

H.R. 7445, Renegotiation Act, which expires on June 30.

S. 426, Premarket Testing of Chemical Substances.

Senate Joint Resolution 129, Temporary Extension of Certain HUD Authority.

House Joint Resolution 512, Extension of Certain HUD Authority.

Both Friday and Saturday can be long days, and yea-and-nay votes will occur on both days. Senators will be prepared for possibly long sessions on both days.

The Senate will reconvene on Monday, July 9, following the Independence Day recess—assuming that there will be a recess. The main track item for consideration on the day of our return will be S. 1081, rights-of-way across Federal lands. Any other calendar measures which have been cleared for action prior to that date may be called up on a double-track system for that Monday.

Hence, rollcall votes can be expected on Monday, July 9, when the Senate reconvenes, keeping in mind that we will

then have only 4 weeks in which to transact business prior to the August recess.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, 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 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6:32 p.m. the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Friday, June 29, 1973, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of June 25), 1973:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

George A. LeMalstre, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years, vice Irvine H. Sprague, resigned.

U.S. COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Jack R. Miller, of Iowa, to be an Associate Judge of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals vice J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of June 25), 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

James R. Schlesinger, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

John W. Barnum, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Transportation.

(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.)

U.S. COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Jack R. Miller, of Iowa, to be an Associate Judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 28, 1973

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

Seek the Lord and you shall live.—Amos 5: 6.

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, we thank Thee for Thy mercies which are new every morning and fresh every day. By our attitudes may we prove ourselves worthy of the gifts Thou art so abundantly bestowing upon us.

Bless us with good health in mind and body and give us the good sense to take good care of ourselves for the sake of our families and for the good of our country. Deliver us from cynicism which corrodes faith and from discords which discourage our efforts to seek peace and pursue it.

Give to us all faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness and good will, no matter how dark and dismal the day may seem to be. May our faith be seen in our worship, our words, and our works.

In the spirit of Him whose life is the light of men we 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8410. An act to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8410) entitled "An act to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. FANNIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7528) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 343. An act relative to Federal primary elections and national conventions;

S. 969. An act relating to the constitutional rights of Indians;

S. 1352. An act to require loadlines on U.S. vessels engaged in foreign voyages and foreign vessels within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1410. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 1 year the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury;

S. 1443. An act to authorize the furnishing of defense articles and services to foreign countries and international organizations;

S. 1615. An act for the relief of August F. Walz;

S. 1618. An act to name the headquarters building in the Geological Survey National Center under construction in Reston, Va., as the "John Wesley Powell Federal Building";

S. 1759. An act authorizing further appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior for services necessary to the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes; and

S. 1901. An act to amend the act of August 20, 1963, as amended, relating to the construction of mint buildings.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 8410, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8410) to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS of Arkansas, ULLMAN, BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Messrs. SCHNEEBELI, COLLIER, and BROYHILL of Virginia.

UNNECESSARY RECORDED TELLER VOTES

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it, that the electronic voting device is saving time for the Members and the staff, but it can be made to be more effective by a change in the rules. We are, in my opinion, having too many rollcall votes, especially recorded teller votes.

Mr. Speaker, I have done some research on this subject. In the first ses-

sion of the 92d Congress, through June 22, 1971, there were 25 recorded teller votes. Last Friday, June 22, we had had 62 recorded teller votes, over twice as many for the same time as in 1971. Also we have had 271 rollcall votes so far, in comparison to 157 votes in 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today that will raise the number required in order to order a recorded teller vote. The resolution will raise the number from 20 to 44, or one-fifth of a quorum in the House.

Forty-four Members standing is not an unreasonable request, and will reduce unnecessary recorded votes.

COMMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS ON THE DISCLOSURE IN THE WATERGATE HEARINGS YESTERDAY THAT HE WAS NAMED ON A SECRET 1971-72 WHITE HOUSE LIST OF "POLITICAL ENEMIES" TARGETED FOR RETALIATION

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

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be included on the list of distinguished Americans whom the White House conspirators regarded as "enemies."

The secret plan to use Federal money and Federal power to harass critics is further evidence of the contempt for law and common decency that has characterized the Nixon White House.

The real "enemies" Americans must fear are those who would subvert the rule of law and the institutions of freedom.

SOCIAL SERVICES FOR ELDERLY AMENDMENT TO THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

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

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to an amendment to H.R. 8410, the public debt limit, which was adopted yesterday—Wednesday—when the Senate considered that legislation. The particular amendment, offered by Senator CHURCH, would exempt the aged, blind, and disabled from the requirement that 90 percent of social services funds be directed solely to current welfare recipients.

Because I, and 155 of my House colleagues, believe that this 90-10 ratio has resulted in unnecessarily increased welfare rolls and a widespread reduction of services for a large number of elderly, blind, and disabled persons who are not on welfare, we attempted to eliminate this unfair provision by cosponsoring H.R. 3819, and companion bills H.R. 4636, H.R. 5710, H.R. 5711, H.R. 8018, H.R. 8019, and H.R. 8020, all identical to the Senate amendment. Chairman WILBUR MILLS and Representative HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, both of whom will be House conferees on the public debt limit bill, are also cosponsors of this corrective social

services legislation. I am informed that they will support efforts to keep this Senate amendment so that it will be included in the conference report, when it comes to the House for a vote.

It is important that we insure recipients of social services a continuation of those beneficial programs which have permitted them to live independently, with some Government aid, rather than being welfareized or institutionalized at a much higher cost to our taxpayers, and to their spirits.

I urge all Members' consideration and support of this amendment to H.R. 8410, which I expect will be voted on when the debt limit conference report comes before us, probably tomorrow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 300 I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

RECOMPUTATION

(Mrs. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the subject of recomputation of retired pay for members of the military has been an extremely complex and difficult problem for myself as well as all my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. The debate surrounding this topic has been highly charged since 1958 when the recomputation system was abolished.

From the time of the Civil War until 1958, military retirement annuities were directly tied to active duty pay scales. Fifteen years ago, this 100-year tradition was abandoned by Congress in favor of a cost-of-living increase system. This new system simply has not proved beneficial for retirees.

Previously, retired pay was a function of years of service and merit; today, it is dependent upon one's date of retirement. The inequities of this system are obvious. The gap between active duty pay and retired pay has been widening each year. The cost of living for the man who retired in 1950 is just as great as that for the man who retired during the sixties. And yet, older retirees now receive considerably less than their younger counterparts, in fact, the disparity can be as high as 50 percent.

In addition, many current retirees enlisted at a time when recomputation was the standard method of computing annuities. At retirement time they found that the whole system had been changed. What once had been held out as an incentive for enlistment has now been eliminated by Congress. They have seen their years of service and sacrifice rewarded with a callous breach of faith on the part of the Government.

Recomputation is not another Federal giveaway program; it is just compensation for dedicated service.

I strongly urge my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee to take prompt action to remedy this injustice.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS TO MEET WHILE HOUSE IS IN SESSION TODAY

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be allowed to meet while the House is in session today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the delegate from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

U.S. SPACE WEEK

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 223), requesting the President to proclaim the 7-day period of July 16 through 22 of each year as "U.S. Space Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 223

Whereas a purpose of the United States space program is the peaceful exploration of space for the benefit of all mankind; and

Whereas the United States space program and its technology directly and indirectly benefit relations among countries, astronomy, medicine, business, air and water cleanliness, urban development, industry, agriculture, law enforcement, safety, communications, the study of the earth resources, weather forecasting, and education; and

Whereas the United States space program has an efficient organization and strong moral leadership, both of which serve as good examples to the people of the United States and to the people of all nations; and

Whereas the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other organizations throughout the world involved in space exploration programs have cooperated in the cause of the peaceful exploration of space for the benefit of all mankind; and

Whereas the United States program, through Project Apollo and other space efforts, has provided our Nation with scientific and technological leadership in space; and

Whereas the United States aerospace industry and educational institutions throughout the United States contribute much to the United States space program and to the Nation's economy; and

Whereas in the week of July 16 through 22, 1969, the people of the world were brought closer together by the first manned exploration of the Moon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested to issue a proclamation designating the seven-day period of July 16 through 22 of each year as "United States Space Week", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such period with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On pages 1 and 2, strike out the entire preamble.

On page 2, line 4, strike the words "of each year" and insert in lieu thereof ", 1973."

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: Requesting the President to proclaim the 7-day period of July 16 through 22, 1973, as "United States Space Week."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 223.

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

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF HOUSE REPORT ENTITLED "REFORM OF OUR CORRECTIONAL SYSTEMS"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-339) on the resolution (H. Res. 462) providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Reform of Our Correctional Systems", and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 462

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives five thousand additional copies of the House report entitled "Reform of Our Correctional Systems" (Ninety-third Congress, first session).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, to whom are these reports going to be distributed?

Mr. BRADEMAS. These are to be distributed to the Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. Would they be available to all Members?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Of course.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF INAUGURAL ADDRESSES BY THE PRESIDENTS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-340) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 185) to provide for the printing of inaugural addresses from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 185

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a collection

of inaugural addresses, from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon, compiled from research volumes and State papers by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that seventeen thousand and ninety additional copies be printed, of which eleven thousand nine hundred and forty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and five thousand one hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate.

Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Documents Rooms.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, delete "seventeen thousand and ninety" and insert "sixteen thousand two hundred".

