket carrying an antiwar sign be banished from his view. The sense that emerges is one of men who had literally become captives of their own fantasies, with Mr. Nixon himself instrumental in producing the epidemic of paranoia.

One can almost hear him exclaiming in disbelief and exasperation when the news was broken to him—as Dean reports—that no

evidence of far-flung, Hanoi-based conspiracy could be produced. Perhaps that is when he decided that the venerable J. Edgar Hoover, long a master spinner of ominous tales, was losing his grip and that a more elaborate—and illicit—"counter-intelligence" network was needed.

Certainly there were various species of revolutionaries scattered around the anti-war movement. What Mr. Nixon and his palace guard seemed unable or unwilling to understand is that a vast multitude of Americans had turned against the war before he assumed the Presidency; that this national revulsion had led to the abdication of Lyndon Johnson; and that his own pledge to secure a swift peace in Vietnam contributed decisively to Nixon's narrow victory over Hubert Humphrey in 1968. In the face of that knowledge how could he have anticipated for example, anything different than the largely spontaneous, intense popular uprising that followed his expansion of the war into Cambodia in 1970?

Now the evidence mounts that there was an authentic hysteria within Mr. Nixon's inner circle, most frenetically manifested in the Mayday mass roundups that Attorney General Mitchell ordered during the Washington protest of May, 1971.

In a sense this was Hanoi's ultimate triumph; this small "fifth-rate" country had succeeded, by its refusal to capitulate, in transforming the leadership of the self-proclaimed "Number One" power into a band of scared little men, as fearful of their own countrymen as of foreign adversaries.

The archives are far from fully revealed. Some may contend, on the basis of what is so far disclosed, that Mr. Nixon and his deputies cynically fashioned the fantasy of alien conspiracy to justify the pattern of lawless surveillance and sabotage now known as Watergate.

Certainly the crude "dirty tricks" played on Ed Muskie's campaign were at variance with the notion that the Administration's hatchet men were primarily protecting the country against what they deemed the monstrous menace of McGovernism (and its alleged Hanoi designers). There are, after all, indications that in fact one strategic aim of the Nixon cabal was to advance McGovern's primary fortunes on the theory that he would be the most vulnerable opponent. In doing so, they were necessarily increasing the risk that this most dangerous man—according to the gospel circulating among themselves—might capture the Presidency. If they were true believers in their own alarms, why did they give covert help to McGovern in strategic primary tests?

Another bizarre circumstance is that, even as fear of "revolutionary violence" was reportedly shadowing the White House, some FBI provocateurs were providing the tools and techniques of violence to antiwar zealots. Indeed, we have apparently only glimpsed the surface of such operations in the isolated confessions unveiled at the Camden trial and in other places.

Perhaps these mysterious discrepancies can only be explained by a realization that there were many diverse aspects and characters in the intrigue that accompanied the desperate resolve to retain power at any price.

Some of the paradoxes are absurdly apparent. Even as government provocateurs were helping to foster the climate of violence, the White House and Mitchell's Justice Dept. were reading the reports of turmoil as proof that anarchy was at the gates. Were all the signals mixed?

Equally grotesque is the spectacle of the President and Dr. Kissinger secretly setting the stage for heralded trips to Moscow and Peking while the Nixon domestic operation was mounting a major assault on home-front "radicals"—from George McGovern to Daniel Ellsberg—with flagrant contempt for their Constitutional rights.

In immediate terms Mr. Nixon's complicity in the final, undercover attempt to obstruct justice, as asserted in Dean's testimony, may be the crucial turning point in the case. But historians may be equally fascinated by the mingled elements of irrationality and cold-bloodedness that seemed to have held sway in the top councils of the White House during the years now under review.

ROSWELL PARK MEMORIAL INSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called to the attention of my colleagues this year's 75th anniversary of Roswell Park Memorial Institute, the oldest comprehensive cancer center in the world. Today I am again privileged to place in the RECORD information about the humanitarian history of this world-renowned cancer complex.

Research into the causes, cures, and prevention of cancer is a vital part of Roswell Park, but it is not the only function. Quality personalized patient care is emphasized, with physical and emotional treatment administered by skilled teams of medical professionals, social workers, and hard-working volunteers.

The scientific community is making a concerted effort to combat cancer; government has now recognized its responsibility in the fight against this terrible enemy. Passage of the National Cancer Act of 1971 was a decisive move forward, but was by no means the end of the advance. Yesterday's House passage of the Labor-HEW Appropriations bill increased funding for the Cancer Institute and added \$209 million to the budget request for NIH research institutes. This is another important stage of the war.

Roswell Park is not resting on past accomplishments. Dr. Gerald P. Murphy, director at the institute, has listed eight primary goals, five in research and three in other areas, to be emphasized in the next 7 years:

First. Pursuit of further studies in immunotherapy.

Second. Development of new cancer drugs:

Our goal is to develop new compounds and to get them into controlled studies not taking seven years, but the shortest time possible.

Third. Study of the mechanisms and properties of cancer cells.

Fourth. Finite study of the subunits of cells—a study of what composes them.

Fifth. Examination of the environment to attempt to identify the hazardous things which may or may not be the cause for certain cancers and, through that identification, seek ways of prevention if possible.

Sixth. Training researchers and health workers involved in cancer for our own needs, those of the State, and the whole cancer commitment.

Seventh. Expansion of our clinical investigation activities—demonstrating the effectiveness in man of a great deal of what has been accomplished in our research here in the last 15 years.

Eighth. Public education:

We acknowledge there is a great need to translate the tremendous accomplishments and hope in cancer research and what can be done in care to the public. We've got to take the fear out of cancer.

We must continue to provide the enabling legislation and financial assistance necessary to eradicate the killer. There is no doubt that the dedicated, brilliant men and women of Roswell Park, in cooperation with the best minds from around the world, will keep their commitment to the health of mankind.

I am inserting an article from the June 23, 1973, Buffalo Evening News, describing the work at the center since its inception:

MAJOR CANCER RESEARCH CENTER BEGAN 75 YEARS AGO AS UB LAB

(By Mildred Spencer)

Its name is known around the world.

Men and women who might otherwise never have heard of Buffalo have heard of Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Scientists, physicians and laymen look to it in gratitude for the answers to cancer that have been found there and in hope that still more answers, perhaps the definite one, will be found in the years ahead. Although familiar with its present and anticipatory of its future, many of them know little of its past—a past that reaches back 75 years.

Some, indeed, think the "Roswell Park" of its title refers to a park rather than a famed Buffalo surgeon who attended President William McKinley when the latter was shot at the Pan-American Exposition here in 1901.

That was four years after Dr. Roswell Park, and the then editor and publisher of The Buffalo Evening News, Edward H. Butler, Sr., had first asked the New York State Legislature for a grant of \$10,000 to establish a cancer laboratory within the University of Buffalo School of Medicine. And three years before the laboratory, first vetoed by Gov. Frank S. Black, became a reality with a state grant of \$7500.

Today, that laboratory, which started with three rooms in the old Medical School at 24 High St., has 26 buildings—16 in Buffalo, five in Orchard Park, four in Springville and one in West Seneca.

Its physical plant is worth an estimated \$70 million. In 1972 its yearly operating expenses totaled \$31,772,947.

"The history of the world," Thomas Carlyle said, "is but the biography of great men."

So the history of Roswell Park Memorial Institute can be told in the records of the men—seven directors and two acting directors—who have determined its destiny in the years since 1898.

The first of these was the founder and first director, Dr. Roswell Park.

Dr. Park was already recognized as an outstanding figure in the field of surgery when he came to Buffalo in 1893 as professor of surgery in the 47-year-old University of Buffalo.

He had been graduated from Northwestern University's Medical Department, studied in Europe and returned to become lecturer on surgery in Rush Medical College and attending surgeon in Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago.

MORE THAN A SURGEON

But he was more than a surgeon. He was a universal man—a skilled musician, composer, brilliant conversationalist, world traveler, reader and writer on subjects as varied as tuberculosis and "The Relation of the Grecian Mysteries to the Foundation of Christianity."

One of his first impressions after coming to Buffalo was the apparent greater incidence

of cancer in this vicinity than he had noted in Illinois.

It challenged him. He saw the problem of cancer as "the pathological mystery of the ages" and determined to do something about solving it.

The UB Medical School had no funds to underwrite this research, so he enlisted the support of Mr. Butler and turned to the state.

The research facility that the state's \$7,500 made possible was known in its early days as the New York State Pathological Laboratory of the University of Buffalo.

It was the first government-supported cancer research laboratory in the world.

Dr. Park himself had too many other demands on his time to devote himself full-time to research. But much of the work done there by others in those early days was directed towards the "parasitic theory" of the cause of cancer.

"For my own part," Dr. Park told the State Medical Society in 1893, "I cannot help feeling that we are on the eve of great discoveries in this matter. I have for years had a growing conviction that cancer—and syphilis, too—were parasitic diseases, due to either unfamiliar or yet unknown organisms, and that some new technical method, or some new application of old methods, would ere long furnish the key to the mystery.

DR. PARK'S WARNING

The methods to determine the truth or falsity of his belief never became available in Dr. Park's lifetime. His contribution, therefore, lay in his repeated warning that cancer was on the increase, his creation of the institute that now bears his name and the encouragement that he gave to research.

His contemporary, Dr. W. W. Keen, professor of surgery at Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia, said of him:

"Dr. Park has done more work and better work than any other person in America in this direction, and his work has not only met with great encouragement and recognition abroad but is recognized as being as good as any done there."

During his six years as director, the laboratory moved from the Medical School to its own building, constructed in 1901 with \$25,000 given by Mrs. William Gratwick on land across from Buffalo General Hospital which had been purchased by public-spirited citizens.

For the next several years the laboratory was known as the Gratwick Research Laboratory of the University of Buffalo.

In 1904, Dr. Park relinquished the reins of the directorship to Dr. Harvey R. Gaylord, who was to hold them for 19 years. During those Gaylord years the laboratory expanded from a small research unit to an institute concerned equally with research and patient care.

In 1911 Dr. Park, still active though no longer director, obtained the support of leading Buffalonians to make the laboratory a state institution. Its name was changed to the New York State Institute for the Study of Malignant Disease.

Two years later a 30-bed hospital for cancer patients was erected on land purchased by interested Buffalonians and donated to the state. It was named the Cary Pavilion in honor of Dr. Charles Cary, a Buffalo physician and trustee on the institute.

It was here that Buffalo first saw the large-scale use of radiation in the treatment of cancer. The institute received its first 50 milligrams of radium as a gift from Mrs. Ansley Wilcox in 1914.

HUGE X-RAY UNIT ADDED

Seven years later a 200,000-volt X-ray machine was installed as an alternate source of radiation.

Dr. George H. A. Clowes, during these early years, introduced the use of experimental

drugs in the treatment of cancer for the first time in the United States. Later, in Indianapolis, he was to play a leading role in the development of methods for the manufacture and clinical use of insulin in diabetes treatment.

Laboratory research, however, remained the principal interest of the institute's director, Dr. Gaylord.

On a trip abroad he met Drs. Carl and Gerty Cori and persuaded them to join the institute staff. There they carried out studies of carbohydrate metabolism that later, when continued at Washington University in St. Louis, won them a Nobel Prize. The annual Cori Lecture Series at Roswell Park Memorial Institute honors their contribution.

Dr. Gaylord himself continued investigations into the parasitic theory of cancer advanced by Dr. Park after the latter died in 1914.

They were given impetus with the purchase in 1913 of an experimental farm near Springville—now the Springville Laboratories of the institute. The streams there were stocked with trout with thyroid tumors attributed to a possible parasite and later discovered to be a specific type of goiter.

In 1919 Dr. Gaylord obtained from Dr. Peyton Rous at the Rockefeller Institute a chicken bearing a tumor which Dr. Rous had identified as caused by a virus. Dr. Gaylord and other scientists at the institute interested in a possible parasitic cause of human cancer studied this tumor for several years.

IMMUNOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Dr. Gaylord was also deeply interested in the immunological aspects of cancer. Some persons, he noted, appeared to be "absolutely" immune to the disease and others, when affected, could apparently throw off diseased cells and overcome it. He hoped to be able, through vaccines, to produce immunity to cancer. Research in both of these areas—virus causation and immunology—has been stepped up in recent years after a long period of dormancy.

In 1913 the institute expanded its program of patient care and research to include statewide pathological services. Institute pathologists aided in the diagnosis of cancer in patients throughout the state by interpreting microscopic slides of tissue samples sent to them by the patients' physicians.

The chief pathologist in charge of this program was Dr. Burton T. Simpson, who was named the third director of the institute when Dr. Gaylord relinquished the position because of ill health in 1923.

Research took a back seat to patient care during the Simpson years, which extended until 1943.

"While we endeavor to keep some research under way in the laboratory," an annual report noted, "the increase in our routine duties has been making it more and more difficult to find sufficient time to devote to these problems."

A new hospital building, named for Dr. Gaylord, was opened in 1927. In 1940 another, the Simpson Building, added 78 beds.

The radiation therapy department was enlarged and divisions for the various phases of cancer were established. Each was headed by a full-time man trained in the specialty involved.

When Dr. Simpson retired in 1943, Dr. William H. Wehr, chief of the institute's division of breast cancer, was named acting director, a position he held until 1945.

It was Dr. Wehr who held the institute together during the difficult years of World War II, somehow balancing war-time staff shortages and a long waiting list of patients.

The contacts and know-how he gained in those years were to prove invaluable to subsequent directors whom Dr. Wehr served as unofficial go-between with State Health Department and other Albany officials.

ROLE OF WALTER MAHONEY

One of them, Supreme Court Justice Walter J. Mahoney, has stated that his initial interest in the institute came about as the result of a conversation with Dr. Wehr and Assemblyman Frank Gugino.

As majority leader in the State Senate, Sen. Mahoney was instrumental in obtaining the ever-increasing funds needed to make the institute a respected leader in the fight against cancer.

Dr. Wehr's name is perpetuated at the institute by the Wehr Building, constructed in 1962 to provide additional laboratory space and animal quarters.

In 1945, Dr. Louis C. Kress became the institute's fourth director. Dr. Kress, whose association with the institute as a physician dated back to 1919, had been serving as director of the State Health Department's newly-organized Division of Cancer Control in Albany.

In his new job in Buffalo he added still another dimension to the role of the institute, officially renamed Roswell Park Memorial Institute in 1946. That dimension was education.

Students in the Medical School were invited to attend lectures at the institute, and local hospitals to send resident physicians for training.

Dr. Kress himself gave thousands of speeches on cancer to lay and professional groups, devoting his leisure as well as his professional hours to the task.

He died of a heart attack in 1952 while driving through a snow storm to make a speech on cancer in Rochester. The Kress Building today houses the institute's personnel, epidemiology and the computer center.

Two years before Dr. Kress' death, ground had been broken for a new 316-bed \$7 million patient-care building, then under construction.

At the ground-breaking, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, who had lost two members of his family to cancer, affirmed his intention of upgrading Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

MORE ACCENT ON RESEARCH

After Dr. Kress died, State Health Commissioner Herman E. Hilleboe announced a plan for making the institute not merely a patient treatment center with incidental research interest but a great facility devoted primarily to research.

With this in mind, he launched a search for a new director who could make the dream a reality.

Meanwhile Dr. Morton L. Levin, an epidemiologist who had been among the first to call attention to the relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer, became acting director.

His occupancy of the seat lasted less than a year.

On Nov. 1, 1952, Dr. George E. Moore, 32, was named fifth director of the institute.

One of the youngest men ever to hold a post of such responsibility, Dr. Moore had been associate professor of surgery, director of the Tumor Clinic and cancer co-ordinator at the University of Minnesota Medical School.

Like the institute's first director, Dr. Park, the fifth was a "man for all seasons."

A skilled surgeon and widely-respected researcher, he still found time for a variety of other activities ranging from painting to playing volleyball with the institute's championship team.

But first and foremost, during his 15 years as director, he gave himself to the development of the institute as a research facility second to none. When he was in Buffalo he was in his laboratory or office every day, and many evenings, even over the week-ends.

He culled the scientific literature and travelled throughout the world to find outstanding scientists who were doing promising work in cancer research and persuade them to join the Roswell Park staff.

Evidence of his success is the increase in the number of scientific papers published by members of the professional staff during his directorship—from 13 in 1952 to 777 in 1967.

Because he knew that the solution to the cancer problem might not come in his lifetime, he encouraged young people to become interested in science as a career. The result was the institute's continuing Research Participation Program in Science, established in 1953.

UNIVERSITY'S ROSWELL DIVISION

Two years later a Roswell Park Division of the University of Buffalo Graduate School was established at the institute.

Because Roswell Park Memorial Institute could not, as a state facility, receive gifts and research grants, Dr. Moore was instrumental in the formation of a Roswell Park Division of Health Research Inc. for that purpose. And he exerted his considerable power of persuasion to obtain such gifts and grants from the federal government, the American Cancer Society and private sources.

To support the expanding research program, the institute needed increased operating funds.

Dr. Moore, with the knowledgeable assistance of Dr. Wehr, obtained the necessary budget increases each year by keeping the state legislators and the governor in close touch with the progress being made in the fight against cancer.

When he resigned the directorship to become director of research for the State Health Department, the institute's professional staff had increased from 276 to 1922, its annual budget from \$1,225,751 to \$19,444,979.

Over those years, Gov. Rockefeller noted at that time, almost the entire physical plant of the institute had been replaced at a cost of \$30 million.

Dr. Moore's successor as director was Dr. James T. Grace Jr., who had been one of his assistants.

A tall, soft-spoken southerner, Dr. Grace had decided to devote his life to cancer research after his young son died of leukemia.

In his years at Roswell Park, Dr. Grace had achieved an international reputation for his studies of the possible relationship of viruses to human cancer—the subject in which Dr. Gaylord had evinced such interest a half-century earlier.

During the three years of his directorship, he was equally concerned about strengthening the image of the institute as an outstanding center for patient care.

The rapid growth of the institute in the basic research field had made some physicians reluctant to send patients there. The patients, they feared, might be used as human "guinea pigs," their personal welfare sacrificed to the researchers' desire to learn.

This had not happened and Dr. Grace set out to show the medical profession that it had not happened, that their patients would receive the best possible care for their disease when referred to the institute.

To strengthen the ties with practicing physicians throughout the state, he instituted a toll-free telephone system by which they could call the institute at any time for assistance in diagnosis and treatment of cancer in their own patients.

DR. GRACE AND HIS CHOICE

Both on and off the job, Dr. Grace was untiring in his efforts to carry the message of cancer to professional and lay groups.

One of his last acts, before he was critically injured in an automobile accident in 1970 (he died 17 months later) was to address the kickoff meeting of the Cancer Crusade of the American Cancer Society in Chicago. It was there that he spoke the words that have since been embossed on a plaque that hangs in the main lobby of the institute:

"If I had my choice between a moon walk and the life of a single child with leukemia, I would never glance upward!"

Dr. Gerald P. Murphy, who succeeded Dr. Grace, has continued to build the institute's programs in research, patient care and education.

A cancer drug center, planned by Dr. Grace, has been completed and named the James T. Grace Jr. Cancer Drug Center Building. An educational center, the Center Research Studies Center, has been opened. In 1972, the Institute received the largest federal grant in its history—\$5,523,822—to build a cancer cell center.

In the planning stage is a badly-needed expansion of the pediatrics department and construction of an ambulatory care center to centralize and expand outpatient clinics and related facilities.

Recognizing the need for housing facilities for patients from outside the area who do not need hospitalization but cannot afford to pay hotel rates—and, in some instances, for their families—Dr. Murphy has encouraged the opening of two guest houses and hopes to follow these with others.

And he has announced plans to step up the institute's program to rehabilitate patients not only physically but also psychologically and socially after cancer treatment.

At the turn of the century, when Roswell Park Memorial Institute was founded, cancer was a virtual death sentence. By the 1930s, the survival rate was one in five. Today it is two in five.

The challenge of tomorrow is to increase that survival rate to three, four or even five in five.

Or, better yet, to prevent cancer entirely. Research now under way at Roswell Park Memorial Institute may hold some of the answers.—Mildred Spencer

RESEARCH HEADS LIST OF FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Predicting that the 1970s will be "a very exciting period" for Roswell Park Memorial Institute, Dr. Gerald P. Murphy, director, has outlined eight directions which the institute will emphasize in the next seven years.

Five of the areas are in research:

- (1) Pursuit of further studies in immunotherapy.
- (2) Development of new cancer drugs. "Our goal is to develop new compounds and to get them into controlled studies not taking seven years but the shortest time possible."
- (3) Study of the mechanisms and properties of cancer cells.
- (4) "Finite study of the subunits of cells . . . a study of what composes them."
- (5) Examination of the environment "to attempt to identify the hazardous things which may or may not be the cause for certain cancers and, through that identification, seek ways of prevention if possible." Other areas include:
- (6) Training researchers and health workers involved in cancer "for our own needs, those of the state, and the whole cancer commitment."
- (7) "Expansion of our clinical investigation activities . . . demonstrating the effectiveness in man of a great deal of what has been accomplished in our research here in the last 15 years."

(8) Public education. "We acknowledge there is a great need to translate the tremendous accomplishments and hope in cancer research and what can be done in care to the public. We've got to take the fear out of cancer."

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join the distinguished Representative from the 38th District of New York (Mr. KEMP) in saluting Roswell Park Memorial Institute; may we all benefit from many more years of its contributions to health and long life.

ARCHAIC VOTING PRACTICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of the United States there has been a consistent effort to extend the right to vote to nearly all adult Americans and to reduce unnecessary barriers to the exercise of this most basic right. Restrictions on grounds of property, religion, race, and sex have all been removed in the continuing effort to create a truly universal adult suffrage. Today one of the biggest obstacles that remains to the exercise of the vote are archaic voting practices that continues to penalize the growing number of mobile Americans.

The Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 sought to redress some of these inequities, yet today for a variety of reasons at least 750,000 Americans residing overseas are effectively disenfranchised. These Americans are missionaries, teachers, retirees, businessmen, and businesswomen and their families, news correspondents, and others. They play a very vital role in promoting American interests, promoting good will, securing trade, or providing information for American readers or viewers.

Yet because of their overseas residence most of these Americans are effectively prevented from voting in Presidential and congressional elections, even though they continue to be subject to the obligations and responsibilities of American citizenship. They are prevented from exercising the Federal franchise because the majority of States impose rules which require a voter's physical presence or maintenance of a home in the State or which have confusing absentee forms for registration or voting that appear to require the maintenance of a home in the State or which raise a doubt of voting eligibility—as do the majority of the States—of nonresident domiciliaries whose date of return is uncertain or because the citizen does not honestly know whether he or she will return to the State of last residence or be assigned to a different State.

Last year the Bipartisan Committee for American Voters Overseas surveyed the election officials of the 50 States as to the ability of overseas American citizens to vote for President and Congress in their respective States. The bipartisan

committee is an organization of distinguished business and professional people in Europe of both political parties who have been seeking the enfranchisement of American citizens residing abroad. The following set of circumstances were presented to the election officials of the 50 States:

A qualified voting resident left the State a number of years ago to work abroad in a business or professional capacity. His former home in the State has been sold and he now only has a physical residence in a foreign country. However, he looks upon this as temporary and intends eventually to return to his State. He considers that his last residence before departing from the State remains his domicile or legal residence for voting in Federal elections, even though he has no present place of abode within the State.

Results from the survey indicate that nearly two-thirds of the States effectively disenfranchise or impair the ability of a nonresident domiciliary to vote in congressional elections.

In elections for President, barely half of the States—26 and the District of Columbia would clearly allow him to register and vote absentee. A number of these States have adopted the form 76 Federal Post Card Application form—FPCA—for absentee registration and voting by Americans abroad.

However, under present law, if our typical American citizen abroad does not have an intent to return to the State of his last residence, in other words is not a domiciliary of that State, it would appear that he would presently not be entitled to vote in any State of the Union. This would be the case, for example, if his employer transferred him overseas from one State but could give him no assurance what State he might be transferred to upon his return.

To correct this inequity Mr. RAILSBACK and I are today introducing legislation that would extend the Federal franchise to overseas American citizens. The legislation would allow the otherwise qualified citizen to vote in the State in which he or she had last voted or registered to vote, or if the citizen had not voted or registered, in the last State in which the citizen maintained a domicile before departure from the United States as long as the citizen complies with the absentee requirements of the State and does not qualify as a voter in any other State or territory or possession of the United States. This is the heart of the legislation we introduce today.

The bill we propose today would also write into law an Internal Revenue Service administrative ruling, referred to in Mr. RAILSBACK's speech which would assure the American citizen overseas that exercising the right to register and vote

absentee would not jeopardize tax exemptions afforded by the Federal Government and the overwhelming majority of States income tax laws. Additionally it would assure the American citizen that the States would not make an inconsistent interpretation of their own income tax laws. It would establish the principle that the exercise of the right to register and vote in Federal elections by a U.S. citizen abroad should not constitute an act which would affect the determination of his or her actual residence—a distinguished from his or her place of voting for Federal, State, or local tax purposes.

The overseas citizens voting bill also contains a recommendation to the States that it accept as an application for registration—if required by State law—and/or as an application for an absentee ballot the form contained in our bill. This form is very similar to the Federal Post Card Application now used in most States as an application for registration and ballot for overseas military personnel and certain other groups which vary from State to State.

The principal concern of this legislation and fundamental to democracy is the right to vote. It must not be abridged by the exercise of another basic right of every American citizen—the freedom of movement and travel. This proposal would eliminate present obstacles and would help to insure to every American of voting age, the right to exercise his or her franchise in Federal elections.

I include a survey of the Bipartisan Committee for American Voters Overseas:

SURVEY OF STATE LAWS AND PROCEDURES FOR ABSENTEE REGISTRATION AND VOTING IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS BY AMERICAN CITIZENS RESIDING ABROAD

The Bipartisan Committee on Absentee Voting has recently undertaken a survey of the laws and procedures in the various states to determine the eligibility of U.S. citizens residing abroad for absentee registration and absentee voting in Presidential elections. The survey involved (i) the sending of letters dated February 4, 1972 to the Attorneys General (or equivalent officials) of all of the states and the District of Columbia; (ii) consultation with the staff of the Federal Voting Assistance Task Force; and (iii) independent research by counsel for the Bipartisan Committee. In this survey, the Bipartisan Committee asked whether the person described in the following example would be eligible for absentee registration and voting in the 1972 Presidential election:

A qualified voting resident left the state a number of years ago to work abroad in a business or professional capacity. His former home in the state has been sold and he now only has a physical residence in a foreign country. However, he looks upon this as temporary and intends eventually to return to his state. He considers that his last residence before departure from the state remains his domicile or legal residence for voting in na-

tional elections, even though he has no present place of abode within the state.

The survey took into account two recent federal laws which were expected to expand absentee registration and voting rights of Americans temporarily residing abroad. First, the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955, as amended in 1968, recommended that the states adopt simplified registration and voting procedures for military personnel and other U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad. One of the principal recommendations in the Federal Voting Assistance Act is the adoption of the simplified Federal Post Card Application (FPCA), which can serve as an application both for absentee registration and for an absentee ballot. As of now, 24 states and the District of Columbia have adopted the FPCA for U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad, and the form may be used in those states for all elections—federal, state and local.

Second, Title II of the Federal Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 (the "1970 Amendments") endeavored (1) to abolish completely the durational residency requirement as a precondition to voting in Presidential elections; and (2) to establish uniform national standards for absentee registration and voting in Presidential elections. The language of Title II does not appear to deal specifically with absentee registration and voting rights of Americans residing abroad. During Senate debate on the 1970 Amendments, however, Senator Barry M. Goldwater interpreted Title II to provide that the retention of state domicile (i.e., intent to return) is sufficient to assure these rights for all "civilian citizens who are temporarily living away from their regular homes," even if they are working or studying overseas, 116 Cong. Rec. 3539 (daily ed. March 11, 1970). Only two states (Connecticut and Illinois) appear to have clearly adopted the Goldwater interpretation of Title II. As noted above, 24 states and the District of Columbia accept the FPCA; and Michigan has a statute modeled in the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955, as amended but has not formally adopted the FPCA. The remaining states taking a position have either given a qualified response, or have refused to go along with the Goldwater interpretation entirely.

Below is a state-by-state breakdown of the Bipartisan Committee survey of the eligibility of Americans temporarily residing abroad for absentee registration and voting in Presidential elections, with the totals for each category (the District of Columbia being listed as a state):

ABSENTEE REGISTRATION	
States (including the 25 FPCA states)—"Yes"	27
States—Qualified "Yes"	8
States—"No"	6
States—Unclear	10
ABSENTEE VOTING	
States (including the 25 FPCA states)—"Yes"	27
States—Qualified "Yes"	11
States—"No"	5
States—Unclear	8

[Letters from state authorities were addressed to the Bipartisan Committee unless otherwise noted. The states for which the Bipartisan Committee has not yet received a reply from the Attorney General or other official are shown in the survey by an (*):]

State	Absentee registration	Absentee voting	FPCA for citizens temporarily abroad	Comments
Alabama	No	No	No	Letter from Attorney General, Feb. 9, 1972: Unable to give opinion to private party. [See Title 17, § 25 (Supp. 1969) (absentee registration problem); Title 17, § 64(16), (23), (24a) (Supp. 1969) (absentee ballot problem).]
Alaska	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Arizona	Unclear	Unclear	No	Statute raises doubt of voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliary whose date of return uncertain. A.R.S. § 16-925 (Supp. 1971). Confusing registration form appears to require presence in State. A.R.S. § 15-143(A), (B) (Supp. 1971).

State	Absentee registration	Absentee voting	FPCA for citizens temporarily abroad	Comments
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Statute raises doubt of voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliary whose date of return uncertain. West's Ann. Elec. Code § 14287 (1961).
California	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Colorado	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter from Secretary of State, Feb. 24, 1972: Agrees that under the 1970 amendments a former Connecticut resident "who temporarily resides in Europe" may register in absentia for presidential (elector) elections, and may maintain his voting residence in Connecticut for such elections.
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	No	
Delaware	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter from Attorney General to the county attorney of Peoria, Mar. 13, 1972: Under the provisions of the 1970 amendments, a U.S. citizen and resident of Illinois may vote in the presidential (electors) election in his precinct by absentee ballot "even though he is living in a foreign country." The county clerk is required to allow absentee registration of such citizens.
District of Columbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Hawaii	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Idaho	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Illinois	Yes	Yes	No	
Indiana	Unclear	Unclear	No	Statute raises doubt of voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliary whose date of return uncertain. Ann. Ind Stat. § 29-4803 (1969).
Iowa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter from Attorney General, Feb. 11, 1972: Under the 1970 amendments, "American citizens living abroad who have established residence in Kentucky will be permitted to register in absentee. . . Certainly a person does not have to be physically present in the State in order to vote, but on the other hand he must have some specific residential address in order to register. Thus, concerning the example you present, if the voter cannot cite or declare a particular place within a precinct as being his legal residence in Kentucky, we cannot see how he can legally qualify to register and vote." [See K. R. S. Ann. § 117.610 (1969).]
Kansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Kentucky	Qualified yes	Qualified yes	No. Indicated to Federal Voting Assistance Task Force intention to adopt FPCA by administrative rule in the future.	
Louisiana	No	No	Legislation pending.	
Maine	Qualified yes	Qualified yes	No	Letter from Attorney General, July 29, 1966, verified by telephone, Oct. 27, 1971: "The place where one regards as his home is unimportant, where he actually resides is the determining factor." [See LSA-R. S. § 18.40 (1969) (absentee registration problem).]
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter from Deputy Attorney General, Feb. 7, 1972: "This office has no quarrel with [your] example," but cannot speak for the several hundred registrars of boards of registration or voters in the State [See 21 M.P.S.A. § 71 (Supp. 1979) (absentee registration problem).]
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter from Assistant Attorney General, Feb. 9, 1972: If a voter's name has been stricken from the list of registered voters as a result of the annual voting census and the voter seeks to reregister and can give no street and number which he maintains as a physical place of residence, "I think the voter would encounter grave difficulties."
Michigan	Yes	Yes	No	Letter from Attorney General, Mar. 10, 1972: Statute now provides for absentee voting for U.S. citizen temporarily residing abroad. Mich. Stat. Ann. § 6.1769(1). [Election clerks might accept FPCA as application for absentee ballot (and affidavit).]
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	Yes	Statute raises doubt of voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliary whose date of return is uncertain. M.S.A. § 201.26 (1962).
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter from Attorney General, Feb. 16, 1972: Legislation pending to incorporate requirements of the 1970 Amendments in Missouri statutes. [See U.A.M.S. § 113-240 (Supp. 1971); cf. U.A.M.S. § 112.310 (Supp. 1971) (absentee registration problem).]
Missouri	No	No	No	
Montana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Statute raises doubt of voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliary whose date of return is uncertain. Rev. Code of Mont. 1947, § 23-3022 (Supp. 1971).
Nebraska	Yes	Yes	Yes	Statute raises doubt of voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliary whose date of return is uncertain. R.R.S. 1949, § 32-475 (1968).
Nevada	No	No	No	Letter from Attorney General, Feb. 18, 1972: "In light of the presumptions created by the Nevada Statute as well as the fact that the individual in question has broken up his home and moved to a foreign location it would appear that under the presently existing Nevada law the individual fitting your hypothetical situation would not qualify for an absentee ballot in this State." [See NRS § 293.500 (1969). See also MRS 293.517, 293.553 (1969) (absentee registration problem).]
New Hampshire	Qualified yes	Qualified yes	No	Letter from Attorney General, Feb. 15, 1972: "Where the right to vote involves a temporary absence [from the State] it is a question of fact whether the voter has the requisite intention of returning thereto as his home." [Case raises doubt of voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliary whose date of return uncertain. Felker v. Henderson, 78 N.H. 509, 102 Atl. 623.624 (1971).]
New Jersey	Qualified yes	Qualified yes	No	Letter from Attorney General, Apr. 5, 1972: "It is the position of this office that New Jersey domiciliaries temporarily residing abroad must be afforded an opportunity for both absentee registration and voting in presidential elections. Enabling legislation to this effect is being introduced in the New Jersey Legislature in order that New Jersey domiciliaries can exercise their legitimate right of franchise in the presidential election while residing temporarily abroad." [But see N.J.S.A. § 19:31-6 (1964) (absentee registration problem).]
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter from Attorney General to Department of Defense, May 27, 1969, verified by telephone, Oct. 27, 1971: "[F]or a civilian to vote by absentee ballot he must retain a permanent residence within the State of New York [unless voter is employed by the United States]."
New York	No	No	No	
North Carolina	Qualified yes	Qualified yes	No	Letter from Attorney General, Mar. 30, 1972: Unable to give opinion to private party. "I recommend that you direct your efforts to the legislative bodies which have the power to make changes in New York Law."
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter from Attorney General, Feb. 11, 1972: "[I]f a person goes into another State or country for temporary purpose without the intent of making that country his permanent residence and with the intent of returning to this State and particularly where he continues to vote absentee ballots in this State, then he would not generally be considered as having lost his residence in North Carolina." [The North Carolina statute, Gen. Stat. § 163-57, makes clear that a person shall not be considered as having lost his residence if he goes into "another State or county of this State." However, the Attorney General appears to have liberally construed this language to include "another country." Note also that the statute raises some doubt as to the voting eligibility of a nonresident domiciliary whose date of return is uncertain. Gen. Stat. § 153-57 (Supp. 1969). See also Gen. Stat. §§ 163-67, 163-68, 163-245 (Supp. 1969) (absentee registration problem).]
Ohio	Qualified yes	Qualified yes	No	Letter from Secretary of State, Feb. 15, 1972: "From the facts given in your hypothetical situation, it would appear that the citizen would be eligible to vote by absentee ballot if he otherwise qualifies, i.e., 6 months residence in the State, 30 days residence in the county and precinct, and registered if required." [Ohio appears to impose a 3-year cutoff on absence from the State in determining eligibility to vote. Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 5303.02 (1960). See also Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §§ 3503.11, 3503.27 (Supp. 1970) (absentee registration problem).]
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter from Deputy Attorney General, Feb. 22, 1972: As a result of the 1970 amendments, "The Pennsylvania Elections Bureau has made provisions for registering electors as absentee electors who consider Pennsylvania their domicile. Requests for absentee registration will be handled by the Elections Bureau in the Department of State. From there they will be forwarded to the elector's home county where he will be enrolled. It is important that the elector designate the county in which he wishes to be enrolled. Requests for absentee ballots will, as usual, be handled at the county level." Legislation is pending to incorporate requirements of the 1970 amendments in Pennsylvania statute. [Note that the present statute raises some doubt as to the voting eligibility of a nonresident domiciliary whose date of return is uncertain. 25 P.S. § 2815 (1963). See also 25 P.S. §§ 951-18, 951-18.1, 951-18.2 (Supp. 1970) (absentee registration problem).]
Oregon	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Pennsylvania	Qualified yes	Qualified yes	No	
Rhode Island	Unclear	Unclear	No	
South Carolina	Unclear	Qualified yes	No	See General Laws of Rhode Island § 17-9-7 (1969); cf. § 17-9-10, 17-9-11, 17-9-25 (1969) (absentee registration problem). Letter from Assistant Attorney General, Feb. 9, 1972: As a result of the 1970 amendments, a citizen domiciled in South Carolina who is temporarily absent from the State during the 1972 presidential election will be able to vote by absentee ballot. Legislation is pending to incorporate the requirements of the 1970 amendments in the South Carolina statute. In the event that legislation is not enacted, the Attorney General and State Election Commission "shall, by necessity, devise some emergency procedure to ensure compliance with the mandate of the Congress and the United States Supreme Court." [See South Carolina Code Law § 23-63 (absentee registration problem).]

State	Absentee registration	Absentee voting	FPCA for citizens temporarily abroad	Comments
South Dakota	Qualified yes	Qualified yes	No	Letter from Assistant Attorney General, Feb. 29, 1972: "[N]o citizen of South Dakota loses his right to vote here unless he has established legal residence elsewhere." [However, confusing registration form appears to require presence in State. S.D.C.L. § 12-4-7 (Supp. 1971). See also S.D.C.L. §§ 12-19-16, 12-19-22 (1967) (absentee registration problem).]
Tennessee	Unclear	Qualified yes	No	Letter from Assistant Attorney General, Feb. 9, 1972: "The question whether [a person temporarily out of this country is] a bona fide resident, entitled to register and vote in this State, is a factor to be determined by each local county election commission." [However, there may be a problem with absentee registration, Tenn. Code Ann. § 2-360 (1971), and confusing form of absentee ballot appears to require presence in State, Tenn. Code Ann. § 2-1604 (1971).]
Texas	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Utah	Unclear	Unclear	No	Statute raises doubt of voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliary whose date of return is uncertain. Utah Code Ann. § 20-2-14 (1969). Confusing registration form appears to require presence in State. Utah Code Ann. § 20-2-11 (Supp. 1971).
Vermont	Unclear	Unclear	No	Confusing registration form of absentee ballot appears to require presence in State. 17 V.S.A. § 126 (1957).
Virginia	No	Qualified yes	Qualified yes	
Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes	
West Virginia	Unclear	Unclear	No	Confusing form of absentee ballot appears to require presence in State. W. Va. Code Ann. § 3-3-5 (1971).
Wisconsin	Unclear	Unclear	No	Letter from Attorney General to the Secretary of State of Wisconsin, Jan. 20, 1972: "[I]t does not appear that Wisconsin Statutes provide authority for allowing former residents of the State who now reside permanently in a foreign country to vote by absentee ballot in a presidential election in the election district of the former residence in the State of Wisconsin, simply because the person has retained their U.S. citizenship." Letter from Attorney General to the Secretary of State of Wisconsin, June 7, 1971: "[I]t can be generally stated that a vague general determination to return to Wisconsin in the distant future, may very well be insufficient to support a contention that residency elsewhere is only for temporary purposes." Moreover, confusing form of absentee ballot appears to require presence in State. W.S.A. § 6.87 (Supp. 1971). Confusing registration form appears to require presence in State. Wyo. Stat. § 22-158 (Supp. 1971).
Wyoming	Unclear	Unclear	No	

COMPENDIUM OF STATE LAWS LEADING TO THE DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF AMERICAN CITIZENS RESIDING ABROAD IN NON-PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Thirty-three states effectively disenfranchise or impair the ability of nonresident domiciliaries to vote in elections other than for President and Vice President. Illinois, Louisiana, and New York require a voter's actual presence or maintenance of a home in the state, thereby rendering overseas domiciliaries ineligible. Ohio allows temporary absentees to vote for three years but no longer. Thirteen states appear to recognize the voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliaries but have statutes, decisions or an Attorney General's Opinion which raise doubts regarding that eligibility. Ten states require the execution of absentee registration or voting forms which confuse voters by requiring a state "residence", thereby inducing nonresident domiciliaries to forego the franchise for fear of perjuring themselves. Finally, eighteen states disenfranchise these voters by failing to provide absentee registration or absentee ballots.*

1. The laws of the following three states appear to require physical presence or the maintenance of a home within the state in order to vote in non-Presidential elections:

State and authority:

Illinois, *Stein v. County Board of School Trustees*, 85 Ill. App. 2d 251, 229 N.E. 2d 165 (1967); *Clark v. Quick*, 337 Ill. 424, 36 N.E. 2d 563 (1941).

Louisiana, *Estopinal v. Michel*, 121 La. 879, 46 So. 907, 908 (1908); Opin. Atty. Gen. to Bipartisan Committee (July 29, 1966) (verified by telephone Oct. 27, 1971); "The place where one regards as his home is unimportant; where he actually resides is the determining factor."

New York, Letter from Secretary of State to Office of Information, Department of Defense (May 27, 1969) (verified by telephone Oct. 27, 1971): "... for a civilian to vote by absentee ballot he must retain a permanent residence within the State of New York (unless voter is employed by the United States)."

2. Ohio permits a voter to retain his eligibility to vote while absent from his home "for temporary purposes." However, "temporary purposes" is defined as "a period of absence not in excess of 8 years." (Ohio Rev. Code Ann. Sect. 3503.02 (1960).)

3. Thirteen states appear to recognize the voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliaries but have statutes, decisions, or the opinion of an Attorney General which raise doubts regarding that eligibility. Twelve of those

states have a statute or decision approximately as follows: "If a person removes to another state as a place of permanent residence, with the intention of remaining for an indefinite time, he loses his residence in this state, notwithstanding that he entertains an intention of returning at some future period."

State and authority:

Arizona, A.R.S. Sect. 16-925 (Suppl. 1971). California, West's Ann. Elec. Code Sect. 14287 (1961).

Indiana, Ann. Ind. Stat. Sect. 29-4803 (1969).

Kentucky, K.R.S. Ann. 117.610 (1969).

Minnesota, M.S.A. Sect. 201.26 (1962).

Montana, Rev. Code of Mont. 1947 Sect. 23-3022 (Supp. 1971).

Nebraska, R.R.S. 1943 Sect. 32-475 (1968).

Nevada, NRS 293.500 (1969).

New Hampshire, *Felker v. Henderson*, 78 N.H. 509, 102 A. 623, 624 (1917).

North Carolina, Gen'l Stat. N. Car. Sect. 163-57 (Suppl. 1969).

Pennsylvania, 25 P.S. Sect. 2815 (1963).