Line 8, delete eleven thousand nine hundred and forty" and insert "eleven thousand and fifty".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF "THE FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEE LOYALTY PROGRAM"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-341) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 219) providing for additional copies of "The Federal Civilian Employee Loyalty Program," House report No. 92-1637, 92d Congress, second session, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 219

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Internal Security six hundred additional copies of a report entitled "The Federal Civilian Employee Loyalty Program", House Report Numbered 92-1637, Ninety-second Congress, second session.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS ESTABLISHING NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-342) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 233) providing for the printing of committee hearings establishing a National Institute of Education, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 233

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be

printed for use of the House Committee on Education and Labor one thousand copies of the hearings (including the three appendices thereto printed in separate volumes) on H.R. 33, H.R. 3606, and related bills, to establish a National Institute of Education.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT. WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT WORK?"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-34) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 256) to provide for the printing, as a house document, a revised edition of the house document "Our American Government. What is it? How does it Work?" and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 256

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed, as a House document, a revised edition of the House document "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Work?"; and that two hundred and seventy-two thousand five hundred additional copies be printed, of which two hundred and twenty-one thousand shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and fifty-one thousand five hundred shall be for the use of the Senate.

Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House document rooms.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF "STREET CRIME: REDUCTION THROUGH POSITIVE CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESPONSES"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-338) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 257) providing for the printing of additional copies of the house report entitled "Street Crime: Reduction Through Positive Criminal Justice Responses", and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 257

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives thirteen thousand additional copies of the House report entitled "Street Crime: Reduction Through Positive Criminal Justice Responses" (Ninety-third Congress, first session).

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF "DRUGS IN OUR SCHOOLS"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-345) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 258) to provide for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Drugs In Our Schools", and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 258

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives seventy-five thousand additional copies of the House report entitled "Drugs in Our Schools" (Ninety-third Congress, first session).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, delete everything following the enacting clause and insert the following: "That there shall be printed sixty-eight thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of the House Report entitled 'Drugs in Our Schools', of which fifty-five thousand two hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and thirteen thousand copies for the use of the Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF SENATE HEARINGS ON ILLEGAL, IMPROPER, OR UNETHICAL ACTIVITIES, PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-346) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) to provide for the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on illegal, improper, or unethical activities during the Presidential election of 1972, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 29

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities not to exceed five thousand additional copies of all parts of its hearings on illegal, improper, or unethical activities during the Presidential election of 1972.

SEC. 2. The authorization conferred by section 1 of this concurrent resolution shall terminate on February 28, 1974.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF "THE HISTORY AND OPERATION OF THE HOUSE MAJORITY WHIP ORGANIZATION"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-347) on the resolution (H. Res. 457) to provide for the printing, as a House document, the booklet entitled "The History and Operation of the House Majority Whip Organization," and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 457

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a House document with photographs the booklet "The History and Operation of the House Majority Whip Organization"; and that 5,000 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the House majority whip.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, what kind of publication is this? Is this to be with pictures and diagrams?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the report to which the resolution applies would provide for the printing of an objective, historical account of the operation of the House majority whip organization. The total estimated cost is \$866.86. There will be included photographs in the document.

Mr. GROSS. There will be a few photographs?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That is the majority whip organization?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if possible, we ought to have some diagrams to delineate the various lines of command and methods of operation, and so forth and so on.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to call that subject to the attention of those who prepared the document.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "ORGANIZED CRIMINAL INFLUENCE IN HORSE RACING"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-348) on the resolution (H. Res. 463) providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Organized Criminal Influence in Horse Racing," and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

H. RES. 463

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives three thou-

sand five hundred additional copies of the House report entitled "Organized Criminal Influence in Horse Racing" (Ninety-third Congress, first session).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, after "printed" insert "concurrently with the original press run".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF "THE CAPITOL"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 132) providing for the printing as a House document of a revised edition of "The Capitol," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "four hundred and seventy-two" and insert "five hundred and seventy-five".

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Representatives" and insert "Representatives, one hundred and three thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate,".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA FOR WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1938) to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1974.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1938

An act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1974.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision hereof the referendum with respect to the national marketing year beginning July 1, 1974, may be conducted not later than the earlier of the following: (1) thirty days after adjournment sine die of the first session of the Ninety-third Congress; or (2) October 15, 1973."

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPORTIONING FUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1808) to apportion funds for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and to authorize funds in accordance with title 23, United States Code, for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1808

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

SECTION 1. The Secretary of Transportation shall apportion \$1,000,000,000 of the sums authorized to be apportioned for fiscal year 1974 for immediate expenditure on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in revised table 5, House Report Numbered 92-1443.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the Highway Trust Fund, \$500,000,000 for the Federal-aid primary system, the Federal-aid secondary system, and for their extensions within urban areas for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. The sums authorized in this section shall be available for expenditure as follows:

- (a) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system;
- (b) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and
- (c) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary highway systems in urban areas.

SEC. 3. The time requirements in section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code, shall not be applicable to the apportionment of sums authorized by this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and the Secretary shall apportion such sums for such fiscal year as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1808, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

CXIX—1393—Part 17

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

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. Will the gentleman from Iowa withhold his point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been passed.

The SPEAKER. There are other preliminary matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I desired to ask a question concerning the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not see the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will not withhold.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will not permit the proceedings to be vacated, because the Chair did not see the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want the proceedings vacated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and 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. 305]

Alexander	Danielson	Nelsen
Ashbrook	Davis, Ga.	Pepper
Ashley	Dent	Peyser
Badillo	Derwinski	Reld
Biatnik	Diggs	Rooney, N.Y.
Bolling	Fisher	Sandman
Breaux	Gray	Stark
Brown, Ohio	Hollifield	Steiger, Wis.
Burke, Fla.	Hungate	Teague, Tex.
Chisholm	Matsunaga	Thompson, N.J.
Clark	Murphy, N.Y.	Tiernan

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 400 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

APPORTIONING FUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

On the suspension of the rule and passage of the Senate bill S. 1808, the Chair did not hear anyone addressing the Chair, and was not aware that there were Members who desired to be heard on the matter, and after waiting for a time the Chair put the question, which is the common practice.

But in view of the fact that the Chair was in error in anticipating and thinking that the matter had been worked out, without objection, the proceedings whereby the Senate bill S. 1808 was passed under suspension of the rules will be vacated.

The Chair hears no objection.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) for 20 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill. It has already passed the Senate. Its purpose is to provide an interim highway funding measure for those States—some 34 of them—which without the enactment of such a measure will be completely out of their highway funds within 30 days. Some 10 States already are out of highway funds. Twenty-four more will have completely exhausted one or more categories of those funds within a matter of days if this bill is not enacted.

This bill simply provides that, on a temporary basis while the House-Senate conference continues its labors in an effort to reach an agreement on the regular highway bill, \$1 billion shall be authorized for work on the Interstate System and \$500 million shall be authorized for work on the primary, secondary, and urban extension systems.

Last night at 10 o'clock after 2 months of long and intensive negotiations it became evident to the conferees on the House and Senate sides that we were at least temporarily deadlocked. After having made enormous progress on more than 70 provisions of the bill theretofore in disagreement, we have reached an impasse on remaining sections of the bill. Rather than penalizing the States for our inability to agree, rather than putting the House and Senate under the pressures of having to agree on something they might not want to agree to, rather than putting small contractors out of business and people out of work, and rather than making the Northern States which have short building seasons lose completely their entire year's highway construction, we thought the decent responsible thing to do was to pass this interim bill which will hold them for 30 to 60 days.

Hopefully, during that time we can hammer out upon the anvils of mutual compromise and understanding the kind of long-range bill that both the House and Senate will approve and appreciate.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I thank my colleague for yielding. Being one of those trying to get help for mass transit, I want to join Mr. WRIGHT in asking support of this measure to go along with this 120-day extension, and I emphasize the "one" because I would hope the conferees could come to some agreement in that length of time.

We do not want to be obstructionists. We are all aware of the problem affecting our States. Right now the pot is dry, and by July 30 at least 30, and maybe more, States will have dry pots. We feel the conferees are making headway, but we want them to work out their differences in good faith, and we want to remind them that a mass transit is in dire need, and we are going along on this one extension. We hope in the Members' conference they realize the plight and the needs of those of us in the city.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I commend the distinguished gentleman and his committee for this step. It is important. There are many States, including mine, which are in a serious plight as a result of being out of funds.

I want to ask the gentleman this question. Do I understand there is a time limit on the period in which the billion and a half would be available?

Mr. WRIGHT. No. There is no precise time limit. We are estimating that this will tide the States over for 30 to 60 days, during which time we earnestly hope we will be able to produce a long-range highway bill.

Mr. SIKES. But there is no time limit on the billion and a half dollars as such?

Mr. WRIGHT. They are to remain available until expended.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I want to express the concern of many in this House, including most of the Members of the New York delegation on both sides of the aisle as to the dissatisfaction we feel at having to pass a continuing resolution at this time.

We appointed conferees on the highway bill on April 19, and the conference has been meeting since the beginning of May. The conferees of the other body have offered a number of compromise proposals which to me seem eminently reasonable and not at all violative of the position of the House, yet our conferees have rejected each one.

For example the Senate has offered a proposal wherein each State would be given back 20 percent of the gasoline tax revenues collected within its borders, for such public transportation uses as it desires. This proposal would not invade the highway trust fund. It would not take one penny from any rural State or rural area. Yet our conferees refused to consider it.