Utah, Utah Code Ann. 20-2-14 (1969).

Although New Jersey's decisional law indicates that residence equals domicile for voting purposes, the Attorney General of the State of New Jersey wrote to the Bipartisan Committee on May 11, 1966 (verified by telephone Oct. 28, 1971), as follows: "... in order to have a voting residence in this State it is necessary that a person possess an intention to make this State his home for an indefinite period and, in addition, he must have a residence to which he is entitled to return at will. For instance, if a person rents an apartment and subsequently leaves the State, and that person no longer has a fixed address in New Jersey, he is not a domiciliary who is entitled to vote irrespective of his intentions."

4. Ten states require the execution of absentee registration or voting forms which confuse voters by requiring a state "residence," thereby inducing nonresident domiciliaries to forego the franchise for fear of perjuring themselves:

State and form:

Arizona, A.R.S. Sect. 16-143(B) (Supp. 1971) (Absentee Registration): "My place of residence is _____ precinct, _____ street, city of _____, county of _____, state of Arizona."

Idaho, Idaho Code Sect. 34-411 (supp. 1970) (Application for Registration—Contents): "The period of time ... during which [I] have resided in the state ... See also Idaho Code, Sect. 34-410 (supp. 1970).

Minnesota, M.S.A. 207.19 (Supp. 1971)

(Absentee Ballot): "His home and place of residence is and on said election days will be at _____ in the _____ (town, city, or village) of _____ County of _____ State of Minnesota."

South Dakota, S.D.C.L. (Supp. 1971) Sect. 12-4-7 (Absentee Registration): "... I reside in the _____ precinct in the city of _____ at _____ (street number), _____ street (or town, or _____ township), and in the _____ independent school district, in _____ county; ..."

Tennessee, Tenn. Code Ann. Sect. 2-1604 (1971) (Absentee Ballot): "I, _____, hereby declare that my fixed residence is _____ (street address), _____ (city or town), _____ (county), _____ Tennessee."

Utah, Utah Code Ann. Sect. 20-2-11 (Supp. 1971) (Absentee Registration): "4. Residency qualifications:

A. Will you have resided in Utah six months continuously prior to the next election? _____ yes _____ no.

B. Will you have resided in _____ County sixty days continuously prior to the next election? _____ yes _____ no.

"I do solemnly swear ... that I will not vote a ballot from any other state or election district under penalty of law."

Vermont, 17 V.S.A. Sect. 126 (1957) (Absentee Ballot): "State of Vermont, County of _____

... I am a resident, a citizen and a legal voter of the town (city) of _____, county of _____."

West Virginia, W. Va. Code Ann. Sect. 3-3-5 (1971) (Absentee Ballot): "I, _____ hereby declare that I am now, or will have been, a resident of the State of West Virginia for twelve months, and of the county of _____ for sixty days next preceding the date of the ensuing election to be held on the _____ day of _____, 19__;

that I now reside at _____ (give full address) in the magisterial district of _____ in said county." (Form ambiguous on whether voting right of a citizen temporarily residing abroad requires maintenance of a state "residence".)

Wisconsin, W.S.A. 6.87 (Supp. 1971) (Absentee Ballot) "... I am a resident of the _____ precinct of the town (village) of _____, or of the _____ ward in the city of _____, residing at _____ in said city, the county of _____, state of Wisconsin, ..."

Wyoming, Wyo. Stat. Sect. 22-158 (Supp. 1971) (Absentee Registration): "I do sol-

*The subtotal add up to more than 33 states because several states fit into more than one category.

emny swear . . . that I will have actually and not constructively been a bona fide resident of [Wyoming] one year and of said county sixty days, and of election district No. . . . in said county ten days preceding the next election; that I am an actual resident of ward No. . . . that my address is . . . (within) the limits of an incorporated city or town . . ."

5. Eighteen states do not appear to provide the U.S. citizen overseas (in a non-governmental capacity) with absentee registration or an absentee ballot in non-Presidential elections:

- (a) Absentee ballot:
 Alabama, Title 17 Sect. 64(16) (23) (Supp. 1969); Title 17 Sect. 64(24a) (Supp. 1969).
 Mississippi, Miss. Code Sect. 3196-01 (1957); Sect. 3203-11 (Supp. 1971).
 South Carolina, Cf.S.Car. Code Law Sect. 23-441 *et seq.*, 23-449.31 *et seq.* (Supp. 1970).
 (b) Absentee registration:
 Alabama, Title 17 Sect. 26 (Supp. 1969).
 Connecticut, Conn. Gen'l Stat. Ann. Sect. 9-20 (Supp. 1971).
 Delaware, Del. Code Ann. 15 Sect. 1722 (Supp. 1970); cf. 15, Sect. 1901 *et seq.*
 Idaho, Idaho Code Sect. 34-410 (Supp. 1970).
 Louisiana, LSA-R.S. 18:40 (1969).
 Maine, 21 M.R.S.A. Sect. 71 (Supp. 1970).
 Mississippi, Miss. Code Sect. 3196-06 (1957).
 Missouri, V.A.M.S. Sect. 113.240 (Supp. 1971); cf. 112.310 (Supp. 1971).
 Nevada, NRS 293.517; cf. 293.553 (1969).
 New Jersey, N.J.S.A. 19: 31-6 (1934).
 North Carolina, Gen'l Stat. N. Car. Sects. 163-67, 163-68 (Supp. 1969); cf. Sect. 163-245 (Supp. 1969).
 Ohio, Ohio Rev. Code Ann. Sect. 3503.11 (Supp. 1970); Sect. 3503.27 (1960).
 Oklahoma 26 Okl. St. Ann. Sect. 93.4 (Supp. 1970); cf. 26 Okl. St. Ann. Sect. 345.1 (Supp. 1970).
 Pennsylvania, 25 P.S. Sect. 951-18 (1963); cf. 25 P.S. Sects. 951-18.1, 951-18.2 (Supp. 1970).
 Rhode Island, Gen'l Laws of R.I. Sects. 17-9-7 (1969); cf. Sect. 17-9-10, 17-9-11, 17-9-25 (1969).
 South Carolina, S. Car. Code Law Sect. 23-63 (Supp.).
 South Dakota, S.D.C.L. Sect. 2-19-16 (1967); cf. Sect. 12-19-22.
 Tennessee, Tenn. Code Ann. Sect. 2-306 (1971).
 Virginia, Code of Va. Ann. Sect. 24.1-47 (Supp. 1971).

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, today, I am sponsoring, along with the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. ROBINO, the introduction of legislation which would allow U.S. citizens living abroad to vote in all Federal elections. More specifically, the bill would provide that no citizen who is otherwise qualified to register and vote in his domiciliary State, with respect to any Federal election, shall be denied the right to vote in such State merely because such citizen is residing outside the United States and has relinquished his place of abode or other address in the State—provided that he has not qualified as a voter in any other State.

The right to vote is one of the most basic rights of American citizenship, yet over 750,000 Americans—including thousands of businessmen and women, missionaries, teachers, lawyers, students, engineers, and many others residing overseas are denied the Federal franchise. This occurs because the majority of States impose rules which require a voter's actual presence or maintenance

of a home in the State; or which raise a doubt of voting eligibility of nonresident domiciliaries whose date of return is uncertain; or because the citizen is unsure whether he or she will return to the State of last residence or be assigned to a different State; or the State has confusing absentee registration of voting forms that appear to require the maintenance of a home or other abode in the State.

Last year the Bipartisan Committee for American Voters Overseas surveyed the election officials of the 50 States as to the ability of overseas American citizens to vote for President and Congress in their respective States. The bipartisan committee is an organization of distinguished business and professional people in Europe of both political parties who have been seeking the enfranchisement of American citizens residing abroad.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we propose today would allow the American citizen residing overseas to vote in Federal elections in the State in which the citizen had last voted or registered to vote, or if the citizen had not so voted or registered, in the last State in which the citizen maintained a domicile before departing from the United States as long as the individual is otherwise qualified to vote in that State and complies with the absentee ballot requirements of the State and provided the citizen does not qualify as a voter in any other State, territory, or possession of the United States. This is the crux of the legislation we are introducing today. The present checkerboard pattern of domicile rules among the States should no longer be permitted to deny Americans overseas the franchise in Federal elections.

The legislation proposed today would also provide a form which the States may accept as an application for an absentee ballot to vote in a Federal election and as an application for registration to vote in such election if registration is required by the laws of the State. The form is modeled after the Federal post card application form—FPCA—now used in most States as an application for registration and ballot for overseas military personnel and certain other groups which vary from State to State. Although the States are not required to adopt this form it is our hope that whenever feasible they will do so.

The legislation would also establish as Federal law, in clear and unequivocal statutory language, the principle that the exercise of the right to register and vote by a U.S. citizen abroad should not constitute an act which would affect the determination of his or her actual residence—as distinguished from his or her place of voting for Federal, State, or local tax purposes. The Internal Revenue Code and the laws of all but a handful of the States offer Americans currently residing abroad an income tax exemption, in whole or in part, for income earned abroad. The legislation I am introducing today would help assure that the exercise of the right to register and vote absentee by such a citizen would not jeopardize any such income tax exemption.

The Internal Revenue Service has al-

ready indicated, most recently in an August 28, 1972, ruling letter to Senator GOLDWATER, that the exercise of absentee registration and voting rights will not jeopardize the nonresident Federal income tax exclusion available to a U.S. citizen residing abroad. The legislation being introduced today would enact this administration interpretation into law for Federal income tax purposes and would assure that the States would not make an inconsistent interpretation of their own income tax laws. I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD the Internal Revenue Service ruling letter sent to Senator GOLDWATER by subject.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation does raise several constitutional issues which we will have to explore very carefully during the hearings. Strong arguments may be made on both sides of the issue of whether Congress may legislate to establish new requirements for voting in all Federal elections, different from those which the States have enacted. Constitutional authority, based upon previous decisions by the Supreme Court, appears clearest in support of Federal legislation affecting qualifications for voting for Representatives and Senators. Authority is less clear for elections held to choose electors for the President and Vice President, and for primary elections to choose candidates for Congress.

The principal source of power for Congress to enact qualifications for voters in congressional elections comes from article I, section 4, of the Constitution, which provides that—

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators.

According to the Supreme Court, this provision gives Congress "general supervisory power over the whole subject of congressional elections," *Smiley v. Holm*, 285 U.S. 355, 367 (1932).

The opinion in *Smiley* stated that—

These comprehensive words embrace authority to provide a complete code for congressional elections, not only as to time and places, but in relation to notices, registration, supervision of voting, protection of voters, prevention of fraud, and corrupt practices, counting of votes, duties and inspectors, and canvassers, and making and publication of election returns; in short, to enact the numerous requirements as to procedure and safeguards which experience shows are necessary in order to enforce the fundamental right involved . . . (285 U.S. at 336; emphasis added).

Those who would limit the scope of article I, section 4, point out that the foregoing in *Smiley* were but dictum, as the actual holding of the case concerned only the issue of reapportionment of congressional districts by State legislatures. Nevertheless, the quoted paragraph is often repeated with approval in Supreme Court decisions, most recently in the opinion of the late Justice Black in *Oregon v. Mitchell*, 400 U.S. 112, 119 (1970), supporting the holding that article I, section 4, empowers Congress to lower the minimum voting age to 18 years in Federal elections, and to abolish

durational residency requirements as qualifications for voting in Presidential elections. The broad interpretation of article I, section 4, regarding the supervisory power of Congress over congressional election appears to be widely accepted in other courts as well. See, for example, *United States v. Manning*, 215 F. Supp. 272 (D. La., 1963); *Commonwealth ex rel. Dummit v. O'Connell*, 298 Ky. 44, 181 S.E. 2d 691 (1944).

In contrast with the generous powers granted Congress to regulate congressional elections are the relatively scant express powers with respect to elections for the President and Vice President:

The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States. (Article II, section 1, cl. 3). . . . Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified (Amendment XX, section 3). The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them. Amendment XX, section 4).

The Constitution provides that—

The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens of the several states, (Article IV, section 2), and bestows upon Congress the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry out this provision. (Article I, section 8, cl. 18).

Further:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. . . . (Amendment XIV, section 1).

Congress may enforce the foregoing by appropriate legislation—amendment XIV, section 5.

From these provisions, it is argued that because the right to vote for national officers is a privilege and immunity of national citizenship—*Oregon v. Mitchell*, supra, at 149; cf. *Ex parte Yarbrough*, 110 U.S. 651 (1883)—Congress may enact legislation appropriate and plainly adapted to the end of protecting the privilege of voting in Presidential elections. In any case, these questions, among others, will have to be fully explored during the hearings.

Mr. Speaker throughout American history there has been a continuing attempt to guarantee the franchise and to eliminate arbitrary hindrances to voting to insure that every American citizen has the opportunity to exercise that most basic right in a democracy—the right to vote. I believe this legislation I am introducing today will help further to secure this worthwhile goal.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1972,

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: This is in reply to your letter August 16, 1972, regarding the possible effect that voting by absentee ballot by United States citizens residing abroad may have on their claiming the exclusion from gross income provided by section 911 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Section 911(a) (1) of the Code provides, in relevant part, that the following items shall not be included in gross income and shall be exempt from Federal Income taxation. In the case of an individual citizen of the United States who establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that he has been a bona fide resident of a foreign country or countries for an uninterrupted period which includes an entire taxable year, amounts received from sources without the United States (except amounts paid by the United States or any agency thereof) which constitute earned income attributable to services performed during such uninterrupted period.

You forwarded with your letter a copy of a report prepared by the American Chamber of Commerce of Venezuela. That report and your letter indicate concern that if a United States citizen residing abroad signs an application for registration to vote in one of the States and represents in such application no more than that he intends to return to that State as his domicile, he may thereby jeopardize or forfeit his entitlement to the section 911 exclusion from gross income based on his claim of bona fide residence in a foreign country. You are referring in particular to Internal Revenue Service Publication 54 (10-71) *Tax Guide For U.S. Citizens Abroad*, 1972 Edition, which provides on page 4:

"A U.S. citizen living abroad may vote by absentee ballot in elections held in the United States (national, State, and local) without jeopardizing his eligibility for tax exemption as a bona fide resident of a foreign country. Such voting will not, of itself, nullify the taxpayer's status.

However, where a U.S. citizen makes a representation to the local election official regarding the nature and length of his stay abroad that is inconsistent with his representation for purposes of the tax exclusion, the fact that he made the representation in connection with absentee voting will be considered in determining his status for the exclusion, but will not necessarily be conclusive.

You are concerned that the "inconsistent representation" language of the above-quoted material might be interpreted to mean that a representation by a taxpayer of domicile in a State and of an intent to ultimately return there is not compatible with the taxpayer's claim of bona fide residence in a foreign country for purposes of section 911 of the Code.

The Service has held in a recently published ruling, Revenue Ruling 71-101, C.B. 1971-1, 214:

"[G]enerally the exercise by a citizen of the United States of his right to vote in National, state, or local elections in the United States by absentee ballot is not an action that would affect the length or nature of his stay outside the United States and consequently would not jeopardize the exemption under section 911(a) (1) of the Code. However, where absentee voting in the United States involves a representation to the local election official regarding the nature and length of the taxpayer's stay abroad that is inconsistent with the taxpayer's representation of intention for purposes of section 911 of the Code, the fact that he made the representation in connection with absentee voting will be taken into ac-

count in determining his status under section 911 of the Code, but will not necessarily be conclusive." (Emphasis added).

It is our conclusion that "inconsistent representation" as referred to in the above cited publications does not refer to a mere statement by a taxpayer that he considers himself a voting resident of a State and ultimately intends to return to the State as his domicile. Such a statement is not incompatible with a taxpayer's claim of bona fide residence in a foreign country. Instead, "inconsistent representations" refer to other representations which the taxpayer may have made to the Service regarding the specific nature and length of his stay in a foreign country. If a taxpayer in support of his claim to the section 911 exclusion from gross income makes certain specific representations as to the purpose, nature, and intended length of his stay in the foreign country, and in an application for absentee voting makes other statements which appear inconsistent with those specific representations, the Service must take such inconsistent statements into account in determining the true facts upon which the taxpayer bases his claim to bona fide residence in a foreign country. Further, as stated in Revenue Ruling 71-101, even such inconsistent statements will not necessarily be conclusive.

However, the mere representation by a taxpayer made in support of an application for absentee voting that he considers himself a voting resident of a particular State and that he intends to ultimately return to that State, will not by itself in any way affect his claim to the section 911 exclusion from gross income based on bona fide residence in a foreign country.

We hope that this letter will clarify any ambiguities that may have existed with respect to this situation. We hope that no United States citizen living abroad will hesitate to exercise his voting right out of concern that this action may jeopardize his claim to the section 911 exclusion from gross income.

Sincerely yours,
A. FEIBEL,
Acting Chief, Corporation Tax Branch.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the special order delivered today by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

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

There was no objection.

IMPROVING THE NATION'S SPENDING CONTROL PROCEDURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal 1974 budget, like each of its predecessors, is a statement of national priorities.

A comparison of the totals for various programs will reveal a picture of the values and priorities that the Government will emphasize during the coming fiscal year.

Early in 1973, many Members of Congress were concerned about the priorities reflected in the new budget for fiscal

1974. It was to be the first postwar year, and yet spending authority for defense was going up—not down. President Nixon had recommended \$85 billion for defense, an increase of \$5.5 billion, larger than for any other single government program. Altogether, the United States would continue to spend more on defense in fiscal 1974 than it would spend on education, health, community development, environmental improvements, and agriculture combined.

Still fresh in the memory of many Members was President Nixon's attempt of the year before to take unilateral control of the budget-trimming process. He wanted the power to cut such programs as he saw fit. Congress, however, refused to abandon its constitutional responsibility to pass judgment on all spending requests. Members were concerned that the President would use his unrestricted budget-cutting authority to negate policy decisions by Congress; he could set national priorities according to his own preferences alone.

So Congress denied him the authority, and the President's response was to impound appropriated funds—to refuse to spend for those programs which he personally did not favor. In effect, he was setting national priorities by himself, even though Congress has specifically denied him this authority.

After the new 93d Congress convened last January, the President submitted his new budget and accompanied it with a propaganda barrage attacking Congress as a big spender, presenting himself as the economizer—even though his first four budgets had had deficits that increased the national debt by \$102 billion. For fiscal 1974, he proposed his fifth consecutive deficit which would add yet another \$18.8 billion to the national debt.

Members of Congress, concerned with the President's priorities and his red ink, decided to act. The Congress was determined to enact a fiscal responsible budget for 1974 and—once again—to make it clear that it would not yield its power of the purse to the executive branch.

The result is an important new legislative proposal, initiated by the Congress, modified after extensive hearings as to its efficacy and its constitutionality, and cleared for consideration by the full House of Representatives early in July.

The bill, numbered H.R. 8480, would deal with the immediate problem by imposing a fiscal 1974 spending ceiling of \$267.1 billion—a figure \$1.6 billion less than President Nixon had proposed. The legislation would reinforce its spending ceiling by directing President Nixon to withhold funds—or to impound—if necessary to stay within the \$267.1-billion limit for fiscal 1974. However, the bill would carefully circumscribe the President's impoundment authority so that he could not use it to kill programs or to shift priorities within the budget. All budget programs would have to be cut a proportionate amount—except for social security, veterans benefits and similarly mandated expenditures—and there would be an absolute safeguard limit on the amount any single program could be cut.

That portion of the legislation would

take care of fiscal 1974—proposing a level of Federal spending well within the limits the President himself had said was necessary to combat inflation.

For the longer range problem of impoundments, the bill proposes a permanent check-and-balance system. The bill would require that after fiscal 1974, the President would have to report to Congress within 10 days of any impoundment of funds. The Congress thereafter would have 60 days in which to consider the impoundment, and if it determined that the impoundment was undesirable, could overrule the President by a majority vote of either the House or the Senate.

The bill would direct the Comptroller General—an agent of the Congress—to help enforce the legislation. The Comptroller General, who has long served as a watchdog on executive branch expenditures, would be required to analyze each impoundment message and to report to Congress. Among other things, the Comptroller General would say whether he believed the impoundment to be lawful. Second, the Comptroller General would keep a watchful eye on the Executive and inform Congress of any impoundment not reported by the executive branch. This action would trigger the impoundment review procedures. The Comptroller General would have authority to hire his own attorney and to sue any agent of the President to force compliance with the impoundment law.

During the spring and early summer, support for such a bill continued to grow. Members of Congress felt that some method was needed to preserve congressional authority from further intrusion by the President and to enact a meaningful control on spending in light of the inflation that now disrupts the economy.

The House Rules Committee on June 22, 1973, cleared the bill for floor action, and the full House is expected to begin general debate on the matter in July.

Beyond its consideration of this legislation, the Congress is looking ahead to even longer range measures of dealing with Federal spending control.

As long ago as last October, Congress had created a special committee, made up of Members of both the House and the Senate, to study ways of improving spending control procedures.

The study committee submitted its report last April. Among its proposals were recommendations for, first, a new Committee on the Budget in each of the Houses of Congress; second, a spending ceiling each year to be established by Congress; third, provision for a special tax if necessary to make up a deficit, and fourth, an enlarged professional staff equipped with computers to serve the new budget committees.

Both Chambers praised the study committee for its work; leaders in the House expressed their intention to take up the longer range implications of the study committee's report after the immediate legislation on spending ceiling and impoundment had been disposed of.

Under the study committee recommendation, the new budget committees would take functions from the existing appropriations and tax committees, and would draw two-thirds of their membership from the same committees. The

spending ceiling, to be recommended by the budget committees each year, would take into account the Nation's economic situation as well as the Government's financial position—thus, in times of recession, a Congress could recommend a deficit to spur the economy. The special tax would take the form of a surcharge, and it would make up any deficit that Congress thought inappropriate to the national economic situation.