It may well be true that most of the States are very much pinched right now on highway funding, but we must realize that our cities and our suburbs are pinched too. They too are desperately in need of funds for their transportation systems.

Since the House voted on April 19, the energy crisis and the alleged gasoline shortage have been critical, and the EPA has told many of our major cities that they must drastically reduce the amount of vehicle travel within their borders.

Almost all of the 39 Members of the New York State House delegation have joined in writing to ask the conferees to take a more reasonable approach to compromise proposals, and I urge other delegations to do the same.

As I said at the outset of my remarks, we are willing to consider this resolution, but we may not be so willing if any additional extension of it is asked later on.

I urge the House conferees to reconsider what I regard as their intransigent

stance and to bring us a bill—soon—that will satisfy all of the interests affected by this highway legislation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for her comments and I would merely ask her to understand this. The House conferees have not been intransigent or wholly unyielding. We have made numerous overtures in the direction of agreement and compromise. During the first 3 weeks of the conference we did resolve more than 70 different points in disagreement. There existed a spirit of compromise and understanding on both sides.

During the past 4 weeks, House conferees have offered several substantive proposals in an effort to compromise the remaining disagreements. We feel, quite frankly, that we have been more reasonable and conciliatory than the Senators. No doubt they feel they have been more so than we. I think it really unfair to take a position that either the House or the Senate has been totally stubborn.

We have had difficulties, and I must say it has been extremely frustrating to me as chairman of the conference to have been unable to have persuaded our colleagues to find an avenue on which we can walk arm in arm on the remaining four or five items in disagreement. But we continue, dedicated to the proposition that we shall succeed in that endeavor.

Meanwhile, of course, I think all Members would agree that it would be ridiculous to hold the States hostage to our inability to agree. Therefore the only responsible thing remaining to do is to provide them this limited money on this limited basis, during which time we will continue our efforts to find a solution to the long range problem.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to express my appreciation to the Speaker for returning to consideration of this bill and to the gentleman from Texas for his explanation of it. When it was first called for consideration I had no idea of the nature or content of the bill, as was the case of many other Members of the House. I had absolutely no idea of what we were considering for there was no bill available on the House floor.

I support the bill. I think it is a reasonable extension, and again I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. Surely I would agree that the gentleman and all Members of the House are fully entitled to understand what is involved in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this bill is solely an interim measure. As the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) indicated, there are a number of states which are out of interstate money as of right now. There are an additional number of states which are out of ABC money right now. As time goes by even more will be out of highway money. Without this bill, this means that a num-

ber of our American taxpayers are going to be unemployed and that our economy will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, we have got a problem of inflation in this country, and if we delay the construction of these roads which are now under contract by not enacting this legislation, we are going to add to the ultimate cost of those roads and compound the inflationary problem of the highway construction industry. However, more important than that is that hundreds upon hundreds of workers will be laid off and unemployed until such time as the House and Senate can work their will in this conference.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the gentleman from New York said, and it always amazes me how one not in attendance at a conference can know so much about the transactions in that conference. Not one of the suggestions or proposals by the other side has been in such a form that we could accept it, because each one totally violated the position of the House on the issue of rail transit. As a conferee on that committee from the House, I feel it is my responsibility to sustain the House position as much as possible. There has not been one offer of compromise from the other body that would not do violence to the House position on invading the Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, we, on the other hand, on the House side have offered a number of compromises in an effort to try to resolve this issue, each time going a long way from the House position. Therefore, I urge the members not to be misled by the accusations of those who were not privy to the conference and who do not in substance know what they are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for \$1 billion for interstate money, and \$500 million for ABC money, which is primary and secondary roads and urban extensions of primary and secondary roads. It does not provide any money for mass transit or the urban systems because that is involved in the central issue we are trying to resolve. We have deliberately left out the urban systems and mass transit; retaining that issue for ultimate resolution by the conference committee we are not jeopardizing the House position in any way by this action, but we are trying to alleviate almost sure unemployment and stop breaking up the continuity of the highway construction program.

There was a question raised about when this will go into effect. The language of the bill is mandatory in that it requires the Secretary to apportion the States as soon as practicable after the enactment of this legislation. It is felt that as soon as this is enacted, that the administration will have to issue the apportionments and then the States can immediately obligate the money. In most instances, most of this money will be completely obligated within 30 days. This buys the conferees a little time so that we can hope ultimately to resolve this issue without interrupting the economy of the country, without adding to the unemployment of this nation: Mr. Speaker I urge the adoption of this bill.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I support this apportionment act which will allow the States limited money for the continuation of their highway programs. It affects all the States, but the need for it especially comes home to me since my own State of Arkansas is out of interstate funds and it only has \$6 million in ABCD funds for the secondary and primary system.

Mr. Speaker, it is a logical and reasonable approach to allow the conferees to continue their work without pressure that could lead to too hasty and untimely compromises. I fully recommend this legislation be passed.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this legislation, which is an interim bill, as a member of the conference committee. I want to state to the Members of the House that last night the House and Senate conferees met together informally in one of the most constructive and productive sessions of the entire conference.

We had an opportunity to elucidate on our own particular views as to what our individual objectives on transportation policy might be. Mr. Speaker, I want to put to rest the fact that, while we have differing points of view, we are a long way from being, in my judgment, at an impasse. With the pressure of time, we felt that this was the better part of wisdom to move toward passage of this interim bill. In this way, those States, the construction industry and the workers dependent upon a continuation of funding for highway projects will not be forced to stop their programing.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire, another conferee on the House side.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1808 as a much-needed interim measure to ease the plight of some 30-odd States whose highway construction programs are impaired by our inability in conference to reach agreement on a highway bill.

At the same time, I wish to add a few words in further explanation of the remarks of my fellow conferee, Mr. HARSHA, concerning the highway conference.

It is true the conferees from both Houses have worked in a spirit of compromise and accommodation to resolve many of the differences between the respective versions of S. 502, the highway bill. But I regret to say that this spirit has been totally lacking regarding the principal issue before the conference: Diversion of highway trust funds for rail mass transit. On this issue, the Senate has been totally unyielding. From the beginning, Senate conferees have insisted that the House agree to the diversion for rail transit.

By contrast, the House conferees have made a momentous concession: We have provisionally agreed to the authorization of \$100 million a year or even more over the term of the bill for capital investment in buses. This represents a major departure from past policy regarding use of trust fund revenues and reflects the good-faith willingness of House conferees to go the limit in pursuit of reasonable compromise. Refusing to give due recognition to the magnitude of our concession, the Senate side continues to insist on a complete cave-in by the House side. This unyielding attitude merely serves to reinforce my concern: that the proponents of diversion are bent ultimately on nothing less than massive diversion of highway funds for rail systems in a comparatively small number of large cities.

I have repeatedly stated and do so again that in New Hampshire and many other areas of the country, mass transportation means four wheels on a highway. Indeed, the economies of bus transportation—in comparison to rail transit—are due in no small measure to the fact that the capital investment is shared by multiple users, buses, trucks and private automobiles. Recognizing this, the House conferees have gone the limit in making available the financing for bus transportation under urban system funds. This is as far as we can conceivably go in keeping with the mandate of this body in its rejection of the Anderson amendment. If the Senate side insists on diversion and total surrender of the House position, I foresee a deadlocked conference with consequent losses to highway, highway safety, and urban mass transit programs in this country.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman.

I rise to thank the committee for moving this legislation forward, to remove the tremendous uncertainty which has existed for some months now.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of S. 1808, a bill to authorize the appropriation of \$1 billion, to be available for immediate expenditure for construction projects under the Federal-State highway programs.

Right now the Florida State Department of Transportation is literally out of Federal money. On May 15 of this year, the Department returned to the Secretary of Transportation the balance of its unobligated Federal funds for highway construction, as required by law.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of the check sent to the Secretary was \$1.60.

Florida is a peninsular State and hence its highway systems are a primary mode of transportation. In addition, the State road systems are further burdened by the presence of millions of out-of-State automobiles every year, especially during

the winter months. Florida's Interstate System will total 1,441 miles of multi-laned, limited-access highways when it is completed. All State planning and design will be completed by 1975, but the completion of the system itself is dependent on Federal funds.

Florida's primary and secondary roads—the ABC system—total more than 18,000 miles. They are essential arteries for the delivery of Florida's agricultural crops to market centers. And they are increasingly important in linking fast-growing urban areas.

Under the provisions of S. 1808, Florida will receive \$30.9 million for interstate construction, and \$11.8 million for its ABC system. This is a grand total of \$42.814 million. The seriousness of Florida's need for these moneys can be seen in one simple statement—the State department of transportation will obligate the entire sum within 30 to 40 days.

I would like to compliment my distinguished colleagues on the Public Works Committee. When they realized that the current impasse between the House and Senate over the Federal Highway Act of 1973 was working serious financial harm on the States' highway programs, they acted immediately on this emergency bill. Their speedy action to prevent a grinding halt in State highway construction is a reflection of their long-standing concern over successful implementation of the Federal-State highway programs.

I urge my colleagues in the House to give their approval without delay to S. 1808. I also want to express my sincere hope that the conferees will reach an early agreement on S. 502, the Federal Highway Act of 1973. Florida's highway systems are too important to the State and the Nation to face a constant specter of financial disaster.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Ms. ABZUG. Could the gentleman indicate to us whether there is any money in this continuing resolution for the urban system?

Mr. WRIGHT. There is money for the urban extensions. There is no money expressly earmarked for other urban systems.

Ms. ABZUG. Is there any proposal that is intended to take care of that in the interim?

Mr. WRIGHT. According to our information, and that of the Senators who put together the bill, including Senators RANDOLPH, MUSKIE, BENTSEN, BAKER, STAFFORD, and BUCKLEY, these categories covered in the bill are the categories in which States are running out of money. That is the reason for the coverage of those categories in this bill.

The hope is that we will produce a long-term bill within the next 30 days or so, and that bill of course will take care of all the systems on a long-term basis.

Ms. ABZUG. Is it the gentleman's impression that there have been no responses from the conferees in the other

body with respect to any of these proposals, that there have been no compromise proposals at all?

Mr. WRIGHT. From the other body?

Ms. ABZUG. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is not my impression.

I would say to the gentlewoman that I believe the other body has in good faith offered several proposals. They were not acceptable to the House conferees. The House conferees in turn have offered several proposals in very good faith to the other body, which were not acceptable to the Senate conferees.

I believe the gentlewoman is ill-informed if she concludes in any sense that the Senate conferees have been more yielding than the House conferees. I believe the reverse is true. If I had the time, I would establish that. I do not believe however, that the House wants us to go into a long diatribe today about why the House is right and the Senate is wrong.

I am not in the position of trying to pick arguments. I am in the position of trying to make peace, of trying to harmonize two divergent positions. I have been unable to do that heretofore.

I ask the gentlewoman and the other Members of the House simply to pass this bill, so that the States will not suffer during the remainder of the time in which we shall continue trying to find that elusive grail of a compromise on which both sides can agree.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1808 the bill to provide temporary funds for defense and interstate highways.

I also want to commend the conference committee for standing firm against breaking open the highway trust fund.

In my congressional district highway improvement is imperative if we are to transport the feed and food so necessary to our large consuming centers. We have now and have had for months large stocks of feed which is so badly needed in other areas to produce meat and food products. Our railroad system has been able to supply only a trickle of the transportation needed. Modern highways are imperative to prevent hunger in our mass consuming centers.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with a crisis in the highway program. This is especially true in the State of Florida as my State will have exhausted its ability to award interstate contracts at the end of this month.

This crisis has developed as the Congress is working to complete action on a new general highway bill which will extend authorizations for the next 3 years. The House and Senate conferees have been unable to reach an accord on the major legislation and, consequently, it is imperative that we act with dispatch in providing this interim apportionment of interstate and other highway funds.

It is essential that this legislation be passed today so that the Secretary of Transportation will have the authority to apportion among the States \$1 billion in obligational authority for the

Interstate System. The bill would also authorize expenditures of \$500 million for the primary and secondary highway systems and the urban extensions of these systems.

During the Senate debate on this legislation it was pointed out that the States are losing money every day that we delay in highway financing, as in other fiscal areas, which is demonstrated by the fact that during the 5-year period between 1967 and 1972, the cost of building highways increased by more than 38 percent.

Florida has a great need for its allocation which is contained in this legislation. Florida will receive \$30,939,000 in interstate funds, \$11,875,000 in ABC funds, for a total of \$42,814,000 in obligational authority. I cannot impress enough upon my colleagues the great importance of this legislation. We must be able to permit the national highway construction program to continue without disruption.

I am not persuaded by the view that failure of this measure to pass would provide an added impetus to the conferees to report the Federal Aid Highway Act. Any further delay can only create additional hardships to the States and I am most hopeful that favorable consideration will be given this measure.

There are approximately 33 States that will exhaust highway funds by May 31, in either the interstate, primary, secondary, or urban extensions. The need is obvious and I certainly hope that favorable action will be taken today.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to at this time indicate my support for the passage of S. 1808, the interim bill for apportionment of highway funds to the States. This is a temporary measure while the House and Senate conferees finalize their deliberations on S. 202, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1973.

I did like to especially commend the great gentleman from Texas, JIM WRIGHT, for his handling of this bill today and for his excellent leadership as chairman of the House conferees and chairman of the conference on S. 502.

Contrary to what some may be saying, the conference has been very productive and we have now reached that point in conference where the most important points are being considered. The conferees on both sides have been extremely diligent and in my opinion will continue to be so. I am certainly confident that a satisfactory solution can be worked out.

S. 1808 the interim bill will enable the States to continue their programs and prevent unemployment, economic losses and the other problems which go with an interrupted program. There is no reason to penalize the States while the conference deliberates, and there is no reason to expect that the conference will be in any way deterred from completing its business by the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1808, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the passage of the bill S. 1808.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7200, RAILROAD RETIREMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1973

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 7200) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise certain eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to improve the procedures pertaining to certain rate adjustments for carriers subject to part I of the act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 22, 1973.)

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I will give a short explanation of the bill.

This is essentially the bill we passed originally with only four votes against it. Some minor changes have been put into it, which are all germane to the bill.

Title I of the conference substitutes deals with the Railroad Retirement Act, and is the same as the bill passed by the House with three exceptions. The Joint Labor/Management Committee which was called for in the House bill is required to submit its report and recommendation by April 1, 1974, rather than July 1, as called for by the House bill. The conference agreement spells out in more detail than was contained in the bill the overall structure and procedures which this committee is to follow.

The conference agreement contains a declaration of intent by the conferees that next year legislation will be enacted which will resolve the actuarial deficit of the railroad retirement system, and we expect the recommendations of the joint committee to accomplish this result.

One labor organization had some dif-

difficulties with provisions of the House-passed bill shifting liability for payment of railroad retirement taxes from some of their employees to the union itself, and the conference substitute permits labor organizations affected in that fashion to delay the transfer of tax liability for a time.

Title II of the bill deals with rate-making procedures to cover costs arising out of tax increases under the conference substitute. The Interstate Commerce Commission is required to adopt by August 1 through an expedited rule-making proceeding procedures to be followed by railroads in applying for increases in interstate freight rates. With respect to interstate freight rates the conference agreement is essentially the same as the House-passed bill, but a compromise was arrived at on the procedure for intrastate ratemaking.

Under the conference substitute, the railroads are required in every instance involving freight rate increase applications to cover the costs covered by this bill to proceed initially before the appropriate State commission, and they may not go directly to the Interstate Commerce Commission for increases covering these costs. The State agency is given 60 days in which to act. Four situations are possible:

The State may grant the full increase requested within 60 days, in which case no further proceedings are called for. The State may grant an interim increase within the 60 days, and subsequently order refunds if the rate increases are determined to be excessive, subject, however, to the overriding power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to grant relief on burdens on interstate commerce or discriminations against interstate commerce.

The third possible situation is that the State agency may deny the increases entirely or fail to act upon them within 60 days, in which case the railroads may petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for rate increases and the Commission is required to act on that petition within 30 days, with the State authority subsequently authorized to require refunds subject again to the overriding authority of the Commission under section 13(4).

The fourth possible situation is that the State agency may grant an increase within the 60-day period, but in amounts less than requested, in which case the carriers may petition the Commission under section 13(4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and the Commission is required to act on that petition within 30 days.

For purposes of the new section 15a (d)(B) proposed to be added to the Interstate Commerce Act by the bill, the word "finally" as used therein means action either granting an increase, denying an increase, granting an interim increase, or granting an increase in amounts less than requested.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, as I said when the bill passed, that this is really a landmark piece of legislation because it reduces the retirement age

of men to age 60, after 30 years of service. I believe that all other labor, in days to come, and soon, will follow along this line. It will give the younger men and women a chance to have a job, and it will give those who are older a chance to enjoy some of the golden years of their lives in retirement.

Mr. Speaker, in another way it is a landmark piece of legislation, in that labor and management sat down and worked out a great many of the provisions together that would be acceptable to the Congress and to the administration.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I hope there will be no opposition to the conference report in any way. I think this report is a very acceptable compromise. I recommend the report to the House as the very best we could do and I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) for any comments he might have.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the railroad retirement bill which now comes back to the House after conference with the other body is basically the House bill. To major differences were the subject of the main negotiations.

The Senate bill, while providing for the continued negotiation by labor and management to perfect a restructuring scheme for the Railroad Retirement System in much the same manner as the House bill, added a 7.5-percent raise in the amounts to be paid into the fund. This was done without specifying who should be the donor—management, labor, Government, or a combination thereof.

This provision posed serious problems for the success of a rewrite because we do not know at this time whether the proper increase will be greater or smaller than the 7.5-percent figure, in which event it would have to be undone. Further, it seemed to be setting some kind of limit or goal. Although the administration is anxious not to continue deficit funding in the railroad retirement fund any longer than necessary, the inclusion of the increase with an uncertain figure should be no more satisfactory than none. The Senate agreed to drop the 7.5-percent increase.

The wording of the bill as finally agreed upon should satisfy anyone that the restructuring will be promptly accomplished. The labor-management committee which is designated to work upon it is held very tightly to a time schedule for interim reports and a final report.

In addition, the bill states unequivocally that Congress will legislate on this subject in 1974. If by any chance the labor-management committee fails to agree and bring forth a proposed bill, Congress will proceed to work out a system of its own.