The imbalance between staff in the executive branch and the Congress is marked. The Appropriations subcommittees in both Houses have small staffs. In contrast, the President has within his Executive Office the full-time staff of the Office of Management and Budget with 660 employees, including financial experts who devote the full year to budget preparation and review. Despite his much publicized cut in Executive Office staff, the President did not touch the OMB, which is one of its largest components.

The study committee proposals must now undergo hearings, and the House Rules Committee has scheduled them for the week of July 15. The matter is complex; it has long range implications for the Nation's spending control process. This bill, like the spending ceiling and impoundment review legislation ahead of it, will require major attention from Congress. Both measures will get it, but first things must come first. The impoundment legislation and spending ceiling, already well advanced, will get priority. Then Congress will be free to give thorough consideration to the longer-range budget control procedures.

Rarely has Congress been confronted with such a challenge to its constitutional responsibilities; never has it responded with greater vigor.

As THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., Democratic majority leader of the House, said:

The President can shake his finger all he wants. The Congress is not about to be bullied away from its constitutional responsibilities as guardian of the purse.

THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, the Subcommittee on Housing approved for full Banking and Currency Committee action, H.R. 8879, a bill "to make various changes in laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes." This bill includes several provisions that were agreed upon earlier by the Banking and Currency Committee when it reported out its 1972 omnibus housing and urban development legislation. As you know, that legislation never reached the floor of the House. The bill also contains some new provisions authorizing some needed improvements in our housing and urban development programs.

H.R. 8879 contains no special revenue sharing or community development block grant proposals, nor does it contain any major new subsidized housing initiatives since the Housing Subcommittee plans to hold extensive hearings on these sub-

jects later this summer or in the early fall.

For the information of my colleagues, I would like to place into the RECORD a section-by-section summary of H.R. 8879 as approved by the Housing Subcommittee.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF H.R. 8879

TITLE I—NEW COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT *Change in name of Community Development Corporation*

Section 101 amends Part B of Title VII of the 1970 Act by striking out all references to "Community Development Corporation" and substituting "New Community Development Corporation".

Membership of board of directors of New Community Development Corporation

Section 102 amends section 729(b) of the 1970 Act to increase the size of the Board of Directors of the Corporation from five to seven members.

Increase in interest differential grants to State land development agencies

Section 103 amends section 713(a) of the 1970 Act to increase the amount of interest differential grants which the Secretary is authorized to make to State land development agencies to an amount not exceeding the difference between the interest paid on obligations of the agency and the interest which would be paid under the interest rate (decreased by one-half of 1 percent) on similar obligations whose income is tax-exempt.

Interest differential grants for State development agencies with unguaranteed obligations

Section 104 amends section 713(a) of the 1970 Act to authorize the Secretary to make grants to any State land development agency whose obligations are eligible for guarantee but are not guaranteed. Such grants could not exceed the amount for which the agency would have been eligible if its obligations were guaranteed.

Supplementary grants for projects assisted by National Foundation on Arts and Humanities

Section 105 amends section 718(c) of the 1970 Act to include within the definition of "new community assistance projects" a project or portion thereof assisted by contracts or grants under section 5 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

Inclusion of waste disposal facilities and community or neighborhood heating or air-conditioning systems among eligible land improvements

Section 106 amends section 711(f) of the 1970 Act to include waste disposal installations and community or neighborhood central heating or air-conditioning systems within the definition of "land development" for the purpose of assistance in the development of new communities under Part B of Title VII of that Act.

Reservation of housing subsidy funds for new Community development

Section 107 amends section 712 of the 1970 Act to require the Secretary to reserve such housing assistance funds as he finds appropriate for use in connection with new community development programs.

TITLE II—STATE DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES *Declaration of purpose*

Section 201 defines the purpose of this title as an effort to encourage the formation of state development agencies authorized to provide housing for low- and moderate-income families, to revitalize blighted areas, and to improve employment opportunities.

Eligible development agencies

Section 202(a) requires that the State development agency, in its role as a large-

scale developer, have power to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of its interests in projects; to participate in Federal, State and local government projects; to relocate those who are displaced as a result of activities carried out by the agency; to establish subsidiaries through which its functions can be carried out; and to establish community advisory committees.

(b) defines "State development agency" as any public body or agency, publicly sponsored, or instrumentality of one or more States, designated by the Governor or Governors, for purposes of this title.

(c) defines "State" as any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory or possession of the United States.

Guarantees of obligations

Section 203(a) authorizes the Secretary of HUD to guarantee taxable obligations of a State development agency and to make grants to these agencies which would cover the difference between the interest paid on such obligations and the interest which would be paid (decreased by one-half of one percent) on similar obligations the income from which is exempt from Federal taxation.

(b) provides that the full faith and credit of the United States would be pledged to the payment of these guarantees; that any guarantee made by the Secretary would be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the obligations involved for the guarantee; and that the validity of the guarantee would be incontestable in the hands of a holder.

(c) directs the Secretary to establish and collect fees and charges for and in connection with the guarantees.

(d) limits the amount of obligations which could be guaranteed and outstanding at any one time to \$500,000,000.

Limitation on guarantees

Section 204 directs the Secretary to take reasonable steps, with respect to the guaranteed obligations, to assure issuance to approved investors; acceptable public offerings; satisfactory interest rates; and satisfactory provisions for repayment, maturity and protection of the security interest of the United States.

Revolving fund

Section 205(a) authorizes the Secretary to establish a revolving fund comprised of receipts from fees and charges; recoveries under security, subrogation, and other rights; repayments, interest income, and other receipts derived from guarantees; proceeds of the obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the following subsection; and such sums, authorized to be appropriated as may be required for the interest differential grants and for other purposes under this title. Money in the revolving fund would be kept in cash on hand or on deposit; invested in obligations of or guaranteed by the United States; or invested in lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, or public funds unless needed to pay liabilities incurred as a result of guarantees or grants or to pay obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury under the following subsection.

(b) authorizes the Secretary to issue sufficient obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury to meet his liabilities pursuant to guarantees under this title. The Secretary of the Treasury would determine the maturities and interest rates of such obligations and would be authorized to purchase such obligations by using as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of Second Liberty Bond Act securities.

(c) provides that in order to protect the interests of the revolving fund, the Secretary would have the power to pay out of such fund expenses or charges associated with the acquisition, handling, improvement, or disposal of real or personal property acquired as

a result of recoveries under security, subrogation, or other rights regardless of any other provision of law which would otherwise apply.

Technical assistance

Section 206 authorizes the Secretary to provide technical assistance to State development agencies to assist them in planning and carrying out development activities under this title.

Labor standards

Section 207 requires that prior to any assistance, assurance be given that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in development activities under this title will be paid prevailing wages, as determined in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, except in the case of residential property designed for the use by fewer than eight families.

General provisions

Section 208(a) gives the Secretary power to contract (before or after default) to extinguish all rights or interests of a State agency in any instrument held by or on behalf of the Secretary for the protection of security interests of the United States. He would also have power to foreclose or to enforce any right conferred on him by law or contract. Property which the Secretary purchases at foreclosure sale may be completed, remodeled, leased or disposed of or otherwise dealt with, notwithstanding other provisions of law. The Secretary could pursue to final collection all claims acquired by him in connection with any security, subrogation or other right obtained by him.

(b) requires that interest paid on obligations issued by State development agencies which elect the benefits of guarantees under this title must be included in gross income for the purposes of Chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION AND FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Federal National Mortgage Association

Section 301(a) amends section 302 of the National Housing Act to specify that September 1, 1968 is the effective date on which the original Federal National Mortgage Association was divided into two entities, the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Government National Mortgage Association.

(b) amends such section 302 to provide that the principal office of FNMA may be located anywhere in the District of Columbia metropolitan area, though for jurisdiction and venue purposes FNMA is to be considered a District of Columbia corporation.

(c) and (d) amend such section 302 to allow purchase of a conventional mortgage with the outstanding balance exceeding 80 percent of value when the excess over 80 percent is insured by a qualified insurer. Under existing law such mortgages may be purchased only where the outstanding balance exceeding 75 percent of value is insured by a qualified "private" insurer.

(e) amends such section 302 to provide that the maximum amount of a conventional mortgage purchased by FNMA may not exceed the limitations contained in the first sentence of section 5(c) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 (\$45,000 in the case of single-family dwellings and the dollar amounts contained in section 207 of the National Housing Act for multi-family housing), except that such limitations may be increased by 25 percent with respect to mortgages on property located in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii.

Section 302 amends section 303 of the National Housing Act to eliminate from the capitalization of FNMA the initial nonvoting preferred stock.

Section 303 amends section 304 of the National Housing Act to correct an erroneous citation to section 243 of that Act.

Section 304 amends section 309 of the National Housing Act to provide that employees subject to the Civil Service retirement law who became employed by FNMA prior to January 31, 1972 may continue under such law.

Section 305 repeals certain provisions of law relating to FNMA's transitional period, now completed, and related to GAO audit of FNMA while any mortgage-backed securities issued by FNMA and guaranteed by GNMA are outstanding.

Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation

Section 306 amends section 305(a)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act to allow the FHLMC to purchase a conventional mortgage with the outstanding balance exceeding 80 percent of value when the excess over 80 percent is insured by a qualified insurer. Under existing law such mortgages may be purchased only where the outstanding balance exceeding 75 percent of value is insured by a qualified "private" insurer. The section also provides that the maximum amount of conventional mortgage purchased by FHLMC may not exceed the limitations contained in the first sentence of section 5(c) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 (\$45,000 in the case of single-family dwellings and the dollar amounts contained in section 207 of the National Housing Act for multi-family housing), except that such limitations may be increased by 25 percent with respect to mortgages on property located in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii.

TITLE IV—PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION IN EXTENSION OF MORTGAGE ASSISTANCE

Title IV adds a new section 525 to the National Housing Act which (1) prohibits the denial of any Federally-related mortgage loan or Federal insurance guarantee or other assistance to any person on account of sex, and (2) directs every person engaged in making mortgage loans secured by residential real property to consider without prejudice the combined incomes of both husband and wife for the purpose of extending mortgage credit in the form of a Federally-related mortgage loan. "Federally-related mortgage loan" is defined to mean any loan which (1) is secured by residential property designed principally for occupancy by one to four families, and (2) is either (A) made by a lender regulated by or whose deposits are insured by the Federal government, or (B) insured, guaranteed, supplemented, or assisted in any way by the Federal government, or (C) eligible for purchase by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Government National Mortgage Association, or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, or (D) made in whole or in part by any "creditor" (as defined in the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968) who makes or invests in residential real estate loans aggregating more than \$1,000,000 per year.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Increase in maximum mortgage amounts under Federal Housing Administration one-to-four family mortgage insurance programs

Section 501(a)-(d) amends various provisions of the National Housing Act to increase from \$33,000 to \$40,000 the maximum mortgage amounts for sales housing insured under the FHA sections 203(b) regular program, 220 urban renewal program, 222 servicemen's program, and 234 condominium program.

Sales of housing projects by Secretary to cooperatives

Section 502 amends title V of the National Housing Act by adding a new section 526 to the Act providing that in the case of the sale of a housing project by the HUD Secretary to a nonprofit cooperative which will restrict occupancy to members, the Secretary may accept a mortgage in an amount equal to the appraised value of the property plus the amount of prepaid expenses and costs in-

involved in achieving cooperative ownership. Prior to disposition the Secretary could pay for the repairs and improvements necessary to make the housing suitable for cooperative ownership.

Rural housing

Section 503(a) amends section 507 of the Housing Act of 1949 to include the post-Korean period and Vietnam Era for the purpose of defining veterans and families of deceased servicemen entitled to preference under the Farmers Home Administration's rural housing programs.

(b) amends section 506 of the 1949 Act to eliminate the present requirement that rural housing financed under title V be inspected only by employees of the Department of Agriculture, thus permitting the use of private inspectors under contract agreements; and section 507 of the Act to authorize funds in the Rural Housing Insurance Fund to be used to pay for inspection, appraisal, and other such services.

(c) amends section 517 of the 1949 Act to transfer from the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund to the Rural Housing Insurance Fund the assets, rights, and liabilities of the Government with respect to those farm labor housing loans and rental housing loans that were insured through the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund prior to the establishment of the Rural Housing Insurance Fund in 1965.

(d) amends section 502 of the 1949 Act to authorize the Agriculture Secretary, on a discretionary basis, to require rural housing borrowers to pay taxes and insurance into escrow accounts on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

Determination of rentals under public housing program

Section 504 amends paragraph 2(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to (1) impose a minimum rental for each low-rent public housing unit equivalent to 40 percent of that part of the cost of operating and maintaining the project which is attributable to that dwelling unit, (2) require that the aggregate rentals charged each year to families residing in the dwelling units administered by any local public housing agency equal at least one-fifth of the sum of the incomes of all such families, and (3) impose a maximum rental for any dwelling unit occupied by a family receiving welfare assistance of not to exceed the greater of one-fourth of the family's income or the maximum amount of welfare assistance which the family could receive for the specific purpose of assisting the family in meeting its housing expenses. The section also defines "income" for purposes of the public housing program as income from all sources of each member of the family in the household, except that there shall be excluded (A) the income of any family member (other than the head of the household or his spouse) who is under eighteen years of age or is a full-time student; (B) the first \$300 of the income of a secondary wage earner who is the spouse of the head of the household; (C) an amount equal to \$300 for each member of the family residing in the household (other than the head of the household or his spouse) who is under eighteen years of age or older and is disabled or handicapped or a full-time student and who has no income included in family income for purposes of this paragraph; (D) nonrecurring income as determined by the Secretary; and (E) such extraordinary medical expenses as the Secretary approves for exclusion. This section would become effective, with respect to any public housing agency, on the first day of such agency's first fiscal year which begins after the date of the enactment of this section.

Interstate land sales

Section 505(a) amends section 1402 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968

to extend the land sales regulatory requirements to land located in, and commerce involving, foreign countries.

(b) adds to section 1402 of the 1968 Act a new subsection (c), extending the exemptions from the requirements of the program to include those who hold land as fiduciaries and who must file a statement of record, where the Secretary finds that enforcement is not necessary in the public interest or for the protection of purchasers.

(c) amends section 1404(b) of the 1968 Act to extend the period during which a purchaser may revoke an agreement to purchase or lease land if he has not received a timely property report from forty-eight hours to seventy-two hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays). It also deletes the language which provides that the contract may stipulate that a revocation may not be made where the purchaser acknowledges that he has inspected the land and read the report before signing the contract. These changes would be effective sixty days after enactment.

(d) amends section 1403(a)(9) of the 1968 Act to exempt from the requirements of the program the sale or lease of real estate which is zoned by the appropriate governmental authority for industrial or commercial development when (A) local authorities have approved access from such real estate to a public street or highway; (B) the purchaser or lessee of such real estate is a duly organized corporation, partnership, trust, or business association; (C) the purchaser or lessee is represented in the transaction of sale or lease by counsel of its own selection; (D) the purchaser or lessee affirms in writing that it is purchasing or leasing such real estate for its own use; and (E) a policy of title insurance or title opinion is issued in connection with the transaction showing that title to the real estate purchased or leased is vested in the purchaser or lessor, subject only to such exceptions as may be approved in writing by such purchaser or the lessee prior to recordation of the instrument of conveyance or execution of the lease; except that any purchaser or lessee may waive, in writing in a separate document, this requirement.

COTTER PROPOSES SOCIAL SECURITY TAX CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COTTER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, many working men and women are now perceiving the new higher social security tax bite. The rampant inflation in food, clothing, and all areas of the cost of living combined with increased social security taxes are eroding the workers take-home pay.

It is widely held that the social security tax is one of the least progressive Federal taxes. The tax rate of 5.8 percent is applied to a flat base of \$10,000 this year and a \$12,000 base next year. The tax burden is no different if a worker makes \$12,000 and has four dependents, or \$50,000 with two dependents.

Last year, when I supported the new 20 percent increase in social security benefits, I promised to study the social security tax structure to get a more equitable system.

The crux of the problem, of course, is that a social security retiree is getting similar pension whether he makes \$12,000 or \$50,000 annually during his working years. Under the new law, in 1974, a person working 30 years in a covered job

gets a minimum pension of \$170.00 and a maximum of \$274.60.

The social security problem is important. Twenty years ago, only 3.2 percent of the American population drew social security stipends. Today, 14 percent of the American population receives social security benefits. Under the new law, residents of Connecticut will pay an estimated additional \$52 million in 1973.

The new social security tax rate is 5.85 percent on a base of \$10,800. Next year the 5.85-percent tax rate will be applied to a \$12,000 base.

What this means to the worker who makes at least \$10,800 this year is that social security taxes will be \$63 more this year, and \$126 more in 1974.

A little chart which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report tells it better than I can. This chart shows that with a 5-percent wage increase most workers actually lose money during the months they are paying social security taxes.

SUPPOSE YOU GET A 5-PERCENT PAY RAISE—A MAN WITH A WIFE AND 2 CHILDREN GETS A 5-PERCENT BOOST IN PAY EFFECTIVE JAN. 1, 1973. HERE IS WHAT HAPPENS AT VARIOUS LEVELS OF WEEKLY INCOME

Base pay now.....	\$150.00	\$250.00	\$400.00	\$500.00
Take-home pay now.....	131.20	222.40	337.00	408.00
Base pay after 5-per- cent raise.....	157.50	262.50	420.00	525.00
Federal income tax takes this.....	11.00	29.60	68.60	98.40
Social security takes this.....	9.21	15.36	24.57	30.71
Take-home pay after raise.....	137.29	217.54	326.83	395.89
Change from present take-home pay.....	16.09	4.86	10.17	12.11

¹ Increase.

² Decrease.

Note: At base pay above \$208 a week, social security taxes become paid up before the year is over and are not withheld for the rest of the year.

As I began my search for a more equitable formula, I expressly rejected using general tax revenues to supplement shortfalls. This I did because I believe that the social security trust fund can be, and should be, self-sustaining—a "pay as you go operation."

Therefore, working with both the Library of Congress and the actuaries in the Social Security Administration, I devised a formula that would lower the 1974 social security tax bite by \$72.00, but would require those making in excess of \$12,000 to pay 5.6 percent on income up to \$24,000. This allows for equity because it introduces an "ability to pay" feature that is absent in the present tax system. For those paying the additional tax, I would give a tax deduction for the additional social security taxes. I would be the first to admit that my formula does not give massive relief to the worker earning less than \$12,000, but it does introduce a more progressive tax base. According to the Actuary at the Social Security Administration, my new proposal would generate \$71.2 billion for 1974, a figure of \$1.2 billion more than the revenues estimated for 1974 under the old formula.

Since those persons making between \$12,000 to \$24,000 would receive similar benefits to those making under \$12,000,

I believe simple equity demands that he be given similar relief for tax burdens. Therefore, I propose that a tax deduction be allowed for the social security payments between \$12,000 to \$24,000. Again, even with this feature, the viability of the social security trust fund remains complete. The revenue loss for this feature is between \$1.4 and \$1.9 billion.

For the employer, the social security tax rate would remain at 5.85 percent on the first \$12,000, and no tax for salaries over \$12,000. For the self-employed, the rate would be reduced from 8 percent to 7.5 percent on the first \$12,000, and a rate of 7.6 percent would be applied on incomes between \$12,000 and \$24,000 for self-employed individuals.

In summary, this proposal will grant some tax relief to workers making under \$12,000, will require taxation of those with the ability to pay, but for their contribution, those required to pay the additional taxes with an increase in benefits, will receive a tax deduction.

Candidly, this proposal does not grant massive tax relief, but it does retain economic viability in the social security trust fund, and does introduce a more progressive social security tax rate:

H.R. 9000

A bill to establish for the year 1974, under chapters 2 and 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, more equitable rates and schedules of social security taxes on employees and self-employed individuals (with partial income tax deductibility therefor), and to provide a method for the development of similar rates and schedules for years after 1974

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) with respect to wages received during the calendar year 1974—

(1) the figure "4.85 percent" in section 3101(a)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on employees for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) shall be deemed to read as follows: "(A) 4.6 percent to the extent that such wages do not exceed \$12,000 and (B) 4.8 percent to the extent that such wages exceed \$12,000 but do not exceed \$24,000"; and

(2) the figure "1.0 percent" in section 3101(b)(2) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employees for purposes of hospital insurance) shall be deemed to read as follows: "(A) 0.6 percent to the extent that such wages do not exceed \$12,000, and (B) 0.8 percent to the extent that such wages exceed \$12,000 but do not exceed \$24,000";

(b) With respect to self-employment income for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1973, and before January 1, 1975—

(1) the phrase "7.0 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year" in section 1401(a)(4) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on self-employment income for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) shall be deemed to read as follows: "(A) 6.9 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year to the extent that such amount does not exceed \$12,000, and (B) 6.8 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year to the extent that such amount exceeds \$12,000 but does not exceed \$24,000"; and

(2) the phrase "1.0 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year" in section 1401(b)(2) of such Code (relating to rate of tax on self-employ-

ment income for purposes of hospital insurance) shall be deemed to read as follows: "(A) 0.6 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year to the extent that such amount does not exceed \$12,000, and (B) 0.8 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year to the extent that such amount exceeds \$12,000 but does not exceed \$24,000".

SEC. 2. For purposes of the taxes imposed under sections 3101 and 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as modified by the first section of this Act) with respect to wages received during the calendar year 1974 and self-employment income for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1973, and before January 1, 1975, the figure "\$12,000" in sections 3121(a)(1) and 1402(b)(1)(H) of such Code shall be deemed to read "\$24,000".