The other main difference between the two bills concerned the automatic freight rate increases to cover the costs

attributable to changes in railroad retirement benefits. The provisions of the Senate bill were cumbersome and would have defeated the very purpose of the pass-through. A compromise was offered by the Senate conferees which in its original form set out procedures which kept ICC and the State regulators chasing each other indefinitely around the barn. This was finally resolved with a fairly complicated set of provisions which in effect allow the increased rates to go into effect promptly. Thereafter the State regulators may review the intrastate portions of those rates and make decisions regarding their acceptability subject to ICC review to be sure that interstate commerce is not prejudiced thereby. These changes do give States considerably more authority to deal with the intrastate portions than the original House bill did, but the main purpose of the House bill is preserved because the rates are not held up pending any proceedings at the State level.

The changes made by the conference do not disturb the basic principles or the provisions of the agreements reached by labor and management and are recommended to the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) yield?

Mr. HARVEY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman: Are all the amendments to the bill in conference germane to the bill?

Mr. HARVEY. Yes, they are.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 8537, AMENDING DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services and pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 8537, together with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STRATTON moves to take from the speaker's table the bill H.R. 8537, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree with the amendment of the Senate, and request a conference with the Senate.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PIKE moves that the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 8537, be instructed to insist on disagreement to title III of the Senate amendment.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN).

Mr. ASPIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The issue we are discussing this afternoon is on the question of flight pay for officers of the rank of colonel and above who do not fly.

Originally, in order to receive flight pay, an officer had to do a certain number of hours every month as proficiency flying. Then, because it turned out that it was costing so much money to buy planes and to buy fuel for people who were doing proficiency flying, some years ago the Appropriations Committee cut off the need for proficiency flying and determined they would no longer buy planes and fuel for that item.

While we cut out proficiency flying, we did not cut out at that time flight pay for those who were not flying, so it was a loophole in the law which continued.

Then in the fiscal year 1973 appropriation bill the Committee on Appropriations, which held hearings on the matter, decided that we were to cut off flight pay for officers, colonels and above, who do not fly. The cutoff date for that money was May 31, 1973, almost a month ago.

Since that time there has been tremendous lobbying by the Air Force and Navy to get this pay extended. They tried to get it attached to the bill we have before us here today, which is the Dependence Assistance Act. They tried to get the flight pay amendment attached to it in the House Committee on Armed Services, but the committee did not attach that amendment, and the bill passed the House on June 19, 1973, without the flight pay amendment attached to it.

However, the Air Force and Navy succeeded in getting it attached to the bill over on the Senate side. That bill passed the Senate, along with the amendment, last Friday without any debate on the Senate floor.

So the issue now is before us on the motion to instruct conferees to insist on the House version of the bill, which does not include flight pay for those officers, colonel and above, who are not flying. That is the issue we are voting on, and it is the only opportunity in either body where we have a chance to vote on that issue publicly whether we favor flight pay for people who do not fly or not.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why we should insist on the House position is, first of all, with the cost of manpower going up and up and now consuming 56 percent of the budget it is imperative that we cut out any little boondoggle in order to get the most out of our defense dollar.

There are some 6,000 colonels in the Air Force and 4,000 are receiving flight

pay but only 900 are flying. The cost is \$14.6 million a year, which is money that could be very well spent elsewhere on other aspects of defense.

Flight pay is the only special pay we provide for the Armed Forces which continues after the person is no longer assigned to that billet. We pay submarine pay, but that stops when a person is no longer in the submarine force. We pay parachute jump pay, but that stops when a person stops jumping. We pay demolition pay, but that stops when the person is no longer assigned to the demolition force. We pay combat pay, but that pay stops when people leave the combat zone.

Only flight pay keeps going. Only flight pay continues after this activity has stopped. The Committee on Appropriations in its report made reference to the morale problems in the Air Force of people who receive flight pay even though they are not flying who serve alongside of somebody not receiving flight pay, and doing essentially the same job.

Undoubtedly there will be people who will be hurt when we cut off flight pay, and the lobbyists have been pointing out how these people will be hurt. They will lose \$2,940 annually. This will be cut out if they lose flight pay. That is true. But I would like to point out that there is some compensation for these people. The pay of colonels and—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, I would like to point out that there are compensations for this. The pay of colonels has gone from approximately \$19,000 to \$30,000 in 5 years. They have received an automatic cost-of-living increase last January, and they will receive another automatic cost-of-living increase next January.

Mr. Speaker, it will be pointed out by people on the other side that this is an inequity. It is not an inequity. We are paying an awful lot of people these extra benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the question is are we going to get the most out of our defense dollar, or are we not? It will be said by the opposition that if we do not carry out this pay bill that these people will be living out of pocket. June 30 is coming up, and they will be living out of pocket. They will not be living out of pocket. We can pass the bill and make it retroactive. We have done this before, we did it 2 years ago when many of these provisions did not pass until October, and they were made retroactive to June 30.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the question is are we going to get the most out of our defense dollars, or are we going to continue with these costly little manpower boondoggles which together add greatly to the size of our defense budget and add nothing to our national defense?

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I was in hopes that the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) would address the House first because the gentleman is more conversant with all of the facts with relation to flight pay.

I notice that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) who spoke before me, was speaking about flight pay, but he did not say anything at all about the Navy flight pay.

Mr. Speaker, Navy flight pay is one of the most important things, to my mind, and the most important thing to the minds of other people, for the young naval aviators today. They have gone into the service. They have been married. They have families. These young naval fliers are depending on this flight pay to assist in educating their children now, or when the time comes, and if we cut off this money from them now they will not enlist—we are not going to get the most for our defense dollars. I say this because most of these young fliers whom I have talked to have told me that they are ready to resign their commissions and leave the service rather than to wait until they are lieutenant commanders or commanders, wait until the time when they no longer receive flight pay. And whether you call it flight pay or whether you call it something else, it is still extra compensation for these people who have been trained by the services to the extent of \$60,000, \$80,000 or \$100,000 to provide these young men to be naval aviators, so that they can land on our carriers, and so forth. Now they want to cut them off.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to permit the Speaker of the House to name conferees so as to go to the Senate and confer with them on this bill which is before the House this afternoon, without instructions.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill and I point out that it would be the height of irresponsibility for the House to delay this legislation because some people want to see a reduction in the flight pay to colonels and generals.

The Dependents Assistance Act expires the 30th of this month. If this bill is not passed, our lower ranked GI's will suffer a reduction averaging \$65 a month in take-home pay. We will be unable to offer special pay to physicians and dentists and veterinarians and optometrists who might be willing to join the Armed Forces. We cannot get enough of them to join the services even with the special pay we provide now. How many do you think we can get without any special pay at all?

The extension of the flight pay deadline is merely to provide a reasonable amount of time for the committees to consider a revision of the flight pay system.

If we are going to change the rules of the game on our pilots, we should not do so until we are at least able to tell them what the new rules of the game will be. When we bring the bills to the

floor later in the year that provide for a revision of the system, the House will have a chance to work its will on the legislation. The House will have a chance to make deductions as it wishes. And the members of the Armed Forces will at least know where they stand.

It is not just the pay of high ranking generals involved here, it is the pay and morale of all of our combat pilots. If the cutoff is allowed to stand, some outstanding lieutenant colonels will find themselves being promoted to colonel, but taking a cut in their monthly income. The resignation rate among junior grade flying officers has already increased because of the uncertainty created by this arbitrary cutoff.

You may have noticed that Mr. STRATTON did not address himself to the cost implications of the bill. The reason is that there are none. The purpose of this bill is to continue allowances and special pays now in effect, to prevent a reduction in the income of our service personnel. The cost of this 6-month extension of the flight pay cutoff is \$9.2 million, including the cost of flight pay for June. That compares with the total annual flight pay budget of \$227.5 million.

Involved are approximately 5,000 officers out of the 99,000 who receive flight pay. What is proposed by those who oppose the bill is cutting off those 5,000 in a way that damages the morale of all of our 99,000 pilots.

There is a lot of sentiment on our committee for revising the flight pay provisions. It may be that we will determine that many of those in high positions should no longer receive flight pay. But let us do it in a reasonable manner that allows the people in the Armed Forces to know where they stand. Let us not attempt to legislate on the floor on such a very complex matter. Give the Armed Services Committee the opportunity to report back to you with a logical modernization of the flight pay system.

I urge the Members to vote for the motion to allow H.R. 8537 to be enacted into law.

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

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

Mr. CRANE. It is my understanding that the committee is going to make some provision in the interim period down the line for people who are in this peculiar situation.

Mr. HUNT. The armed services is currently conducting a study, and we do contemplate that there will be some officers who will be removed from the flying pay status. There will be a full legislative hearing on this before the Committee on Armed Services, so anybody who wishes to be heard might be heard, but at this time it is dangerous to hold this bill up because of the fact that we are so close to the end of the fiscal period, and we do not have a chance to get in there and tell the fellows what the ballgame changes are. It is like quitting half way through the football game playing according to the rules, and then very suddenly switch-

ing over to personal rules. We should permit this to go to conference with the conferees so we can have additional time to work the will of the House with the recommendations that we get.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, as has been explained, the gentleman from New York seeks by this motion to uphold the action of the House Appropriations Committee when it passed section 715 of the fiscal year 1973 Appropriation Act, and which was adopted overwhelmingly by the House to eliminate flight pay for the colonels and generals, captains and admirals who are not assigned to an operational flying billet.

I do not know exactly how much money the amendment of the Appropriations Committee will save. I have heard that between now and December 31 it will save \$7.5 million, but as far as the Air Force is concerned this amendment will bring about an annual savings of over \$10 million per year. At the present time in the Air Force—and this is the Air Force alone—there are 4,187 colonels and 354 generals who are entitled to flight pay. Those who are in an operational flight billet should receive the flight pay. Those who are not, should not receive the flight pay.

The House Committee on Appropriations merely mandated that those who do not fly should not receive flight pay. Section 715 went into effect on June 1. The gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) seeks to undo the action of the House Appropriations Committee.

Let me say that I advised the gentleman from Wisconsin before coming to this well that is not very often that I take the well supporting the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin. In fact I highly suspect this is the last time this session I will be with him on matters of defense. It is probably the last time during this Congress and may well be the last time during our service in Congress together, because I bow to no one either in the Congress or outside the Congress in support of funding for a strong national defense. I think the best way to maintain the peace is to have a strong national defense, and I disagree with the gentleman from Wisconsin when he time and time again tries to make out whole weapons programs that would weaken the national defense of this country. I will be in the well supporting the B-1. I will be here in the well supporting the Trident system. We should not try to save money in defense by destroying or eliminating entire weapons systems.

We should do it by taking the fat out of the defense appropriations. There is literally and figuratively fat in flight pay. There are colonels and generals drawing flight pay who are really too fat to fly. I do think there are some inequities in section 715. I think the action was a little harsh, but we do have a bill in the House Armed Services Committee which we can consider to remove existing inequities. It is my intention to support a more liberal program, but at this time I ask the Members to save \$10 million annually in the Air Force alone and we

will be really making a diligent effort to take the fat out of our national defense appropriations.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I support the committee's position, and I oppose the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, all that is being requested here is a 6-months extension of present flight pay programs so that the legislative committees of the House and the Senate may work out an orderly flight pay; plan and keep faith with military personnel. It is felt that a plan can be worked out which can save money. All that we are requesting now is a 6-month extension.

Do not cut these deserving individuals off and leave them hanging. Give the Congress an opportunity to work out a reasonable plan.

The Department of Defense, in response to a request from committees of Congress, has provided a new program for flight pay which has merit and deserves consideration. Whether or not that is the plan which finally will be agreed upon, we do not know; the committees have not had time to work their will. However, remember that the officers who entered into an implied contract, a good faith contract, mind you, to serve while in flight pay status, have carried out their side of the bargain through three wars. They are ready to respond again when we need them.

Mr. Speaker, flight pay is for hazardous duty. The mortality rates are higher in this group. Look at the records. They show clearly that mortality rates are higher among flyers than nonflyers. That is the reason for the higher pay for flying officers. Submariners are in the same category as flying personnel in that they receive extra pay but it is not generally known that submariners get, in addition to hazardous duty pay, an enlistment bonus of \$3,750 per year. It was found necessary to do that in order to enlist enough of them to do the essential job of manning the Nation's submarine fleet. The same may be required for flying officers if we take away their present incentive.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the cost of replacement training of pilots would be much more than the implied saving which would result if flight pay were canceled. I strongly support the position of the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) and his committee.

Now let me call attention to the fact the bill before us is not a flight pay bill. It is emergency legislation intended to help the most needy low-income service families. There should be no delay in passing this legislation. The basic livelihood of over 300,000 low-income service families will be impaired after July 1 if we do not complete action on the measure before us. The completion of H.R. 8539 is a very important matter indeed.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr.

Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct.

As we continue this important discussion, I wonder how many people in the Chamber realize that during those touch-and-go moments when Astronaut Capt. Peter Conrad was attempting, in a heroic manner, to save the Skylab mission he lost his flight pay. Think about it, at the very moment when this great hero was performing his most dangerous mission in space, he lost his flight pay. Even though our POW's are receiving their flight pay during their period of hospitalization, the O-6 and above will lose it immediately upon recovery.

There is a need for a comprehensive reevaluation of the philosophy of flight pay. Is it hazardous-duty pay? Is it incentive pay? Should it be paid by the flight, by the year, or by the career? Should it increase as pilot skills increase or should it remain constant?

H.R. 8593 directs itself toward answering these questions and eliminating the inequities in the present program. However, in the few days remaining before the end of the fiscal year, there is insufficient time for adequate hearings and thorough study.

Not to extend the present program until remedial legislation is adopted is both unfair and unwise. Such an act tends to destroy morale. At this point in time, if an aviator works hard, volunteers for and participates in combat, risks his life, and finally earns promotion to O-6, he is penalized roughly \$2,500 in pay. It just does not make sense. When has our society penalized those who succeed?

An average O-5 has accumulated roughly 6,000 hours of flight time. During each of those hours there is a potential for loss of life. A lifetime career of flight pay would total approximately \$60,000. This means the typical O-5 has risked his life for about \$10 each hour of flying. Ten dollars an hour does not seem excessive.

How many times during a lifetime should a man risk his life for \$60,000? How many individuals in this Chamber would put their lives on the line just once for that \$60,000—or for any amount of money.

It costs the taxpayers of the United States nearly \$800,000 to train a Navy jet carrier pilot. This is more than 10 lifetimes of flight pay. If we do not grant this extension, we are in danger of losing many of the young men in whom we have this big investment.

The Navy reports resignations of young aviators has increased 300 percent since last October when the new policy for flight pay was announced. Apparently these men see the handwriting on the wall. Obviously we are not just adversely affecting the "colonels and generals," or "Navy captains and admirals," but rather the young pilots America must rely on in time of crisis.

The argument has been advanced that not to grant the flight pay extension would save the taxpayers \$7½ million. I submit this is a classic example of false economy.

On the basis of Navy pilot resignations alone, the cost to train replace-

ments would run \$50,000,000 a month or \$350,000,000 for the 7-month period. I do not have Air Force statistics. However, if we assume the dollar cost for replacement is similar, and that we need to replace the young pilots who are resigning, instead of saving \$7 million over 7 months we will need to spend \$700,000,000 million in training costs.

As I understand it, the proposed flight pay legislation provides the highest flight pay during the earlier years when an aviator is most active and when the temptations to resign are the greatest. It gradually decreases and terminates after 25 years of service. I think many of the objections to flight pay now being raised.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that two of the finest sources of inspiration and pride for all Americans have resulted from recent actions of our military aviators. I refer, of course, to the attitude and speeches of our returning POW's and the near miraculous repair of the Skylab.

I am not suggesting we should extend the present policy of flight pay forever. It needs revision. I am saying terminating present policy without a thorough evaluation of remedial legislation is both unfair to the aviators and costly to the taxpayer.

Denying these men flight pay prior to adopting new legislation may not prove a breach of contract legally, but it certainly does by implication.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss).

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman who just concluded his remarks that I recall vividly when many laid their lives on the line for \$21 a month, the prevailing rate when I entered the service at the beginning of World War II.

I favor flight pay for those who fly and will continue to fly. I favor taking approximately \$8 million additional and making it available for those who are really flying and exposing themselves to the hazards in the interests of increased military strength of this Nation.

The issue here is not to pay flight pay for fliers. The issue really is: Do the laws written by this body, signed into law by the President of the United States, mean anything at the Pentagon? Because the law mandating the reduced flight pay for the nonfliers became effective on the 31st day of May, and here we are, almost a month later, debating whether or not the law meant what it said.

If we were wrong let us proceed through a proper device, not here on a conference report.

I believe we have one solemn obligation, to instruct our conferees to serve notice to any department or agency of our Government that the law means what it says.

We cannot ignore it and be rewarded because of it.

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of bringing in the extraneous issue of the astronauts. I do not think any of them are going to end up on breadlines, but I do think that we cannot regard as extraneous the multiplying instances where

the clear will of this body, of the institution of the Congress itself, is contemptuously ignored.

That is what we must face up to here today, and for that reason alone, with every bit of merit that we have in our system of government, we should adopt the instruction to the conferees and tell them to insist that that law be obeyed.

Mr. Speaker, I think there ought to be a vigorous slap on somebody's wrist for failing to obey it for almost a month.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CHAPPELL).

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, we had better have a real close look at the proposition before us. I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct. I want to point out some specifics which are extremely important.

If we want save money, we will vote "no" on the motion to instruct. If we wish to retain in the military services our best and most aggressive young pilots, we will vote "no." If we believe in retaining our most competent senior officers we will vote "no."

We are seeking here nothing more than a 6-month extension within which to perfect legislation already introduced in the House to better resolve the problems caused by the so-called section 715. It is not a simple problem. Anyone who thinks it is a simple problem has not had the responsibility or laboring with recruiting and retaining military pilots. As a former Navy pilot and officer, I know that problem.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize the fact that we are competing with the airlines and other industries in recruiting and retention. This competition is taking place in a time of relative peace and prosperity. We seek capable, aggressive young college men. These men understand the present worth of lifetime earnings and this value is an important factor in their selection of a career. The glory of military jet flying and the value of its concurrent education is keenly persuasive to such men, but time and hazard has its dulling effect. About the 5th or 6th year of a young well-trained military pilot's career the higher pay of the airlines lures many to commercial aviation. They quit the Air Force, Navy, Marines, and Army because their chance of survival is six times greater in civil aviation and earnings that of the services over their lifetimes with the airlines.