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the taxes imposed on self-employment income in excess of \$12,000 under subsections (a)(4)(B) and (b)(2)(B) of section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as modified by the first section of this Act) for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1973, and before January 1, 1975, and the taxes imposed on wages in excess of \$12,000 under subsections (a)(1)(B) and (b)(2)(B) of section 3101 of such Code for the calendar year 1974, shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year within which paid or accrued under section 164 of such Code (relating to deduction for taxes) in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of the taxes enumerated in subsection (a) thereof.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall develop and formulate, and submit to the Congress no later than January 1, 1974, a proposed revision of the tax rates and schedules set forth in sections 3101 and 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (and of related provisions of such Code) to be applicable with respect to calendar years after 1974 and taxable years beginning after December 31, 1974. Such revision shall maintain the same relationships between the proposed tax rates and the rates otherwise applicable to the years involved under such sections 3101 and 1401 as those which are established under the preceding provisions of this Act with respect to the year 1974, shall include deductible taxes on amounts in excess of the contribution and benefit base otherwise applicable for the years involved, and shall utilize the same methodologies and actuarial assumptions as those on which the rates and schedules established under the preceding provisions of this Act are based.

SALE OF JETS TO SAUDI ARABIA: A FOREIGN POLICY MISTAKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1973, the State Department announced its intention to accomplish the sale of a "limited number"—reportedly between 24 and 30—of sophisticated F-4 Phantom jet fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia. It has also been reliably reported that the United States is considering the sale of these same aircraft to Kuwait.

I wish to express my grave concern over the proposed sale of Phantom aircraft to Arab nations. To a substantial extent the security of Israel can be attributed to the continued exclusive use of the effective, versatile, and advanced Phantom F-4 aircraft. To place this weapon in the hands of a potential foe

of Israel would in my view be dangerously irresponsible.

While I recognize the legitimate interest that the United States has in the security of the Persian Gulf area, I must question whether massive American arms sales of sophisticated weaponry to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait will in fact contribute to the security of the area—or whether it will, instead, do just the reverse. The sale of Phantoms to Saudi Arabia would add a dangerous new element to the military, political, and diplomatic factors upon which the uneasy peace in the Middle East hinges. I must question the appropriateness of selling Phantom aircraft to these Arab nations when there are other, less destabilizing and more defensively oriented aircraft that are available for sale.

I do not believe that the question of the security of the Persian Gulf can be detached from the larger question of the stability of the entire Middle East. For this reason I cannot accept the argument that the United States must supply F-4's to Saudi Arabia so as to protect it from its occasionally hostile neighbors, for the sake of maintaining the "balance of power" in the Persian Gulf. I must ask the question: What good is a balance of power in the Persian Gulf if its achievement threatens the balance of power in the whole Middle East?

It is my hope that the administration will reconsider its announced intention to sell Phantoms to Saudi Arabia. If it does not, however, I would urge Congress to act to stop such sales.

U.S. INTERESTS IN THE PERSIAN GULF

Since the departure of Great Britain from the Persian Gulf, it has been popular to refer to a "power vacuum" in the area. This "power vacuum" is in part responsible for the often frenetic scramble of the United States and the Soviet Union to get a piece of the action and consolidate their influence in the area.

In addition, two-thirds of the world's known oil reserves are located in the Persian Gulf area, according to President Nixon. Saudi Arabia reportedly has the largest oil reserves of any of the countries in the area, and is also the world's largest exporter of petroleum. Iran is said to be second on both counts. Even tiny Kuwait, with a population of 900,000, is rich in oil.

Given the so-called energy crisis in the United States, it is not at all surprising that the United States has cast its lot with these countries. While denying that the "energy crisis" was exclusively responsible for the proposed Phantom deal, a State Department spokesman has admitted that "oil is one of the considerations" in our intended agreement to arm Saudi Arabia with these aircraft.

While the United States is not presently the major importer of oil from the Persian Gulf States, it nonetheless makes good sense for the United States to protect our legitimate interests in the area, and, similarly, to enhance the prospects for genuine stability in the troubled area. These policies should not come at the expense of the security of Israel. But, our current policies will not bring stability

to the area and may threaten our principal ally in the Middle East, Israel.

Both the Soviet Union and the United States have been pumping weapons into Persian Gulf countries and show every intention to continue doing so. Other parties interested in this burgeoning weapons market are Great Britain and France. Britain, for example, just signed a \$625 million agreement to upgrade the Saudi Arabian air defense system.

The political splits in the area can be roughly viewed as the "traditional" states—Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and non-Arab Iran—against the "radical" states—Iraq and South Yemen. Iran has been the largest purchaser of American arms in the area, having recently concluded a \$2 billion agreement for U.S. weapons. Iran, traditionally at least a tacit supporter of Israel, is the primary supplier of Israel's oil, and is presently participating in a technical assistance effort with Israel. Further, the strategic implications of Iran to the Mediterranean also distinguish it from other states in the Persian Gulf.

Saudi Arabia's relations with Iraq, and South Yemen are not good, and Kuwait's problems, particularly with the Iraqis, are worse. The threat to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait from Iraq did not really develop until April of last year, when Iraq concluded a treaty of friendship with the Soviet Union and massive Soviet arms shipments, estimated to total about \$1 billion worth, began.

Subsequently, signs of growing hostility from Iraq, rebellion in Oman, and at least some evidence of subversive activities throughout the Gulf supported by Syria and Iraq, aggravated the situation. The sharpest incident to date was the Iraqi takeover of a Kuwaiti border-post at Al-Samta on March 20 of this year. This incident more than highlighted the weakness of the Kuwaitis; it raised the specter of a larger and more ominous confrontation between Iraq and the other "radical" states with Kuwait and its "traditional" allies.

The perils of Kuwait are illustrated by a statement made by the Iraqi Foreign Minister shortly after the March 20 "incident." In an interview with the Beirut Al-Sayad published on April 5, 1973, the Foreign Minister responded to a question of whether the border-post at Al-Samta was located on disputed territory by saying that:

The whole of Kuwait is disputed territory.

The Iraqi official then suggested that Iraq had never formally accepted the existence of Kuwait at all.

ARMS AND THE PERSIAN GULF

One can trace the dramatic growth in American military support for Kuwait and Saudi Arabia to the growing tensions in the area. It is now expected that U.S. arms sales to the Persian Gulf will total \$4 billion—\$2.5 billion for Iran, \$1 billion for Saudi Arabia, and \$500 million to Kuwait.

Included in the \$1 billion total for Saudi Arabia is a \$500 million agreement which the United States is currently negotiating with the Saudis, involving ships, military communications equipment, and training. According to some

reports, as many as 19 U.S. warships could be sold to Saudi Arabia as part of this deal. New aircraft—possible Phantoms—and other forms of military hardware would comprise the remaining \$500 million. By way of contrast, U.S. military sales to Israel amounted to \$317.9 million in 1972.

The Kuwaiti Army, which numbers approximately 8,000, is reported to be about to receive \$500 million worth of armor, rolling stock, artillery, and light weapons. In addition, two Ling-Temco-Vought (LTV) F-8H/K fighters have been flown to Kuwait for demonstration purposes, according to Aviation Week and Space Technology—June 11, 1973. Aviation Week also reports that the F-8 aircraft have been flown by "resigned" U.S. Navy and Marine pilots, under contract to the Kuwait Government to "train Kuwaiti pilots, and also, give the country an instant air defense capability." If true, the suggestion that U.S. pilots could fly Kuwaiti aircraft in combat missions—possibly against Iraqi, South Yemeni, or even Cuban pilots—gives great cause for alarm.

Included in the Soviet Union's \$1 billion worth of arms shipments to Iraq are, according to one estimate, 800 tanks, 150 Migs of various types, including the relatively advanced Mig-21C, Sukhoi Su-7 attack aircraft, and an air defense system, including SA-2 "Guideline" and SA-3 "Goa" surface-to-air missiles, both of which were encountered by U.S. forces in combat operations in Southeast Asia. According to some sources, the Soviet Union is considering supplying Iraq with advanced SA-6 "Gainful" missiles, which are mounted on tracked transporters and thus pose a greater ground-to-air threat.

According to another source, the Iraqi Air Force, as of late-1972/early-1973, was equipped with:

Nine Tu-16 "Badger" jet bombers, which can also be used for reconnaissance, anti-shiping, and electronic countermeasures (ECM) activities; 48 Su-7 single-seat ground attack/close-support aircraft; 32 Hunter F.G.A. British-made ground attack aircraft, some of which have reportedly been transferred to Egypt; 80 Mig-21C jet fighters, the most advanced Soviet fighter flown by non-Soviet pilots outside the Warsaw Pact; and 20 Mig-17/19 older, less sophisticated jet fighters.

In recent months South Yemen has also been the recipient of large quantities of Soviet arms. The South Yemenis are estimated to have about 15 older Mig-17 and Mig-19 aircraft, and reportedly the Soviet Union has begun to send South Yemen the more advanced Mig-21C fighter. According to a report that appeared in the Washington Post on June 25, 1973, South Yemeni pilots are being trained by Cubans to fly the Mig-21C's. According to another estimate, South Yemen will eventually receive about 20 of the more advanced Soviet aircraft.

Reportedly the Saudi Arabians—and the Kuwaitis—claim that they require a highly sophisticated aircraft if they are to deter any potential Iraqi or South Yemeni threat, given the sophisticated nature of the military hardware supplies to their potential adversaries by the Soviet Union. The aircraft favored by the

Saudi's is the F-4 Phantom, made by McDonnell-Douglas in the United States, and currently the mainstay of not only the Israeli Air Force, but also the U.S. Air Force and Navy as well.

MAKING MATTERS WORSE

Typically, both the Soviet Union and the United States have forsaken the diplomatic route to acquiring influence and achieving stability for the time-worn, and unconvincingly demonstrated, method of trying to buy friends through military favors. Both the United States and the Soviet Union have seriously exaggerated existing tensions in the area through massive shipments, present and pending, of arms to their "friendly partners." While the arms influx has not contributed in any measurable way to real security in the area, it has served to exacerbate tensions and dramatically increase the level of violence possible between the antagonistic camps in the Persian Gulf.

It has also served, and I am sure that these factors have not gone unnoticed in either the Soviet Union or the United States, to lessen the balance-of-payments difficulties that both superpowers are encountering, as well as to consolidate the hold of various regimes in the area upon their populations. In this case, as was lamentably also true with our tragic experience in Southeast Asia, our expressed desire to enhance the "security" of the area can be translated to mean, in part, relentless support of the status-quo. Allegedly, the status quo of these countries is in our "national interest."

This is not to say that there are not real and important differences between Persian Gulf nations, and that the United States has no valid stake in the area. The opposite is true. What I am suggesting, however, is that our efforts to date, and our future policy as currently outlined, will prove to be counterproductive to our genuine objectives. Our efforts, combined with the even more reprehensible efforts of the Soviet Union, have made matters worse, not better. Throwing a new level of technological sophistication into the weapons "mix" of this potentially explosive area—such as is proposed in the sale of Phantoms to Saudi Arabia—will increase the risk of war, not reduce it.

On the other hand, it would be precipitous and irresponsible for the United States to withdraw entirely from the Persian Gulf and leave this oil-rich part of the world to the Soviet domain. Both the Soviet Union and the United States would be well-advised to mutually reduce the flow of arms into the Persian Gulf, as well as to the Middle East as a whole.

Given that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States is likely to make such a foreign policy turnaround overnight, I think it necessary to examine more closely the particulars of the proposed sale of Phantoms to Saudi Arabia and the possible sales to Kuwait. The evidence conclusively demonstrates to me, at least, that such a sale would do more harm than good to the legitimate policy objectives of the United States in the region. I believe that a plausible al-

ternative to the sale of Phantoms is available—one that would not jeopardize the security of Israel.

THE DANGERS OF SELLING PHANTOMS TO SAUDI ARABIA

Upon taking a few reasonable assumptions, the F-4 Phantom is qualitatively superior to any aircraft likely to be operating in either the Persian Gulf or in the entire Middle East region in the near future. These assumptions are: first, that the United States does not sell Iran either the F-14 or the F-15 fighter—both newly introduced and under development for the U.S. Navy and Air Force, respectively; second, that the Soviet Union continues its longstanding policy of keeping its best aircraft to itself, and thus does not sell advanced aircraft—for example, the Mig-25 Foxbat, the Su-11 Flagon-A, the Mig-21J, or the Mig-21E—to any Arab State; and third, that the Soviet Union does not again provide pilots to Arab States to fly these aforementioned advanced aircraft, as it did to some extent during the "war of attrition" and before the expulsion of Soviet "advisers" from Egypt.

Assuming these assumptions are all correct, the F-4 fighter, of which the Israeli Air Force has approximately 120, is the superior aircraft operating in any potential combat zone. Its superiority lies chiefly in its great flexibility—it can double as a straight air-superiority fighter and can handle tactical air-to-ground missions, and do both jobs well.

Top speed of the F-4 is in the Mach 2.2 range. It can carry four AIM-7 Sparrow "standoff" air-to-air missiles, four to six AIM-9 Sidewinder heat-seeking close-in air-to-air missiles, an internally mounted M-61 multibarrel air-to-air cannon—which can also be used for strafing—and can carry up to 16,000 pounds of conventional ordnance, including gravity bombs, "smart" bombs or missiles, and a variety of other missiles. The aircraft can be equipped with a variety of ECM, electronic counter-measures, gear. Israeli F-4's include a number of features designed and built in Israel, including a modification to the American fire-control system which provides for a lead-computing gunsight, and the Israeli "Shafir" air-to-air missile, which though similar to the American Sidewinder is reputed to be superior in some characteristics.

In an interceptor mode, the F-4 can operate over a radius of action of 350 to 400 miles, while in a ground-attack configuration the aircraft has a nonrefuel range of 350 to 450 miles depending on ordnance carried. Range and performance figures with a large quantity of ordnance exceed those of any other fighter-bombers presently operating in the Middle East, although in certain flight conditions other aircraft might have advantages over the F-4. Nonetheless, the multirole characteristics of the F-4, its advanced avionics, its excellent air-combat or ground-attack performance—depending on configuration—all combine to make it the dominant aircraft in the Middle East.

The F-4 is at the core of the Israeli Air Force, and the Israeli Air Force is at

the core of Israel's security. Although Israel did not have F-4s at the time, the 6-day war of 1967 was to a large extent won by Israel because Israel established air-superiority and was thus able to utilize effective ground attack aerial capabilities. When it had F-4s, the Israeli Air Force defeated Nasser in the "war of attrition", even though conditions were far more difficult, by continuing to demonstrate air-superiority in all meaningful operational conditions.

To be sure, the Israeli aerial advantage in the Middle East, which I believe acts to deter Arab aggression, is due not only to the characteristics of the Israeli aircraft but also is due in large measure to superior Israeli tactics and training. But if the United States sells F-4s to Saudi Arabia, an Arab state, the grave possibility exists that Israeli superiority in hardware and in tactics will be negated.

POTENTIAL THREAT TO ISRAEL

There are essentially four reasons to be concerned that the sale of Phantoms to Saudi Arabia might imperil the military security of Israel. First, there is the possibility, although Saudi Arabia did not actively participate in the 1967 war, that Saudi Arabia might use the F-4 against Israel itself. Second, Saudi Arabia might transfer these aircraft to another more aggressively hostile country, such as Egypt. Third, a revolution or coup in Saudi Arabia could replace the aircraft in the hands of a more violently anti-Israeli Government. Fourth, Saudi Arabia might allow other Arab countries to study the F-4, to train their pilots against F-4s, and to develop tactical advantages over Israeli F-4s through these means. Already under intense pressure from its fellow Arab states to take a more aggressively anti-Israeli stance, Saudi Arabian acquisition of Phantoms would only increase this pressure, and increase the likelihood of the Saudi's taking one of these forms of anti-Israeli actions.

If the Saudis had the F-4 and chose to attack Israel, the F-4 would give them a marked increase in damage infliction capabilities. The ordnance capability of the Phantom in the ground attack mode would mean that the Saudis could attack any target in Israel and do serious damage. This ordnance capability is possessed by neither of the other two aircraft that could be sold by the United States to Saudi Arabia, the F-5E or the F-8J. On a 150-mile strike, the Phantom carries 4 times the ordnance of the F-8.

The risk of a transfer of these aircraft to a third country is perhaps more serious. Under this scenario, the Saudis would "give" the Phantoms to a country like Egypt or Syria, which are far more willing to take on the Israelis given any new advantage, than is the traditionally more reluctant Saudi Arabia. That such a transaction is a real possibility is demonstrated by the recently revealed transfer of 38 French Mirage fighters to Egypt from Libya.

While the Saudi Government seems relatively stable at this time, the risk of another Colonel Qaddafi cannot be altogether discounted. Political instability in the area, increased agitation sponsored or supported by Iraq, South Ye-

men and other potential hostile Arab neighbors, or other developments in the region might bring about the fall of King Faisal, and thus the Phantoms could fall into worse hands.

The risk of tactical advantages for the Arab States from experimentation and training with the F-4 is potentially extremely serious. Saudi Arabia could share the technical secrets of the Phantom with other Arab States. It could allow pilots from other Arab countries to train against Phantoms, thus mimicing potential Arab-Israeli air battles. That these tactical factors are important is evidenced by the stall/spin problem exhibited by the F-4 in certain highly classified flight conditions. According to Aviation Week and Space Technology, the U.S. Air Force and Navy have lost more than 170 F-4's in the past 7 years from failures attributable to stall/spin problems. If the Arab pilots learn what conditions put the Phantom into a stall/spin, this knowledge can be applied to aerial combat with Israelis, when the Arabs would attempt through their tactics to force the Israeli aircraft into high-risk, potentially fatal, modes of flight. Through such means as these the Israeli advantage in tactics could be seriously diluted.

SAUDI ARABIA AND ISRAEL

While it is true that Saudi Arabia has not taken an active part in hostilities against Israel, it is true nonetheless that Saudia Arabian officials have time and again expressed their opposition to the very existence of Israel. Expressed Saudi sentiments on Jews and Israel offer little comfort to those who would sell F-4's to Saudi Arabia and then hope that the aircraft would not be "misused."

In a June 1966 visit to New York City, King Faisal offered the following in response to a newspaper reporter's written question:

The Jews throughout the world are supporting Israel. We regard those who provide assistance to our enemies as our own enemies...

As a result of this blunt statement Mayor Lindsay of New York and Governor Rockefeller cancelled planned functions for visits with the Saudi leader.

Saudia Arabia has always barred Jews from the country. Attitudes of Saudi officials towards Jews and Israel are also reflected in such statements as these:

Zionism is the mother of Communism. It helped spread Communism around the world. It is now trying to weaken the U.S. and if their plan succeeds, they will inherit the world—Newsweek, December 21, 1970.

The battle is now actually a pan-Arab battle. The pan-Arabism of the battle means the unification of efforts. We must double our work towards this end.

We have succeeded more than we expected. I fully hope that every drop of Arab bloodshed will, God willing, explode in the enemy's face.—Saudi Arabian Foreign Minister Omar Saqaf replying to journalists' questions in Amman, Jordan, June 1971.

The enemies of Islam are criminals, Jews and infidels, who do evil throughout the world.

We must fight these attempts of our enemies. The Zionists are behind all wicked schemes, and it is regrettable that there are still some countries which support Zionism."—King Faisal, quoted in a Niger newspaper during a visit to Niger in November 1972.

Given such statements as these—which are but a small sampling of the virulent anti-Semitic and anti-Israel rhetoric which flows out of Saudi Arabia, it is hard to feel altogether sanguine that the Saudis will not use their Phantoms to the detriment of Israel.

There is no way that the United States, even though we would be selling these aircraft, can insure that they are not used against Israel. One of the enduring lessons of American military aid and assistance programs—as well as that of other nations, including the Soviet Union, is that once put in the hands of a foreign nation, there are no effective strings of control running back to the seller. Apparently the State Department has forgotten the sorry history of previous attempts to control the use of American-made arms. During the 1965 India-Pakistan war, American arms were used on both sides. Also, of course, there is the much cited example of our sale of Patton tanks to King Hussein's Jordan in the early 1960's. As a condition of sale, Jordan signed an agreement that these tanks would not be used against Israel, and that the tanks would not cross the Jordan River. Like the Phantoms the administration wants to sell Saudi Arabia, these tanks were to be used for self-defense—and presumably internal purposes—only. Yet when the smoke cleared from the 6-day war, the burning hulks of the U.S.-made tanks were found on the West Bank—across the Jordan River. So much for the agreement.

Announcing the intention to sell Phantoms to Saudi Arabia, a State Department spokesman said that:

Any military equipment sold by the United States to the [Persian] Gulf states is not allowed to be transferred to a third-country without specific U.S. approval.

But in response to questions from a subcommittee of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco admitted that:

There is no guarantee, and there is no one who can guarantee, that they [the F-4s] will not go to third parties.

Further, the Phantoms have a great symbolic importance to Israel. They are a symbol not only of the military security of Israel, but a symbol of the support of the United States for that country. To sell these same aircraft to an Arab State would be a damaging blow to the prestige and morale of Israel.

AN ARMS RACE VERSUS PEACE

There are two other important considerations. The great difficulty in securing a negotiated peace settlement in the Middle East virtually goes without saying. I believe that there will never be a negotiated peace settlement if the Arab nations believe that they are in a position of strength. Selling Phantoms to the Arab world would at the very least raise hopes of victory, and depending on Saudi Arabian uses of these aircraft, could lead to intoxicating visions of new-found power. Why should the Arabs negotiate if they believe that a military solution is possible?

Finally, it seems likely that sales of

Phantom aircraft to Israel would trigger yet another spiral in the Middle East arms race. As I suggested earlier, a "balance of power" is not an end in and of itself, especially if that balance is precariously maintained by the virtue of more and more arms, at ever higher levels of violence. Our objectives in the Middle East and in the Persian Gulf ought to be to defuse the area; but the sale of Phantoms would accomplish the reverse. It would continue the action/reaction trap of the arms race.

Billions of dollars would in all likelihood be spent on new arms, but no security, or stability, would be gained. Once the Saudis acquired Phantoms, the Iraqis might be compelled to demand more advanced aircraft and air-defense apparatus from the Soviets. This in turn could cause other Arab states, such as Egypt and Syria, to ask for the same favors. On the other side, Israel would almost inevitably have to seek more and better arms in response. Already there have been reports in the press of Israeli interest in the F-14, F-15, and the improved version of the F-4—the F-4M—which mounts maneuverable leading edge slats for increased maneuverability and an improved fire-control system. This escalation in weaponry does not provide stability. It is inherently destabilizing, because it enhances the risk that one country or another, intoxicated by its seeming military strength, might launch an attack—an attack that would cause a war far more destructive than the last.

So what is to be gained from selling Phantoms to Saudi Arabia? Very little, I believe. The risks are great. The only sure rewards are a slight improvement in our balance of payments—a benefit far too small for the price to be paid. Even the benefit of increased "influence" in the Persian Gulf—a goal that is impossible to quantify—is problematical. In sum, I believe that the proposed Phantom deal is a grievous mistake.

If we need to sell aircraft to Saudi Arabia, if they are in fact necessary to provide for the defense of Saudi Arabia against its Soviet-armed and unfriendly neighbors, then we would be far better advised to sell not the F-4s but the F-8s. I personally believe that compelling arguments can be made not to sell advanced aircraft to Saudi Arabia at all, and that further arms transfusions will make more problems than they solve. But if there is a serious threat to Saudi Arabia from Iraq and/or South Yemen, the F-8 would make a far better choice than the F-4.

The F-8 is a defensively-oriented weapon. It is better at air-to-air combat than the F-5E, a version of which the Saudis already have. It has very limited ground attack capabilities, so that it does not pose an offensive threat to Israel. It does not represent a quantum leap in military technology in the area.

The F-8 is relatively cheap, at approximately \$1.8 million per copy, as opposed to approximately \$3.5 million for the F-4. It could be available almost immediately, as the U.S. Navy Reserve uses only a small part of the more than 1,500 that have been manufactured. And, as the Navy Reserve receives F-4B's that are

being replaced in the fleet by F-4J's, F-8J's will be readily available.

The F-8 has better avionics than the F-5E, better "first detection" characteristics than the F-5E, better endurance, and is superior in performance to the F-5E in most air-combat modes. It would provide a credible deterrent to the Mig-21C's operated currently by Iraq and South Yemen. The F-8 is a proven air-to-air system. The F-8 has enjoyed a 6-to-1 kill ratio over Migs in Vietnam, whereas the F-5E was not employed in air-to-air combat in Vietnam, and in fact has rarely been used for this purpose. In addition, the F-8 poses one-half the maintenance and one-half the crew requirements of the F-4, since it is a single-engine, single pilot aircraft. It reportedly enjoys a 30-40 percent edge in maintenance reliability over the F-4.

But the F-8 is not a threat to Israel and is not destabilizing to the weapons balance in the Middle East.

Reportedly the United States is considering selling F-8's to Kuwait as a hedge against possible sales, 2 or 3 years hence, of the F-4. I have already noted that an LTV team is in Kuwait for "demonstration" purposes. Assistant Secretary of State Sisco has reportedly said that he considers the F-8 a viable aircraft in the Persian Gulf area for at least 3 to 4 more years. I would urge the administration to extend the logic applied to Kuwait to Saudi Arabia, which faces essentially the same military threats as Kuwait. If the security of Saudi Arabia requires an upgrading of its aerial capabilities, then the sale of F-8's is more appropriate, all things considered, than the sale of F-4's.

CONGRESS AND PHANTOMS

If the administration does not choose to reconsider its precipitous and most unfortunate action in agreeing in principle to the Phantom sale, then I urge that Congress act to stop such a sale. Congress has the power to do so, and there are a number of precedents for such an action.

There are two methods through which the Saudi Arabian Government can purchase American Phantom aircraft. A cash sale through commercial channels, that is between the Saudi Arabian Government and McDonnell-Douglas, could be arranged. Such a cash sale would require an export license from the State Department, and approval from the Pentagon as well. Or, the sale could be made on a credit basis, either on a government-to-government basis or on a government-to-manufacturer basis. In the latter case an export license and Department of Defense approval would also be required.

Credit sales are limited by section 31 (b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act (22 U.S.C. 2771(b)), which establishes an aggregate ceiling on foreign military sales credits:

(b) The aggregate total of credits, or participations in credits, extended pursuant to this Act (excluding credits covered by guaranties issued pursuant to section 24(b)) and of the face amount of guaranties issued pursuant to sections 24 (a) and (b) shall not exceed \$550,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972, of which amount not less than \$300,000,000 shall be available to Israel only.

Since \$300 million in credits are guaranteed to Israel, only \$250 million can be used to finance arms deals to all other nations. Thus limits are placed on the amount of credits that the Saudi Arabian Government could receive. Section 31(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act has not been amended.

Within the broad limitation of \$250 million in military credit sales, Congress has enacted a network of other more restrictive limitations on all types of military sales. Section 33 of the Foreign Military Sales Act (22 U.S.C. (sec. 2773)) establishes regional ceilings on Latin America and Africa. Subpart (a) of section 33 establishes a limitation of \$100 million on aggregate military cash or credit sales to Latin America, while subpart (b) of section 33 establishes a similar ceiling of \$40 million for all types of sales to African nations. In either case, subpart (c) states:

(c) The limitations of this section may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this or any other Act unless the President finds that overriding requirements to the national security of the United States justify such a waiver and promptly reports such finding to the Congress in writing, together with his reasons for such finding.

In no event, however, is the President allowed to increase aggregate military sales to a region beyond an amount equivalent 50 percent above the regional ceilings.

There are many precedents for limitations on foreign military sales or other forms of assistance applied to specific countries. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act (22 U.S.C. section 2370) contains a listing of conditions for foreign aid and military sales as well as a categorization of countries to which the United States will not give assistance to (such as Communist countries or the United Arab Republic Egypt) or to which assistance is limited. Section 620 (v) and (w) apply specific limitations to Greece and Pakistan:

(v) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act, and no sales shall be made under the Foreign Military Sales Act, to Greece. This restriction may be waived when the President finds that overriding requirements of the national security of the United States justify such a waiver and promptly reports such finding to the Congress in writing, together with his reasons for such finding . . .

(w) All military, economic, or other assistance, all sales of defense articles and services (whether for cash or by credit, guaranty, or any other means), all sales of agricultural commodities (whether for cash, credit, or by other means), and all licenses with respect to the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war (including technical data relating thereto) to the Government of Pakistan under this or any other law shall be suspended on the date of enactment of this subsection.

Sophisticated weapons systems, such as jet fighters, have also been singled out in previous legislation governing foreign assistance and foreign military sales. Section 4 of the Foreign Military Sales Act (22 U.S.C. 2754) establishes restrictions on the credit sale of advanced weapons to all but a handful of countries. Section 4 reads in part:

... Provided, That none of the funds contained in this authorization shall be used to guarantee, or extend credit, or participate in

an extension of credit in connection with the sale of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes, to any underdeveloped country other than Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, the Republic of China, the Philippines and Korea unless the President determines that such financing is important to the national security of the United States and reports within thirty days each such determination to the Congress.

Saudi Arabia is not on the list of nations entitled to receive sophisticated weapons without a Presidential determination. However, the section 4 limitation applies only to credit sales. Cash sales are not similarly restricted.

It is apparent in each of the aforementioned limitations imposed by Congress on foreign military sales that the President is granted, by Congress, limited authorities to waive various restrictive provisions. The President can waive the limitations of section 4, supra, to facilitate credit sales of "sophisticated weapons systems" to countries not enumerated in section 4, such as Saudi Arabia. An example of such a waiver is Presidential Determination 73-14, signed by President Nixon on May 21, 1973. Presidential Determination 73-14 provides for the waiver of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Foreign Military Sales Act, supra, to provide for the extension of credit for foreign military sales to the Governments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela, so as to facilitate the purchase of F-5E jet fighters to these nations.

Existing precedents, in the form of limitations on the sale of sophisticated weapons systems to particular countries, suggest that there are a number of methods through which Congress could act to stop or place certain limitations on the sale of Phantom aircraft to Saudi Arabia. Congress could amend the Foreign Assistance Act and/or the Foreign Military Sales Act, both of which require yearly congressional action.

Clearly the Presidential determination mechanism would have to be altered and strengthened in favor of increased congressional control over military sales. Congressional review of certain types of military sales actions could be required. For example, an amendment could be offered to the Foreign Military Sales Act, governing military sales of certain types of sophisticated weapons systems, on a cash or credit basis, to underdeveloped nations, similar to the existing section 4, supra, in the Foreign Military Sales Act. Such an amendment might require that approval of the whole Congress, or of the authorizing committees in the House and Senate, follow a Presidential determination to seek the waiver of statutory limitations on the sale of sophisticated weapons systems, such as jet fighters, to the excluded countries.

Or, Congress could amend the Foreign Assistance Act by inserting prohibitions against the sale of Phantoms to Saudi Arabia similar to those against assistance to Greece or Pakistan in section 620 (v) and (w), quoted above. The language of such an amendment might specifically prohibit the sale of F-4 aircraft to Saudi Arabia.

During its consideration of S. 1443, the Foreign Military Sales Act of 1974, the

Senate this week passed two amendments that are applicable to the proposed sale of Phantom jets to Saudi Arabia. An amendment offered by Senator NELSON would give Congress the opportunity to review any military sale in an amount of \$25 million for any single sale to one country, or cumulative sales of over \$50 million to one country in a year. The President would be required to report such a sale and the justifications for it to Congress, which would then have 30 days in which either House could adopt a resolution disapproving the sale.

Senator JACKSON and Senator RIBICOFF offered an amendment, subsequently adopted by a voice vote, which requires termination of arms shipments to any country which allowed "sophisticated weapons, including sophisticated jet aircraft," to be transferred to another nation. This amendment specifically addresses the concern that Phantoms sold to Saudi Arabia might be transferred to a more aggressively hostile Arab State.

Congress clearly has the power to prevent the sale of Phantom aircraft to Saudi Arabia, and there is ample precedent for such action. I hope that the administration will reconsider its intent to sell these advanced fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia, but if such does not occur, then I hope that the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, now considering the House version of the Foreign Military Sales Act, as well as the Members of the House of Representatives as a whole, will add to the Foreign Military Sales Act language preventing what I believe would be a dangerous misstep in our foreign policy in the Middle East.

THE NEED TO REFORM THE HATCH ACT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Hatch Act. While not disputing the Court's decision on the authority of Congress in this matter, I do believe it is a mistake for the Congress to exclude over 5.5 million public employees from active political participation. The Supreme Court has made it clear that the responsibility now rests with Congress to restore to these people their full political citizenship.

On March 20, 1972, I first introduced the Government Political Activities Act which I reintroduced as H.R. 668 at the opening of this Congress to legislate this much needed reform. H.R. 668 would preserve the valuable intent of the Hatch Act, cited by the Supreme Court, to protect public employees from involuntary political activity and coercion. But, it would eliminate from the present law the sweeping prohibitions against political activity by Government employees. The only restriction on political activity to remain would be a prohibition on holding a salaried office in a partisan political club. H.R. 668 would empower the Civil

Service Commission to take action against public officials, including those appointed by the President, found guilty of unlawful coercion of Government employees. Most important for civil servants, is the bill's prohibition against the solicitation of political financial contributions from, or by, Government employees. The need for these prohibitions, extended to Presidential appointees, has been dramatized by the abuses which are being uncovered in the Watergate investigations.

In carrying out the provisions of H.R. 668, the Civil Service Commission would have a functional interrelationship with the Department of Justice. The Commission would process and investigate complaints and upon finding that a violation has occurred, would levy penalties and refer the case to the Justice Department for prosecution under section 602 of title 18.

In 1966, the Hatch Act Commission was established by Congress to study all Federal laws restricting political participation by Government employees. In its report of 1967, the Commission noted the need for substantial reform of the present act so as to clarify its intent and reduce the number of employees within its purview. The Commission found that most Government employees are so confused by the more than 3,000 prohibitions and have so little idea what activities are permissible, that they tend to avoid all political activity. Similarly, in his decision, U.S. District Judge Gerhard A. Gesell declared that the Hatch Act was a "classic case of a statute which in its application has a chilling effect under the first amendment."

When the Hatch Act was first enacted, its coverage was limited. Even when amended in 1940 to include State and local government employees working in federally funded programs, less than one-half a million were subjected to it. But this number has swelled over tenfold and is likely to increase if the much needed reform is not enacted. New York City alone has more than 300,000 municipal employees, many of whom receive some Federal contribution toward their salaries and therefore are "hatched" under the existing law. Other government employees, both State and local, are currently prohibited from engaging in political activity by similar local regulations.

H.R. 668 would lift the ban on political activity off all city and State government employees by mandating compliance by any State or local agency receiving funds under revenue sharing.

The responsibility now rests squarely with Congress to enact legislation that would continue to protect Federal employees from improper political solicitations as the Hatch Act was intended to do, but restore to millions of Government employees their full political citizenship. I urge Congress to act now to make this important reform. Congress has taken the initiative in recent years in expanding the opportunities for political activity through its civil rights legislation and the 18-year-old vote. It is time that Congress act on the recommendations made by the Commission that it created and restore full citizenship to all Government employees.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct your attention to the following excerpt taken out of the Washington Post of June 26:

JAPANESE TOLD TO EAT LESS FISH DUE TO POLLUTION

TOKYO, June 25.—The world's foremost fish-eating nation awoke this morning to a government report advising the citizenry to restrict the fish in their diets and suggesting a shift toward meats and vegetables instead.

A Ministry of Health and Welfare committee finding, based on the hazard of mercury pollution from Japan's increasingly befouled coastal waters, was the top story in the press and the number one topic of political as well as family discussions.

The primary sources of protein in the diet of the American consumer are red meat, poultry, and fish. A particularly strong interest in consuming fish has developed with the skyrocketing increase in meat prices.

Of the sources mentioned, only fish are not required to be inspected for wholesomeness through the oversight of Congress. Since Americans consume approximately 2 billion pounds of fish and fishery products each year, we are left with a substantial source of food without a specific statutory mandate to insure wholesomeness. The public is not being protected.

Fish are extremely perishable and are highly susceptible to contamination during handling and processing because they offer an excellent medium for bacterial growth. For example, bacterial growth has been responsible for several outbreaks of poisoning which were attributable to fish. Nine deaths occurred in 1963 as a result of botulism from smoked lake fish. Smoked fish again caused 400 cases of salmonella poisoning in 1966, and 250 food poisonings occurred in the very same year from contaminated shrimp. In addition there has been an alarming increase in the discovery of hazardous materials in fish such as mercury and DDT.

While there continues to be concern about these various health hazards, Congress has done nothing. The inadequacies within our system for dealing with the inspection of fish and fishery products are horrendous. According to the National Marine Fishery Service, there are approximately 1,836 fishery plants within the United States—of those 1,836, only 42 plants are inspected by the Service, and those on a voluntary basis.

On December 2, 1971, the Senate passed S. 284, a strong and comprehensive bill setting stringent inspection standards for all aspects of fish and fishery products. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on December 6, 1971. Since that time there has been no action on that bill. Hearings were never scheduled. The need, however, goes on. Sitting in committee are several other bills that also would launch massive inspection systems exclusively for fish and fishery products.

Furthermore, these bills would direct appropriate agencies to survey fisheries and vessels to gain further information for developing adequate standards for good processing, sanitary transportation and storage facilities; all of these are vital to insure wholesome fish and fishery products.

Is it necessary for more deaths to occur because of the present hazards before there is adequate legislation? Must we continue to eat rotten fish?

The ground has already been paved and the foundation set on which we can build. I therefore urge the respective committees to begin immediate hearings on the urgent problem of protecting the millions of Americans who consume vast quantities of fish.

TERRORIZING THE INNOCENT

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the inherent danger in our "no-knock" laws has once again captured the limelight with the recent and repeated disclosures of violent drug raids against the innocent. In the fight to combat "Public Enemy No. 1," drugs, law enforcement officers have made no, or at best, shoddy preraid investigations, often followed up by illegal raids.

Adherence to the Constitution's fourth amendment, prohibiting unreasonable searches and seizures, is mandatory for law enforcement agents at all levels. Cases of hideous raids by narcotic officers have been reported in which the officers had: First, no search or arrest warrant; and second, the wrong address for the suspect operation. How many cases of a similar nature have unreported taken place?

A captain of the State police described smashing into the wrong house, massive destruction of property and terrorizing of innocent citizens as "insignificant." The frequent occurrence of these outrageous and illegal raids raises questions as to whether this "insignificant" attitude is an isolated opinion, or whether it is the view held by many law enforcement officers involved.

Stringent measures must be taken to prevent the recurrence of such activities. Legislation is needed to compensate innocent victims for both physical injuries and property damage. Federal law enforcement officers involved in these raids should be strongly disciplined. We can do that first.

Drugs are a menace to our society. But so are criminal violations of our constitutionally guaranteed right to freedom from the threat of illegal police searches. One evil cannot and should not be used to justify another. These illegal police tactics must be ended immediately.

IS THERE A THAW IN THE COLD WAR?

(Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, at this time when there is according to the media a thaw in the cold war and President Nixon and Chairman Brezhnev were recently pictured toasting each other in champagne, it might be well to look carefully at the Soviet Union and ask ourselves whether the Russian bear is now housebroken.

I am alarmed that Americans and Members of this body and the other body as well seem to have forgotten the long list of political prisoners in the U.S.S.R. as the government of that nation continues its repressive policy of forced Russification of subject nationalities groups.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants peace and disarmament more than I do. I have lived through two major wars as well as the Korean conflict and our more recent involvement in Southeast Asia. I know what war's horror means. But my desire for peace does not mean that I have forgotten justice of the commitment this Nation has to the cause of self-determination.

Clearly, Mr. Brezhnev wants the present detente. I think the impetus for this policy change comes in large measure from the Kremlin. Which in my view is not wrong. On the other hand, since they want a normalization of relations, why should we simply accede? If we are to make concessions, and I think it reasonable that we should make concessions, then let the Soviets make a few concessions of their own.

The concession I want is not impossible for Comrade Brezhnev and his cohorts to put into effect. All they have to do is to call a halt to the great Russian imperialism which has gone on for centuries under czars as well as commissars. I bear no ill will against the great Russian people. They, like all people, have a right to pursue their own national traditions, but Mr. Brezhnev has no right to impose them on other people.

Mr. Speaker, lest we forget I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record a list of Ukrainian political prisoners.

The list follows:

A LIST OF UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS IN THE U.S.S.R.

CHORNOVIL, VYACHESLAV

36; journalist.

July 1966: arrested for the first time and sentenced to 3 months hard labor for refusing to testify at a closed trial of Ukrainian dissidents.

August 1967: rearrested and on November 15, 1967 sentenced to 3 years hard labor for compiling documents on the arrests and trials of twenty Ukrainian intellectuals in 1965-1966. The document were published in the West in 1968 under the title "The Chornovil Papers." Chornovil was released after 18 months due to an amnesty.

December 1969: Chornovil signed a petition against the imprisonment of Sviatoslav Karavansky (journalist and poet); against the inhumanity of sentences for 25 years; and demanding open trials.

November 1970: refused to testify at the closed trial of Valentyn Moroz (historian).

August 16, 1971: wrote a protest letter concerning the deliberate destruction by the KGB of tombstones at Yaniv Cemetery in Lviv of World War I Ukrainian soldiers.

September 1971: signed a letter to the editors of "Radyanska Ukraina" protesting a

slandorous attack on V. Moroz.

December 1971: joined a committee headed by the Jewish dissenter Pyotr Yakir to defend Nina Strokata-Karavanska (a microbiologist).

January 1972: arrested.

February 1972: tried in camera and sentenced to 7 years hard labor and 5 years exile.

DZYUBA, IVAN

42; literary critic.

September 4, 1965: together with Chornovil and Vasyl Stus (poet) publicly condemned the arrests of dissenters in August and September 1965. Shortly after he was arrested for allegedly sending abroad the diary of the deceased poet Vasyl Symonenko. Because he suffers of tuberculosis he was released. Following the arrests of 1965-66, Dzyuba wrote "Internationalism or Russification?", a critique of the current Soviet nationalities policies. His work was published in the West in 1968.

November 1967: signed with others a letter protesting the sentencing of V. Chornovil.

Early 1968: together with more than 150 persons signed a petition addressed to First Secretary of CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev, Alexey Kosygin, and Nikolai Podgorny, protesting closed trials.

July 1968: wrote an open letter to "Literaturna Gazeta", defending Chornovil and Karavansky, after they were attacked by that newspaper.

June 1970: together with Chornovil, Ivan Svitlychny (literary critic) and Ivan Sverstyuk (literary critic), wrote a protest letter concerning the arrest of V. Moroz.

November 1970: refused to testify at the closed trial of V. Moroz.

August 1971: wrote a protest letter to the newspaper "Radyanska Ukraina" defending V. Moroz against a slanderous attack.

September 1971: along with others wrote a letter to "Radyanska Osvita" concerning yet another slanderous attack on V. Moroz.

January 1972: placed under house arrest.

March 1972: expelled from the Union of Writers of the Ukrainian SSR.

April 1972: put in prison.

March 1973: tried in camera, and sentenced to 5 years imprisonment. (It should be noted that Ivan Dzyuba suffers from acute tuberculosis).

HEL, IVAN

36; a locksmith, and an evening student of history at the University of Lviv (enrolled in 1960).

August 24, 1965: arrested.

March 25, 1966: tried and sentenced in camera to 3 years hard labor.

February 23, 1967: sent a letter to the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR stating his innocence, and protecting the illegality of his arrest.