Let me give you some statistics. Section 715 was passed in September 1972. The increase in resignations has gone rapidly upward since that time. In the Navy alone, monthly resignations went from 27 to 39, to 48, and right on up and in the first 4 months of this year we had 315 resignations, as opposed to 350 in all of last year. The files are complete with resignations of officers who stated section 715 as the cause of resignation.

Mr. Speaker, many feel the Congress is not keeping faith with our pilots who have already taken into account expected earnings over their lifetimes.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk a bit about saving money. Let us look at this from

a profit and loss standpoint. At the most we would be expending, at the cost of enacting 715, an amount which would render to us an initial savings of a little over \$15 million.

Now, if you take away from that \$15 million in savings, the amount of income tax we lose, which would be \$4 million—

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CHAPPELL. If we take from the \$15 million savings the \$4 million we lose in income tax, it leaves a net gain of \$11 million; but when we take into account the cost of training the people we lose by resignations due to section 715 we will lose some \$25,000,000 so that we end up the year with a \$13,904,000 loss. These figures and statistics are based on the most conservative of calculations.

I ask the House to give us the opportunity of 6 months—just to extend this and the opportunity to work this problem out—so we can come back to you with something reasonable and acceptable to this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of the motion.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON).

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding this time to me.

I think the issue has been pretty well brought out and it has been done very clearly. Everybody on the Armed Services Committee agrees that the system needs to be overhauled and looked at and that there have been abuses.

I agree with that, but I think to cut off everybody from colonel and Navy captain up from drawing flight pay without a look at the overall situation to see what we are doing is being penny wise and pound foolish.

I believe this should be extended for a period of 6 months so we can take a look at it.

The Air Force was asked to come in with a plan and they did it, but they were late in doing it. They only filed their plan in May. We have not had a chance to study it and to see what it will do.

So I ask the Members of the House to go along with the majority of the Committee on Armed Services and do not instruct the conferees. Give us an opportunity to have hearings and see what we are doing so we will know what the final result will be and not be flying blind.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD).

Mr. MACDONALD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I know very little about this amendment and I am not trying to interject myself into the debate, but it seems there are different things being said concerning the amendment. I would like to know just what it is we are voting on. I would like to address myself either to the author of this motion or someone who spoke earlier to explain this matter to me.

As I understand it, we are voting not

to cut flight pay of people who are flying but only to cut flight pay of people who do not fly.

Mr. PIKE. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is absolutely correct. It only applies to people who do not fly and only to colonels and above.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know why it should apply only to colonels and above, but I do not see, either, why people should get flight pay for not flying. I therefore support the gentleman's motion.

Mr. HUNT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNT. I do not think the answer was quite properly stated. The response to your question was it applies to flying officers who at the present time are not in a flying position. It may be an operations officer or someone else.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI).

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in belief of the action to instruct, but I do so with some misgivings, because it is always difficult to instruct conferees; to, in effect, tie their hands.

Having served as a conferee on the higher education bill, I am well aware that the House position is not in fact the final word of the conferees. So, this is really a sort of psychological exercise and give conferees an indication of really where the House stands.

I think it is a very important topic we are discussing here. What we are talking about here is welfare, if you will.

I have been in this House for 2½ years during which it has been my privilege to serve my district. I have heard the welfare state argued about and fulminated against and denounced generally as a very bad thing.

The welfare state is that state of mind and state of body in which someone gets something for nothing. It is a state in which you do not really do a service for something in return; but, it is where something is given to you for no effort in return.

With all due respect to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT), and those who have argued in behalf of preserving flight pay for nonflying general and colonel-grade officers, it would seem to me where are really recompensing them for something they did do and something they might do, but not for something that they are doing today.

I believe that in America you should be paid not for doing nothing, but for doing something.

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the impression that we are trying to preserve flight pay for generals. What we are trying to do is to get the information in time for the study that is being projected so that we might come back into the House and explain the reasons for those that should be deleted, and those who should be retained in flight pay but, in the meantime, in a

very few days this act will expire, and if the act expires we are going to have many people who will be left dangling. It could create considerable financial hardship to some officers.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I still say that those who are against the welfare state should vote for this motion to instruct.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this House will not instruct the conferees in this instance without giving the conferees an opportunity to see what they can work out. I am against the general practice of instructing conferees unless it is on some really basic question, and something really predetermined before Members get into the conference.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter to the Members, if I may, which shows the other side of the coin, and may prove to some of the Members that we would be foreclosing discussion in the conference on this issue.

This is a letter from a colonel in the Air Force. He writes:

As a career physician in the United States Air Force, I feel compelled to write to you expressing what I believe represents many of my colleagues' opinion, as well as my own. At this time I have 14 years of service in the United States Air Force and have recently sustained a \$3,000 a year pay cut due to the loss of flying status. I am a Board-certified neurosurgeon and I sincerely desire to continue my career in the United States Air Force for many reasons which I will not take the time to enumerate. However, I have a large family and I must plan to support and educate six children. Unless appropriate, fair and badly needed legislation is passed soon in order to give me an adequate income to provide for the above, I will not be able to continue my military career.

For years we, as physicians in the Air Force, have been underpaid but have been promised improved and fair remuneration for our services. It is my sincere opinion that if an all volunteer defense service is to become and remain a reality, appropriate payment of the military health services must be provided for.

At the present time and for 5 years in the past I have had to utilize my leave time so that I could "moonlight" (which has been authorized under AFM-168-4) at a second job in order to provide for my family and to continue my career in the Air Force. Due to federal cutbacks and loss of federal funds, I do not know how much longer this additional employment will be available. Certainly, any further loss of income would be an even greater factor in my having to resign my commission in the Air Force and go into private practice.

I believe further that the job I am doing for the United States Air Force is a good one, and I truly believe that medical care and expertise which I am able to provide the Air Force is of the highest quality obtainable. If this same care would be obtained by members of the service from a private neurosurgeon, the cost to the government would be many times what I am paid in a salary. I therefore believe that the government is obtaining a real bargain.

Mr. Speaker, here is a case of some merit, and one that the Members might consider carefully.

Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, I have heard Members of Congress complain about the times when they were

in Bethesda or Walter Reed Hospital, that qualified, good doctors are leaving the services because they no longer can afford to stay in. If that is true of good doctors who we should keep in the service, that they are leaving, it means that the little man who is the sailor or the buck private, is not getting the kind of medical care he should have.

So I would say to the Members that I believe this question needs more consideration. It can be discussed in the conference, and we should not foreclose the opportunity to do so.

I would ask the House to please go slowly on asking that the conferees be instructed prior to the time that they have the opportunity to further discuss the question from all angles.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER).

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I am very much in opposition to instructing the conferees as has been proposed here today, but I feel that I must speak to this question in another way.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the allegations made by the gentleman from Wisconsin concerning the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. I have been acquainted with Gen. John D. Ryan for many years—on a personal basis from the time he was Commander of the 2d Air Force at Barksdale Air Force Base in the early sixties. I have the highest regard for his ability, dedication, and integrity.

The country has been extremely fortunate during the past 4 years to have had General Ryan leading the Air Force.

The contributions made by the Air Force to the deterrence of strategic nuclear war, to our efforts in Southeast Asia and to the overall security of this country have been tremendous; success in each of these areas has depended to a large degree on the foresight, judgment, and leadership of General Ryan. Few men could have withstood the pressures and demands. None could have possessed the experience or ability to do as well.

I consider the allegations of the gentleman from Wisconsin a direct affront on the conduct and integrity of a man whose conduct and integrity I know to be beyond reproach.

Because I know the man, because I know how much this Nation should be grateful to him for his service, and because I know that the allegations made against him are not only false but reflect a sad lack of knowledge about the facts and lack of understanding of the public law on the part of a Congressman who should know better, I feel compelled, and, dutybound, to rebut those allegations.

There is a saying in the Air Force that goes like this:

The Mission of the United States Air Force is to Fly and Fight. Don't You Ever Forget It!

It follows that whoever leads the Air Force had better know how to fly and he better be able to fly well. I thank my lucky stars that General Ryan can and does do both. The very minimum requirement of a competent commander

and leader is that he have current firsthand experience in the operations about which he must make numerous, often critical, decisions. General Ryan, throughout his career, has always been this kind of leader—leading by example, not words, leading through firsthand personal experience and knowledge and not by abstract theory.

In the Air Force, this means flying. Since 1939, General Ryan has averaged 360 hours/yr. Contrary to what the gentleman from Wisconsin has alleged, the positions he has held have been flying positions as defined by public law and that includes the position of Chief of Staff. At no time has General Ryan been "in violation of law" and "in utter defiance of civilian authority" as Representative ASPIN has alleged. Certainly, by no manner of thinking can General Ryan be considered an "armchair" leader of the Air Force during his service as Chief of Staff. He is presently a fully qualified pilot in the KC-135. To be considered such, he has met the proficiency requirements, and logged the required flying time, that every other line pilot qualified in this aircraft in the Air Force has done. During fiscal year 1973, he flew 282 hours in the process of accomplishing his job as Chief.