After Feb. 1967 and before Aug. 1968: wrote to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. stating a number of demands: to annul Art. #62 of the Criminal Code of the Ukr. SSR as illegal and unconstitutional; that Ukrainian political prisoners serve their sentences on Ukrainian territory, stating that 50% of all political prisoners held in the camps of Mordovia are Ukrainians; to abolish discrimination and hard labor; etc. He further demanded that his statement be published in the newspaper "Izvestia", since 1968 had been proclaimed by the United Nations as the "Human Rights Year".

November 28, 1970: Alla Horska (artist) was assassinated by the KGB—according to dissident sources. I. Hel delivered an eulogy at her funeral calling her "the faithful daughter of the Ukrainian Revival". For his participation in the funeral and the eulogy he got a strong reprimand from his employer for "truancy".

End of Nov. and begin Dec. 1970: wrote an

appeal protesting the harsh sentence given to V. Moroz.

Jan. 12-13, 1972: arrested.

August 1972: tried and sentenced to 10 years hard labor and 5 years exile.

KALYNETS, IKOR

34; poet.

Beginning Nov. 1970: along with his wife Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets and others sent a telegram to the Prosecutor's office of the Ukr. SSR and to the Ivano-Frankivsk Regional Court demanding they be permitted to attend the trial of V. Moroz.

November 29, 1970: Ihor Kalynets and his wife Iryna wrote a letter to the Chairman of the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR protesting the imprisonment of V. Moroz to 14 years "merely for what he was thinking".

After the arrest and trial of V. Moroz, I. Kalynets wrote some poems dedicated to him. The same year a collection of his poems was stopped from being published in Ukraine, while another collection appeared in the West under the title "Poetry from Ukraine".

August 11, 1972: arrested.

November 1972: tried and sentenced to 9 years of imprisonment and 3 years exile.

KALYNETS, IRYNA STASIV

33; philologist; wife of Ihor Kalynets.

Summer 1970: dismissed from her position as instructor of the Ukrainian language and literature at the Lviv Polytechnical Institute, and forced to work in a textile factory.

Sometime in 1971: Iryna Kalynets on her behalf, and the family and friends of V. Moroz, wrote a letter addressed to Alexey Kosygin, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Health, and to the Chairman of the Red Cross Committee in the USSR, to release the seriously ill V. Moroz; to investigate the inhumane conditions at the Vladimir prison. In the early summer of 1971, V. Moroz was critically stabbed while serving his sentence at the Vladimir prison.

January 12, 1972: arrested.

End of July 1972: tried and sentenced to 6 years imprisonment and 3 years exile.

MOROZ, VALENTYN

37; historian.

August 1965: arrested for the first time.

Jan. 20, 1966: tried and sentenced to 5 years hard labor.

April 15, 1967: he produced an appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR entitled "Report from the Beria Reservation"—a lengthy analysis of the Soviet system.

Sept. 1, 1969: released, but unable to find employment because of his "criminal" record.

June 1, 1970: rearrested for having written "A Chronicle of Resistance"—a critical essay in which he assailed the Russification of Ukraine.

Nov. 20, 1970: tried and sentenced to 9 years hard labor and 5 years exile. In court he delivered his famous final statement "Instead of the Last Word", in which he challenged his jailers with "there will be a trial . . . very well, we will fight!". Moroz's essays and his statement to the court have already appeared in the West in numerous publications and in many languages.

The last reports about V. Moroz stated that he was seriously ill in a prison hospital. Early summer 1971 Moroz received stab wounds in the Vladimir prison.

KARAVANSKY, SVIATOSLAV

53, journalist, poet, and literary translator.

July 1941: after his Soviet army unit was routed by the Germans, he managed to escape to Odessa.

June 1944: after Odessa was recaptured by the Soviets he was arrested, and later court-martialed and sentenced to 25 years at hard labor "for connections with the Ukrainian underground". In reality, he refused to inform on fellow students.

December 1960: released due to an am-

nesty. He returned to Odessa where he worked on literary translations from English into Ukrainian. In that period he began translating the novel *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Bronte.

Feb. 24, 1965: wrote a letter to the Prosecutor General of the Ukr. SSR charging certain officials with national and racial discrimination; as well as Russification of the Ukrainian educational system.

March 4, 1965: Karavansky's apartment was searched.

Nov. 13, 1965: rearrested for having written a memorandum to the Polish and Czechoslovak Communist Parties regarding the arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals. Without trial Karavansky was sent for 8 years and 7 months to a hard labor camp to complete his 25 year sentence. In the camp he wrote a number of petitions to official organizations and highly placed persons, for which he was repeatedly punished in camp isolators.

Between Jan. 9 and June 7, 1966: wrote several letters and petitions to various Government officials and agencies, in which he at length analysed the abuses of the Soviet system regarding the rights of individuals and nationalities.

Jan. 15, 1968: *The New Leader* of New York published Karavansky's petition in defense of the Soviet Jews and other nationalities.

Sometime in 1969: while in prison the authorities staged another "trial" for Karavansky for having written several articles, in particular one concerning the mass execution of Polish officers (PoW's) in the forests of Katyn perpetrated by the Russians in 1941. As a result Karavansky's total term of imprisonment was increased to 33 years.

KARAVANSKA, NINA STROKATA

48; microbiologist; wife of S. Karavansky.

End 1965, and beginning 1966: wrote to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. protesting the renewed imprisonment of her husband.

Sometime in 1969: at the "trial" (in Vladimir prison) of her husband, she appeared as a witness defending him and accusing his jailers for cruelty. In response the court sent a resolution to the Odessa Medical Institute where she was working, accusing her of failing to "reeducate" her husband. She answered that it was her moral duty to support her husband. However, at this point the authorities had to stop further harassment due to a cholera epidemic that she actively was helping to control.

Beginning 1971: renewed harassment and threats in the local press (in Odessa), with accusations "why hasn't she yet denounced" and "broken off" with her husband "the enemy of the people".

May 1971: she was dismissed from her job at the Institute.

End of summer 1971: due to continuing harassment and the impossibility to find work, she was forced to leave Odessa for Nalchik (Kabardinian-Balkarian ASSR).

Dec. 8, 1971: she was arrested on her way from Nalchik to Odessa.

May 15-19, 1972: tried and sentenced to 4 years of imprisonment. A citizens' committee in defense of Nina Strokata Karavanska was immediately formed by Pyotr Yakir, Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets, Wasyli Stus, Vyacheslav Chornovil, and Leonid Tymchuk (sailor). On Dec. 21, 1971 the committee issued a public announcement stating that the committee in defense of Nina Strokata-Karavansky was formed "on the basis of the guarantees provided by the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. and the Declaration of Human Rights . . . In its activities the committee will abide by the Soviet law". The members of the committee were arrested in early 1972.

SHABATURA, STEFANIA

32; artist.

Nov.-Dec., 1970: protested with others the arrest, trial and sentencing of Valentyn Moroz.

Jan. 12, 1970: arrested.

Early July 1972: tried and sentenced to 5 years imprisonment and 3 years exile.

SHUKHEVYCH, YURI

40; married with two small children; son of the General Roman Shukhevych, C-in-C of the Ukrainian resistance against the Nazis and Soviets during and after World War II, who died in action against Soviet troops in March 1950.

1947: arrested for the activities of his father, and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment, at the age of 14.

Aug. 21, 1958: on the same day of his release, he was rearrested and shortly thereafter sentenced to a second 10 year term for "anti-Soviet agitation among the prisoners of Vladimir prison".

July 28, 1967: Yuri wrote a letter to the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, stating his innocence, and accusing the authorities of continuing "blackmail in order to force me to come out with the required public statement . . . in which I would condemn my father . . .". So far he has resisted all KGB pressure.

Aug. 21, 1968: released, but denied the right to return to Ukraine for 5 years.

Feb. 27, 1972: arrested for the third time, in Nalchik (Kabardinian-Balkarian ASSR), where he was living with his family.

Antonyuk, Zinoviy, 40, scientist. Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: Aug. 8-15, 1972. Sent.: 7 plus 3 yrs.

Chubay, Hryhoriy, 30; poet and worker. Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Fate: unknown.

Hulyk, Stefania, former employee of the Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments; married, with small child. Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Fate: unknown.

Katala, —, 30; engineer. Arr.: April 1972. Committed suicide during interrogation in Lviv.

Kholodny, Mykola, 31, poet. Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Fate: unknown.

Kovalenko, Ivan E., 54; teacher. Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: July 10-13, 1972. Sent.: 5 yrs.

Krasin, Victor, 44; economist. First arr.: Dec. 20, 1969. Second arr.: Sept. 12, 1972. Fate: unknown.

Lisoviy, Vasyli, 30. Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Fate: unknown.

Melnychuk, Taras, 30; poet. Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: July 1972. Sent.: 3 yrs.

Osadchyi, Mykhailo, 35; journalist, poet and writer. First arr.: 1965. Second arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: Sept. 4-5, 1972. Sent.: 7 plus 3 yrs.

Plakhotnyuk, Mykola, 36; medical doctor and lecturer. First arr.: 1965. Second arr.: Jan. 13, 1972. Held in psychiatric asylum, until Sept. 9, 1972. Suffers from tuberculosis. Fate: unknown.

Plushch, Leonid, 33; scientist. Arr.: Jan. 20, 1972. Imprisoned in a psychiatric asylum.

Pronyuk, Yevhen, 30. Arr.: July 6, 1972. Fate: unknown.

Rechetyuk, Anatoly. Arr.: Jan. 1972. Fate: unknown.

Rokytsky, Volodymyr, 28; worker; expelled from the university. Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: early June 1972. Sent.: 5 yrs.

Rev. Romanyuk, Vasyli, 50; priest. Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: end July 1972. Sent.: 7 plus 2 yrs. Like many others he protested the imprisonment of historian Valentyn Moroz, and opposed Russification in Ukraine.

Senyk, Iryna, 48. First imprison.: 1947-1957. Second arr.: Dec. 72. Trial: Apr. 1973. Sent.: 6 plus 5 yrs.

Seredyak, Lyuba, 20; student (?). Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: Nov. 1972. Sent.: 1 yr.

Serhiyenko, Oleksander, 40; engineer. Arr.:

Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: early June 1972. Sent.: 7 plus 3 yrs.

Shumuk, Danylo, 50; worker. Arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: July 5-7, 1972. Sent.: 10 plus 5 yrs.

Stus, Vasyl, 34; poet. Arr.: Jan. 1972. Trial: Aug. 1-Sept. 7, 1972. Sent.: 5 plus 3 yrs.

Sverstyuk, Yevhen, 43; literary critic. First arr.: Sept. 1965. Second arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: March 1973. Sent.: 5 yrs.

Svitlychnyi, Ivan, 42; literary critic. First arr.: Sept. 1965. Second arr.: Jan. 12-13, 1972. Trial: March 1973. Sent.: 5 yrs.

Svitlychna, Nadya, 36; philologist; sister of Ivan Svitychnyi. Arr.: April 1972. Fate: unknown.

Dyak, Volodymyr. Arr.: Dec. 1971. Trial: April 1972. Sent.: 7 yrs.

Lupynis, Anatoliy, 38; poet (?). First arr.: late 1950's or early 1960's. First imprisonment left him disabled. Second arr.: May 28, 1971. Placed in psychiatric asylum. Fate: unknown.

Prytyka, Oleksa, 40; medical doctor. Arr.: July 9, 1971. Fate: unknown.

LEGEND

Arr.: arrested; sent.: sentenced to; sentences mainly consist of years if imprisonment and hard labor, plus a number of years of banishment from Ukraine.

DOCUMENTARY SOURCES

The Chornovil Papers, 1968; Chronicle of Current Events (Russian underground publication); Ferment in the Ukraine, 1971 and 1973; Internationalism or Russification?, 1968; Revolutionary Voices, 1971; Ukrainian Herald (Ukrainian underground publication); Ukrainian Intellectuals tried by the KGB, 1970; U.S.S.R. Labour Camps, Testimony of Abraham Shifrin before the U.S. Senate, Feb. 73.

PROSPECTS BRIGHTEN FOR PUBLIC TV

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, we will be considering on Friday H.R. 8538, the bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend authorizations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and provide for construction grants for educational television and radio stations throughout the country.

I strongly support this legislation, reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as I have previous legislation to create the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and develop an effective system of noncommercial broadcasting in this country.

I am pleased, therefore, that the conflicts which threatened the future of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Public Broadcasting Service have been resolved and we have an opportunity to consider this legislation to continue this vital public education service.

In this connection I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues articles which have appeared recently in major newspapers in my State. The first of these articles is by the distinguished editor of The Miami News, Mr. Sylvan Meyer, who has had an intimate association with public broadcastings, as well as long experience in the print media. The text of his editorial column, entitled "Prospects Brighten for Public TV," is as follows:

The second article by the Associated Press appeared in the Tampa Times and reports the statements of Mr. William S. Frates, chairman of the board of WPBT, our Miami educational television station, regarding governmental interference with educational TV programming.

The text is as follows:

PROSPECTS BRIGHTEN FOR PUBLIC TV

(By Sylvan Meyer)

Give the credit to public pressure, managers of local public television stations, the public television broadcasts of the Watergate hearings and Dr. James Killian.

It looks as though public television, threatened by monolithic bureaucratic control and congressional disillusionment, will survive. It looks as though public television's capacity to prepare and telecast strong public affairs programs, in keeping with honest journalistic practices, may also survive.

Dr. James Killian is the former president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He recently was named chairman of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Presidentially-appointed commission at the apex of the structure of public organizations that have the responsibility for various portions of public TV program production and network transmission.

Dr. Killian's arrival amidst these embattled agencies obviously brought some common sense to bear on what appeared to be an arbitrary assumption of power, contrary to earlier congressional mandates, by CPB staff executives.

CPB and PBS (Public Broadcasting Service, which is in charge of the "interconnect," or public network) reached agreement on several critical points. The Corporation, which gets money from Congress and distributes it to cooperating agencies and local stations, as well, yielded its earlier demands for total prior approval of all programs. It will be informed generally of the programs planned by subsidiary agencies. It will not censor the interconnect. If it cannot agree with PBS on a particular program or the agency producing programs, there is an arbitration procedure that should work fairly well.

The agreement reaffirms that public affairs are an essential responsibility of public broadcasting. This statement is significant because for a while the administration-appointed CPB people insisted that public affairs programs had been captured by chronic liberals who spent their time sabotaging the Nixon administration. They described what they wanted henceforth as "non-journalistic" public affairs, but no one could figure out what that meant.

There will be public affairs, given sufficient budget, and programs financed by foundations or contributing corporations will be accepted for the interconnect. The Ford Foundation, which has been providing major funding for public affairs programs, was about to withdraw its help because it would not fund an agency subject to censorship. It appears now that Ford will continue its support.

Public TV can turn once again to Congress with a degree of unity in its appeal for funds. The Congress generally is delighted with public TV's evening re-runs of the Watergate hearings, which have drawn more than 65,000 favorable letters to the network, and now might approve the two-year funding requested of it, at substantial increases over current funding.

A proposed federal money distribution formula would put about half of whatever Congress appropriates directly into the hands of local public stations, an adroit piece of leverage that assures grass roots support for the legislative branch, possibly enough to overcome a Presidential veto of the appro-

priation, an action no longer considered likely in view of the fact that the White House has other things on its mind right now.

So, public TV has a double shot in the arm—a working climate that is philosophically and professionally acceptable and the probability of enough federal funds to assure two years of operation at a level as high or higher than the current one.

It can then consider in some comfort the basic question flagged by the whole interagency argument in the first place, which is whether public television should use or be dependent upon federal money in the first place.

TV STATION HITS U.S. "INTERFERENCE"

MIAMI.—Condemning "governmental interference in programming," Miami's non-commercial television station has declared its independence from federal funding.

"Any government that seeks to circumvent the right to free expression must be repudiated," said William S. Frates, chairman of the board of WPBT. "Public broadcasting cannot be the voice of government."

Frates said while the station would not refuse federal funding, it wanted to "make it clear to viewers that Channel 2 must be able to stand on its own—independent of federal monies."

He said only five per cent of WPBT's annual budget comes from federal sources, with the rest coming from viewer contributions. He said the station plans to seek more contributions from its 2.3 million viewers in south Florida.

Frates said federal interference with national programming had caused cancellation of "a number of favorite programs," including William F. Buckley Jr.'s Firing Line, World Press, Washington Week in Review, Bill Moyers Journal and America '73.

FOREIGN POLICY IN A STRANGE WORLD

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 my wife was privileged to attend a luncheon at the Women's National Democratic Club and to hear a most stimulating and enlightening address entitled "Foreign Policy in a Strange World," from a great American, a great scholar, and a great former Secretary of State, Dean Rusk.

Mr. Rusk was able to bring to bear upon this challenging subject his rich and long experience as Secretary of State and as one who has long been at or near the center of great national and international events. Mr. Rusk objectively, yet persuasively, and with his own inimitable charm and wit surveys the world scene from the point of view of our country.

He also discusses the making of foreign policy as he has known it under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations and as he sees it under the present administration. He tells us about what our country has done in world affairs, the price we have paid for doing what we thought was right and he also points out the problems and perils that we face today. My wife has obtained a copy of Secretary Rusk's address and I offer it here in this RECORD following my remarks, Mr. Speaker, because I believe every Member of Congress and every citizen who reads this able address will be better in-

formed, for having read it, about the problems of our country's relationship to other nations and will also have great respect, high esteem, and warm feeling toward the great and able American and good man who delivered it.

The address follows:

FOREIGN POLICY IN A STRANGE WORLD

(Address by Dean Rusk, former Secretary of State)

Ben Read, Mrs. Koteen, Peter McClellan, members, and guests of the Women's National Democratic Club, Virginia Rusk and I are delighted to be with you today.

This is my first visit with this club. During the 1960s, President Kennedy and President Johnson made it very clear that this type of club was off-limits to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury, and those gentlemen present who have served in the armed forces will know what I mean when I say it is always intriguing to visit with women who have been off-limits (laughter).

Ben, I deeply appreciate your moving introduction. Now that I am happily dropping out of the public eye, I do not take introductions for granted anymore. For example, in the Atlanta Airport not long ago a man came up to me and said, "Aren't you John Foster Dulles?" And I can only say to him, "Well, if I am, there's been quite a miracle!" But there may be some of you who feel that I too much resemble John Foster Dulles (laughter). He, in his term, was criticized for being too much like Dean Acheson. I noted that the worse thing that Senator Fulbright could find to say to Secretary Rogers according to press reports in a hearing some months ago was: "You sound just like that fellow, Rusk" (laughter). So Secretaries of State share a certain common tradition of disapprobation.

When I left Washington to go back to a campus, I realized I'd have to spend a good deal of time in learning the new vocabulary of the campus, not necessarily to use it, but at least to understand it. I think I've succeeded in doing that. But I had not expected that when I came back to Washington I would have to learn the new vocabulary of Washington. But I shall try. Let me make one thing perfectly clear (laughter), everything I said as Secretary of State is now inoperative (laughter and applause), and I mean that 1000 percent (laughter). I'm going to divide my time with you today. We'll get out of here at the usual time. I'll try to speak relatively briefly in order to take your questions. If any of you have to withdraw from heat exhaustion or any other purpose, don't worry about me. I've been walked out on by Mr. Gromyko and it won't hurt my feelings at all! (laughter).

It is hard to come into this poisonous fog that is settled over our National Capital and this Nation without some comment on Watergate. I hesitate to do that because all of you are more expert than I in the matter. But to use an adjective used by Judge Sirika, this has been an odious affair. I feel myself that it is very important that we get all the truth as quickly as possible and take the remedial action and get on with the public business. As far as I am concerned I shall withhold my personal judgments with the respect to those matters that are attributed to unnamed sources or to uncorroborated hearsay evidence, but I have no doubt that the full truth will come out and very shortly. Several committees of the Congress, including the most distinguished committee under Senator Ervin; the work of Mr. Cox, and Mr. Richardson, both of whom I have personal confidence; various grand juries and courts that will be sitting on this matter, and a vigorous and inquiring press. . . .

I hope you in Washington realize this is

not a matter which is concentrated in Washington. I visited many small communities in all parts of the country—and I can tell you that this is a matter of deep concern to people throughout the land—and I find no comfort in this matter for Democrats. We're all in this ship together; we're going to come through together; we'll go down together; and such a deep injury to our national political system is something in which we can take no joy whatever.

I do think it is important for us to realize that 99.0 percent of people in government both in the executive and the electoral branches are honest and decent people who are trying to do the right job. And I would hope that the malefactions of a few would not be used to condemn as a class those who are trying to serve their government.

As far as the Democratic Party is concerned I've been a Democrat since the time of Woodrow Wilson. I have two suggestions to make which will be of no importance because I'm not even a "private, first class" in the Democratic Party. But I would hope that the Democratic Party would not forget that the great domestic program of Lyndon Johnson is a permanent requirement of a free people in our society (applause). To me that means that the Democratic Party must come back to complete and effective power in 1976. It also means that we made a mistake when we tried to brush Lyndon Johnson under the rug at our last national convention (applause) because there are millions of American who think of him with great respect and deep affection. But that is a program which must be resumed even though there are efforts now to sabotage those necessary steps in our society. Yes, with a reform with perhaps tighter administration with whatever needs to be done to make them more effective, because L.B.J. was an impatient man. He knew he had only a limited time and he wanted to get these things started, and he started them with more compassion than any man I have ever known in my life.

Now a second suggestion to the Party will mean nothing whatever because it is too simple to be accepted. It's not a bad idea for a political party to start with those who have the votes (laughter). As far as I'm concerned, I would be glad to see all Democratic senators, congressmen, and governors made voting members of the national convention, reinforced by whatever additional members the situation requires, because they won the election in 1972. They won it. And I would hope they would not forget there was a time when the Democratic Party under Franklin Roosevelt had room in it for people with as diverse opinions as Senator Bilbo of Mississippi and Henry Wallace, and build a coalition of support on a broad base across the country, because I am convinced that the Democratic Party is the party that can do the job which is required.

Now, I want to comment to you very briefly on the foreign policy agenda in the years ahead. My topic is: "Foreign Policy in A Strange New World." First, let me say that in general the foreign policy has not been partisan. In all of the hundreds of visits I was privileged to make with committees and subcommittees of the Congress over a period of eight years, not once did I see differences in foreign policy turn on party lines. There were lively differences, as there were in the executive branch, because many of these problems are extraordinarily complicated. Many of them require on-balance, knife-edged decisions on which honest men can disagree. But I've never seen foreign policy issues out of foreign policy questions because there are reasons to believe the American people get a little nervous when that effort is made.

But I believe that we are now faced with

a series of problems which are different in kind and I emphasize "in kind" from any which the human race has faced before and that these problems must be resolved somewhere around the turn of the century, if homo sapiens is going to make it. And that leads me to put great emphasis on our young people; that has led me to commit what time remains to me in working with young people in the field on international law, because I believe this generation now in our schools and in our colleges are destined to write a unique chapter in the history of the human race. Some of those problems are on our immediate doorstep.

I think of the Law of the Sea Conference which is to convene next spring in Santiago, Chile, to take up territorial waters, the narrow straits, the resources of the deep ocean seabeds, fisheries, the environment of the oceans, the freedom of scientific research—topics which break down into more than 90 sub-topics. But we're at a great crossroads in history on these matters because unless we can find agreed international conclusions on these matters we face the prospect of a national race for the control of the open ocean areas comparable in scope and danger to the race for land areas during the period of European explosion into all parts of the world. It's an extraordinarily complicated negotiation but it deserves a great deal more attention than it is now getting.

I think of the nuclear arms race. There is no way in which one can describe to you what it means to live with that black box that goes around with the President wherever he goes than—that box which controls nuclear weapons. Thousands of megatons now lie in the hands of frail human beings. If all of those megatons were to go off within the course of an hour or so at least it would raise a serious question about whether or not this planet could sustain the species, homo sapiens. And the arms race continues. We have had two rather limited agreements in the so-called SALT talks—agreements which I supported—but that's like building a dam about one-eighth of the way across the river.

Unless we continue that work, just as much water will flow in terms of nuclear competition as flowed before—if in somewhat different channels. There is no agreement on bombers; there is no agreement on the number of warheads and we can expect both sides to continue to put multiple warheads in their missiles, multiplying several-fold the number of war heads deliverable upon the other. There is no agreement of megatonnage. Before the Nuclear Testban Treaty of 1963, we were aware that the Soviet Union had exploded a 50 megaton weapon. Bear in mind that one megaton is 50 times Hiroshima.

There is no agreement on land-based, mobile launchers such as big truck-trailer combinations or railroad cars wandering about the countryside. No agreement on surface vessels firing intercontinental missiles at sea. No agreement on qualitative improvements which alone could divert billions of resources on both sides from urgent national requirements, and no agreement on money. It is of the greatest urgency that SALT II proceed despite the complexities—the difficulties—to an extension of the existing agreements. Related to that is the problem of how to organize a durable peace in the world.

My generation of students was led down the "chute-to-chute" into World War II because the governments of that day could not organize to resist aggression at its earliest stages and allowed that aggression to develop a momentum which made World War II inevitable. We came out of that war with a notion that collective security was the key to the prevention of World War III. Now

there is a great disease and erosion in this country about collective security. That is not irrational—something I can understand—because this country alone has taken more than six hundred thousand casualties in dead and wounded since the end of World War II, and it hasn't been all that collective. We provided 90% of the non-Korean forces in Korea and 80% of the non-Vietnamese forces in Vietnam. I can understand why people would say, "Look, if collective security is going to require 40 or 50 thousand American dead every decade and is not even collective maybe it's not a good idea."

My concern is that we are not addressing ourselves to the question—if not collective security, what do we put in its place in terms of organizing a durable peace? It is a question different in kind for throughout human history it has been possible for us to pick ourselves up out of the death and destruction of war and start over again. But if I could say one thing to you today that I hope you will never forget is that we shall not have that chance after World War III. There just won't be enough left. At long last the human race has reached the point where it must prevent that war before it occurs. And that's going to take a considerable amount of doing. And each generation must find its own answer to that problem.

I think of the environment. We now know that we can inflict irreparable damage upon this thin, biosphere around the surface of this fleck of dust in the universe on which the human race lives. Here I'm relatively optimistic because I believe that there is still time to get at these matters while they are still merely serious before they become disastrous. Although there is much unfinished business it is clear that action is breaking out all over the place at the federal, state, and local level in this country, and that new initiatives are being taken in the international field following the Stockholm Conference and under the leadership of a most extraordinary Canadian, Mr. Maurice Strong. But I hear that there is even some doubt about whether we ourselves are going to come up with forty million dollars a year as our share of an international fund to give impetus to these developments—forty million dollars a year.

I think of the population problem. If the developed countries reach zero population growth by around the year 2000, which seems entirely possible, and the developing countries reached the same position by the year 2040, which seems rather less likely, the world's population will level out in about a century at a level of about 15 and a half billions—with enormous implications for food, housing, jobs, education, transportation, communication, the amenities of life, raw materials, all that go with that. 1974 has been designated by the United Nations as "Population Year," under the leadership of a most extraordinary man, former foreign minister of Mexico, former ambassador in Washington, Mr. Antonio Flores, who many of you know. I would hope that the United States would be prepared to take as active and substantial role in the work of the United Nations on that matter as the political traffic will bear. Our own public policy has turned around in this field in the last decade.

Between 1961 and 1971 major changes came about because of work in both the executive and legislative branches of the government and by many individuals and organizations with whom you are familiar. No country since 1945 has been basing a policy of territorial expansion on the notion of "lebensraum," what Hitler called living space. But, when we reach the point where burgeoning populations can no longer expect to derive from advancing science and technology their minimum needs, then expanding populations could once again become a cause of war, which has

been true since the dawn of history. And so it is an urgent problem.

I think of race relations. When one thinks back over the last 300 years and the explosion of Europe into all parts of the world, it's a miracle that we have not had a direct confrontation between the white race and all the rest in these last few years. I talked to many foreign ministers of non-white countries about why the United States has not been hauled before the United Nations to be assaulted for our unfinished business in this field.

Most of them have given me two answers. One is that you people in the U.S. have no such monopoly on such problems. That wherever there are different races, different religions, different cultural traditions there are problems and most of us have them. But secondly they add, that what is really exciting and stimulating is that there appears to be a national decision on the part of the U.S., its government and its people to find better answers in this field than we have found before. And they say that what happens in the United States is important not just because of what happens in our country but what impact that might have upon other countries where similar issues are present. The white race has a very deep interest in this because we are a minority race in the world and by the end of the century we shall be even more a minority race and this is a matter with which we must definitely grapple.

I think of the problem of raw materials and non-renewable resources such as fossil fuels. We have become rather used to in this country to the notion of doubling our gross national product every twenty years. A Russian representative at a recent meeting of the United Nations. That, if the other nations of the world approximated us in the standard of living, productivity and consumption, that the old earth itself would simply groan and collapse.

Six percent of us—of the world's population in this country—consume about 50% of the world's raw materials. I have no doubt that down the way, our young people are going to have to face up to a rather difficult and complicated question. And that is whether or not we can readjust our own personal and national economic expectations in light of the capacity of the earth's environment to fulfill them.

If I look back with regret on various things, as I do, in my tour as Secretary of State, one of those regrets is I did not, despite the fact that it was not strictly within my responsibilities, insist upon more concern about what we are now calling the energy crisis. I would hope that we could now organize as quickly as possible something like a NASA or a Manhattan Project with full funding to look into every aspect of our future requirements for energy and resources from which that energy might come. Not only the conventional sources such as the fossil fuels and the gasification of coal or the use of oil shales but the so-called unconventional sources which tend to be infinite in their availability, such things as the winds, ocean tides and currents, thermal springs, the heat that is just beneath the crust of the earth, fusion reaction—whatever is required.

We are underestimating the disaster we face in the years immediately ahead. We're always being told by our government that by 1980 or shortly thereafter we shall be depending on the rest of the world for 50% of our oil requirements and that that alone will require us to generate twenty billion dollars a year of additional foreign exchange in order to pay for those requirements. And I would hope that we would get at this in a dedicated fashion.

I can mention other serious tasks ahead of us but I am deliberately avoiding the

domestic field because of lack of time, but there are great problems ahead. I personally hope that the Democratic Party would have the guts to talk about taxes (applause). If I'm not mistaken, I am paying a lower rate of federal income taxes today than I have paid since the Depression days of FDR. If we were paying the Kennedy taxes, the Eisenhower taxes, the Truman taxes, we could be finding substantial additional sources to deal with some of these admittedly urgent problems that we have on our domestic scene.

Now having indicated the problems, let me just mention that in the long run I must confess that I am an optimist. I have considerable faith in the capacity of man to be rational at the end of the day even though in the early morning we can all be pretty ridiculous (laughter). I must confess that I believe that there is coming into being a family of man—not based upon world government, certainly not based upon sentiments of brotherhood which are not present in the breadth and depth required for that purpose, but out of sheer necessity. The hounds of history are barking at our heels. And, if there is anything we can do to give a lift to these young people who must grapple with definitive solutions to these questions, now is the time to make a lunge. And I'm greatly distressed to see the cutback in programs aimed at these young people and their educational institutions at this time in the history of the human race.

So I would hope, fellow Democrats, that we would, yes, deal with the short-term problems as they must be dealt with, but would not be so engrossed in them, that we not be so involved in the temporary ambitions and appetites of our immediate scene that we shall somehow fail to lift our eyes to the great tasks to which we can commit ourselves and which can unify us as a people.

The American people at their best are a very good people, even a great people, and I think the time has come for us to look out to some of these great challenges that are ahead and, if you'll forgive a Presbyterian for mentioning this, to think a little bit about the first question of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, "What is the chief end of man?" And when you talk to your young friends, whatever they think about the older generation, you might just point out two things to them. One is that they will not necessarily improve themselves if they reject the mistakes of their fathers merely to embrace the mistakes of their grandfathers (laughter).

There is no place to hide—no place to hide! This notion that we should forget the rest of the world and take care of our problems here at home, now being put forward by some as a new idea for the 70's, is where I came in in high school. It's an antediluvian idea and down that road leads disaster, because our national problems which penetrate into every home and village in the nation can no longer be solved except as a part of that family of man. And secondly I would suggest to these young people that there is one point on which they can be just a little grateful to us older people. It is obvious that we've been saving some extraordinarily interesting problems for them to solve (laughter).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUNGATE for 3:15 p.m. to end of the day, on account of official business.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for this week, on account of official business.

Mr. DANIELSON (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL) for today, on account of illness in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LOTT), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VEYSEY, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. CRONIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. RAILSBACK, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. BURGNER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOAKLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DULSKI, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. RODINO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ALEXANDER, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. BARRETT, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. COTTER, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DRINAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. MINK, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds three pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$637.50.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia following the remarks of Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming during debate on Interior appropriation bill in Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LOTT), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEATING.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. SYMMS.
Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. HANRAHAN.
Mr. McCLOSKEY.
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
Mr. HOGAN in two instances.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. VEYSEY in two instances.
Mr. REGULA.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. PRICE of Texas.
Mr. ESCH.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. COLLINS of Texas in four instances.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. NELSEN in four instances.
Mr. RONCALLO of New York.
Mr. HUDNUT in two instances.
Mr. KEMP.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELLUMS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOAKLEY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. FLOOD in two instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON.
Mr. FRASER in five instances.
Mr. DINGELL in four instances.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS.
Mr. DENT.
Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.
Miss HOLTZMAN in 10 instances.
Mr. GAYDOS in 10 instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.
Mr. CARNEY of Ohio.
Mr. REID.
Mr. ECKHARDT.
Mr. DULSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1076. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the third quarter fiscal year 1973 report of receipts and disbursements from disposal of military supplies and lumber or timber products, pursuant to section 712, Public Law 92-570; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1077. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit officers of certain foreign navies to serve aboard vessels of the U.S. Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1078. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission of Productivity, transmitting the second annual report of the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 92-210; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1079. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a listing of excess defense articles to be furnished foreign countries on a grant basis, pursuant to section 8(d) of the Foreign Military Sales Act Amendments of 1971, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1080. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting notice of a Presidential determination to permit transfer of supporting assistance funds to administrative expense funds to cover fiscal year 1973 costs of the Vietnam program, pursuant to section 652 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1081. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Materials Policy, transmitting the final report of the Commission, entitled, "Material Needs and the Environment: Today and Tomorrow," pursuant to section 201, Public Law 91-512; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1082. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to permit not more than 30 persons at a time from foreign countries to receive in-

structions at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1083. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 13, 1933 (Public Law 73-40), concerning safety standards for boilers and pressure vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1084. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to expand the authority of the Canal Zone Government to settle claims not cognizable under the Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1085. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the report on the statutes restricting the private carriage of letters, pursuant to section 7 of the Postal Reorganization Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1086. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on social services, relative to helping welfare recipients achieve self-support or reduced dependency, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. H.R. 8480. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives or the Senate may disapprove the President's action and require him to cease such impounding, and to establish for the fiscal year 1974 a ceiling on total Federal expenditures; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 8860. A bill to extend and amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 for the purpose of assuring consumers of plentiful supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices (Rept. No. 93-337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 8998. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to furnish additional consumer protection services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H.R. 8999. A bill to provide income tax incentives for the modification of certain facilities so as to remove architectural and transportation barriers to the handicapped and elderly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 9000. A bill to establish for the year 1974, under chapters 2 and 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, more equitable rates and schedules of social security taxes on employees and self-employed individuals (with partial income tax deductibility there-

for), and to provide a method for the development of similar rates and schedules for years after 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 9001. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 9002. A bill to revise and restate certain functions and duties of the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GRASSO (for herself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9003. A bill to provide for an investigation by the General Services Administration of various problems involved in providing toll-free telephone numbers for incoming calls at each regional office of most executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GRASSO (for herself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9004. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to authorize the transmission, without cost to the sender, of letter mail to the President or Vice President of the United States, to Federal executive departments and agencies, or to Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself, and Mr. BRAY) (by request):

H.R. 9005. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. BREAU):

H.R. 9006. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide more effectively for bilingual proceedings in certain district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GUDE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 9007. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit a Federal court, upon the recommendation of the U.S. prosecutor, to place certain persons charged with Federal crimes in programs of community supervision and services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. ECKHARDT):

H.R. 9008. A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code to remove the possibility of abuse from the grand jury system without removing the effectiveness of the grand jury as a tool for investigating and returning indictments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 9009. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to authorize the transmission, without cost to the sender, of letter mail to the President or Vice President of the United States, to Federal executive departments and

agencies, and to Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 9010. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to benefits shall continue through the month of his death (except where the continuation of such entitlement and the consequent delay in survivor eligibility would reduce the total amount payable to the family); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 9011. A bill to authorize grants for Indian tribal governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 9012. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THORNTON (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 9013. A bill to consent to the Interstate Environment Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHROEDER, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 9014. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself and Mr. PEYSER):

H.R. 9015. A bill to facilitate the completion of the New York Harbor collection and removal of drift project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CAREY of New York, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 9016. A bill to modify the project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, N.Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. LENT, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WYDLER):

H.R. 9017. A bill to modify the project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, N.Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 9018. A bill to establish the Tijuana National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 9019. A bill to provide for the continued sale of gasoline to independent gasoline retailers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 9020. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1970 to prohibit the States from denying the right to vote in Federal elections to former criminal offenders who have not been convicted of any offense related to voting or elections and who are not

confined in a correctional institution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9021. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the coverage extended to individuals of Japanese ancestry who were interned in the United States during World War II shall also be extended to individuals of Japanese ancestry who voluntarily left the areas of their residence in order to avoid such internment, and that such coverage shall be available to any such individual who was a resident of the United States without regard to his or her citizenship; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 9022. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 9023. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to guarantee the constitutional right to vote and to provide uniform procedures for absentee voting in Federal elections in the case of citizens who are residing or domiciled outside the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DRINAN (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H.J. Res. 643. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States lowering the age requirements for membership in the Houses of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRINAN (for himself, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PREYER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. REID, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STARK, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.J. Res. 644. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States lowering the age requirements for membership in the Houses of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.J. Res. 645. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the reconfirmation of Justices of the Supreme Court every 12 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.J. Res. 646. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the protection of unborn children and other persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRASSO (for herself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. WON PAT):

H. Res. 472. Resolution providing monetary allowances for toll-free telephone service for telephone calls to the district offices of Members of the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H. Res. 473. Resolution to provide the House of Representatives with pertinent in-

formation with respect to the possible grounds for impeachment of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H. Res. 474. Resolution creating a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

266. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to canine toxicants used for predator

control; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9024. A bill for the relief of Feliciano Mecaraeg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 9025. A bill for the relief of Israel Wald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 9026. A bill for the relief of Knickerbocker Hospital, New York City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 9027. A bill for the relief of Maria Grazia Bongiovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

247. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Louis Mira, San Luis Obispo, Calif., relative to redress of grievances which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ENDANGERED SPECIES ARE BEING THREATENED

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in today's Washington Post with reference to the Endangered Species Act. It discusses the necessity of passing a strong endangered species bill.

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 is now being considered by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. This bill has been cosponsored by over 70 Members of the House, including myself, and if passed, would protect species of fish and wildlife threatened with extinction. If we allow the extinction of our endangered species, then the entire balance of nature may be destroyed and eventually our entire environment may be threatened.

This bill contains strong provisions to deal with violators of protective regulations specified in the legislation, and is designed to promote the long-term survival of the human species by insuring continuation of the balance of nature. Certain sections of the bill will put strict controls on those who persist in killing rare animals. We have a worldwide problem in this area and it is imperative to demonstrate to the rest of the world that the United States is willing to take an important step in restoring nature's ecological balance.

The editorial follows:

PROTECTING ENDANGERED SPECIES

America has long been a nation of pet owners, and there surely is no shortage of dogs and cats. But large numbers of other animals exist, ones that will never be pets but which nevertheless deserve to survive as species and play their roles as nature intended. Most of us seldom or never see such creatures as the cheetah, of which only 2,000 are left, or the Puerto Rican parrot, down to 15 or 20, or the red wolf, which is almost wiped out. These animals and some 900 others are seriously endangered or are becoming threatened with extinction. They are in this precarious state because we have been overhunting, polluting and exploiting them, as if the animals' breeding capacity is as limitless as our folly. To date, more than 225 species and sub-species of birds and mammals have disappeared from the earth since 1600. They won't be back.

Thanks to the energetic parts of the wildlife and conservation movement, Congress has expressed interest in preventing further destruction. But the interest is not yet great, at least not in the sense that strong legislation has been passed. The 1969 endangered species conservation act has too many weak parts to be effective; for example, there is no federal control over killing native endangered species, and the import of furs from a foreign endangered species is banned only when the animal is nearly gone.

Currently, several much-improved bills are before the Senate Commerce Committee and the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Whatever bill finally emerges, it seems sensible that the ultimate authority rest with the federal government, not the individual states, many of which have proven indifferent to the problem. With little open opposition to the bills, there is no reason—except congressional inertia—for inaction. It is true, the survival of animal life is not a burning political issue of the day, but there is the recent observation of Dr. Lee M. Talbot of the Council on Environmental Quality: "During the past 150 years, the rate of extermination of mammals has increased 55-fold. If (these) exterminations continue to increase at that rate, in about 30 years all the remaining 4,062 species of mammals will be gone." With such a thought before it, Congress has an important obligation to act. Another lost opportunity on Capitol Hill could mean a number of lost species elsewhere.

MARKING UP THE INVENTORIES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has told me of picking a "49 cents" price sticker from a food package bought in a supermarket and finding "39 cents" stamped beneath.

Others, so I am informed, have had like experiences. They have noted ink blurs on plastic tops and lids caused by abrupt price alterations, always upward, made while the products were on the shelves.

This denotes, of course, that old business practice of, when opportunity permits, marking up the inventory. In the case of the "49 cents" sticker covering the 39 cents originally stamped price, the markup was in the neighborhood of 25 percent, a hefty profit indeed.

How much of this is going on these

days? The administration's price checkers have dealt with the validity of general increases. But no Federal agency to my knowledge is policing inventory markups in the retail establishments and, in a time of perilous inflation, it seems to me that this is a matter demanding attention.

Inflation is caused by a number of forces in an economy. Too much money chasing too few things. Price and cost boosts leaping all along the line from producer to consumer. Heavy Government spending. But too little is said about those profit-hungry dealers who take advantage whenever possible of their trusting customers by boosting prices on their stocks on hand. These people give inflation a big shove.

What can be done about them? Complaints can be made to consumer protection bureaus which, in turn, might publicize a profiteer. But this necessitates an angry buyer with strong evidence of fraud, a wrong that is not clearly defined in the deed of gouging by the inventory price hiking route.

The problem could be too big and too important nowadays to be left to the individual. The Federal Government, it appears to me, has both a responsibility in this situation and the means whereby it can be corrected—the taxing authority. Undue profits reported in consequence of marked up inventories ought to be spotted easily on tax returns and made the target for "excess" levies high enough to stop them.

We had our "war profiteers" in times past—people who took advantage of national difficulties to unfairly line their pockets at the expense of the public. Now, apparently, we have "inflation profiteers" who warrant measures against themselves as strong as those which were applied in wartime.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8947

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1973

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, when the Public Works Appropriation bill, H.R. 8947, comes on the floor Thursday, I intend to offer an amendment to delete funds for construction of the New