In addition, because he bears so much of the responsibility for determining the best force mix and type aircraft the Air Force operates and must depend on in the future, General Ryan, throughout his tenure as Chief, has made a concerted effort to gain firsthand knowledge and evaluation of a great variety of military, civilian, and experimental aircraft. The number and variety of aircraft he has flown, again in discharging his responsibility as Chief to the future effectiveness of the Air Force, is quite impressive and includes the F-106, F-111, F-4, A-7, OV-10, AT-37, C-135, C-140, T-39, DC-10, 747, C-5, C-130, 737, Fan Jet Falcon, Beech 99, Hawker-Sidley 748 and the AV-23.

Overall, he has logged 1,380 flying hours as Chief of Staff—which incidentally, has given him a career total flying time of 12,660 hours.

I feel very strongly that the example General Ryan has set as a flying commander has been exactly what we, the Congress, expect of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

It might be well at this time to point out for the benefit of all that our statutes specifically require that "flying units shall be commanded by commissioned officers of the Air Force who have received aeronautical ratings as pilots of service types of aircraft." And the Air Force is a flying unit.

This provision was written into the law over 50 years ago—it was good law then and it is good law now. The successful application of air power to achieve our national objectives in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam has been due in great measure to the fact that the Air Force leaders throughout the years, Generals Arnold, Spaatz, Doolittle, LeMay, and General Ryan were men who could fly and who could fight. They knew their planes, they knew their crews, and they could lead by example. We should be

eternally grateful to the contributions these men have made to the security of our beloved country rather than maligning and imputing base motives to a person such as General Ryan. Can you imagine for a minute an Air Force commanded by one who did not fly?

Without his extensive flying experience and current participation in flying operations, he could not have effectively led the Air Force through these difficult and demanding times.

Certainly, the highly successful direction of an Air Force that supported the 1972 bombing campaign which brought our POW's home from North Vietnam could have been accomplished only by a leader who had a current and thorough knowledge of the capabilities of the aircraft under his command. General Ryan is such a man.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I will simply say that there is nothing in this motion that cuts off the flight pay for anybody who flies. There is simply something in the motion that cuts off the flight pay for people who do not fly.

At this point I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) some questions. As I understand it from the discussion that has gone on here, there is a law in being which would have cut off the kind of flight pay we are debating on May 31, or should have cut off such flight pay on May 31.

Mr. PIKE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We have had two members of the Committee on Appropriations at least down in the well saying that we should not do this today. The fact is that the Committee on Appropriations did it last year. The bill was passed in November. They have had from November until right now, and here we come in at the very last minute trying to squeeze this one through.

Mr. WYLIE. As I understand it further, there was an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate to the Dependents Assistance Act to permit the continuation of such flight pay until December 31 of this year.

Mr. PIKE. That is correct. The amendment was accepted in the Senate without any debate whatsoever and has not been debated anywhere in either body until this moment. This is the debate.

Mr. WYLIE. That amendment relative to flight pay in the opinion of the gentleman from New York, would not be germane to the bill under discussion if offered in the House; would it?

Mr. PIKE. Oh, definitely not. This is a classic example of a situation where many of those who always oppose non-germane amendments are today saying we have to accept this non-germane Senate amendment.

Mr. WYLIE. I might add that I made the same argument with reference to ignoring the law here a few weeks ago in that I argued we should not increase our contribution to the United Nations above the 25 percent limitation enacted into law last October, and in May we changed the formula here on the floor of this House. So, I am inclined to agree

with the gentleman's position. It would seem to me at first blush as though this is a bit of a boondoggle.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to try to put this debate into a little perspective, because listening to the remarks that have been made thus far, one would think that this is a bill on flight pay, and an explanation of exactly what the bill is about is contained in a letter which I sent around this morning—the gentleman from New Jersey and I—to all of our colleagues. We have copies of it here on the table if anyone would like to take the time to read it.

This is basically a military dependents assistance bill. It is an emergency piece of legislation, because in the past every time we have renewed the draft, we have also renewed the provision that provides certain basic housing allowances for all the low-grade, low-income enlisted personnel and their dependents, those in grade E-4 and below. This year, of course, we are not renewing Selective Service, and so if we are to disrupt nearly 400,000 women and children who are looking forward to getting this allowance continued as usual into fiscal year 1974—and these are all low-income service families, let me remind the House, this bill has got to be enacted into law before the 30th of June. That is the real situation we face here today. It is all very simple, and the point is that we are today at the 28th of June. So if we are going to protect the families of our privates and corporals we have got to get the bill out fast.

Any motion to instruct the conferees is obviously only going to complicate the situation and very likely prevent enactment by Saturday. It is not a question of whether we do or do not want to vote for or against generals and admirals. It is basically a question of whether we are going to disrupt the livelihoods of nearly 400,000 service families, low-income service families, who are not involved in this controversy and who are entitled to this kind of support—disrupt it even for 2 or 3 weeks at a time when the cost of living is going up astronomically.

The House Committee on Armed Services did not put anything in this bill about flight pay. I have no brief for flight pay for generals and admirals. I was in the Congress when we enacted the original legislation, and as a matter of fact it was an economy measure because it eliminated the need to provide planes for aviators assigned to nonflying billets to maintain their flying proficiency. I imagine this thing has been in in recent years and it does need to be corrected. But we did not put in this provision with the House committee.

It was the other body that put it in, and because we know that adjusting flight pay was a complex issue if we were to be completely fair to all those in the service who believed this flight pay represented a contractual commitment, and because we knew we could not get the dependents' legislation enacted in time if we had to work out a fair solution to

the flight-pay issue our committee reluctantly accepted the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this is an easy issue to demagog, but it is not really a simple matter, particularly as we are today on the eve of having a completely volunteer Army. Moreover, besides the funds included in this bill for wives and children of low-income personnel, it also includes the special professional pay that we give to doctors and dentists and optometrists in the military services. If we eliminate this special pay, too, then our services are going to be hard pressed indeed to retain qualified medical personnel on a volunteer basis.

Is it not a little bit silly on the eve of going to this Volunteer Army that we now are threatening to take action in this House that will present to our lowest paid GI's and their hard-pressed families an unexpected reduction in pay, and will also to take away the special pay now paid to physicians and dentists and other medical professionals in the services; and finally will also take away the special combat bonus now being paid to those who are in the high casualty ground infantry, armor, and artillery units? That is what this argument is all about.

The Senate amendment extends the present flight pay arrangements for another 6 months. I think that period is probably too long. But the fact of the matter is what the Appropriations Committee was trying to do when they put the cutoff date in the 1972 appropriations bill was to try to draw the attention of the Defense Department to the abuses of flight pay and to suggest the need for corrective legislation.

That corrective legislation has now been submitted to the Congress under normal House procedure it should be and will be considered in the committee itself, and I am the chairman of that subcommittee. I can assure the Members of this House that if we accept this extension inserted by the Senate our committee is prepared to examine this whole question of who is properly entitled to flight pay in great detail, and I can assure the House we will come out with a recommendation that will be fair and will eliminate any abuses that may have developed.

But let us not act today in haste, by trying to instruct the conferees and thus run the risk of jeopardizing the livelihoods of the families of nearly 400,000 low income service personnel. That is what the issue is all about. I ask Members of the House to vote down the motion to instruct and let us continue to take care of our enlisted men and their families as we properly should do.

Mr. Speaker, let me finally just summarize the history of this bill. H.R. 8537 passed the House on June 19. It passed the Senate on Friday, June 22. The Senate passed the bill with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The principal purpose of H.R. 8537 is to make permanent the housing allowances for junior enlisted personnel. Although they have been temporarily extended each time the draft was extended,

these allowances have been in effect for 23 years. With the end of the draft induction authority June 30, if this bill is not passed, 368,000 junior-grade enlisted personnel will suffer reductions in their pay ranging from \$15 to \$76.50 a month. The bill also extends the authority to pay special pay to health professionals, physicians, dentists, veterinarians, and optometrists, ranging from \$100 to \$350 a month. Finally the bill continues the authority to pay a bonus for an initial enlistment in the combat arms.

The laws providing the authorities in question expire on the 30th of this month—on Saturday of this week. If we do not pass the bill, the enlisted personnel will face a reduction in pay and we will be no longer able to offer incentives to health professionals.

On Tuesday I asked unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the Senate amendment. There was objection to that request because of one Senate change. The Senate made three changes in the bill.

Let me briefly summarize the changes: First. The Senate acted to limit the extension of the combat bonus authority to 1 year instead of 2 years as provided in the initial House bill and to limit the bonus to enlistments in the infantry, armor, and artillery branches rather than the more general category of "a combat element of an Armed Force." In accepting the Senate language on the provision, I want the legislative record clear that we are doing so with the understanding that the matter will be the subject of later review when we take up the proposed Special Pay Act later this year.

Second. The Senate amended the bill to change the statutory definition of a military dependent to include illegitimate children in determining eligibility for various allowances. The Defense Department did not oppose the amendment. I want the record of legislative intent to be very clear that in accepting this amendment the House does so on the understanding that it will be diligently monitored by the Department of Defense to require a showing that additional allowances paid as a result of this section are being used to support the child and that the phrase "in fact dependent on the member" will normally be interpreted to mean dependent for over one-half of his support on the member. We do not intend for the Defense Department to pay allowances solely on the basis of a decree by a foreign court.

Third. The Senate added to the bill a provision extending until December 31, 1973, the May 31, 1973, deadline on continuation of flight pay for senior officers not in flight billets.

For many years the appropriations bill has contained a rider to limit the spending on proficiency flying and has authorized the continuation of flight pay to fliers assigned to duties which do not require the maintenance of basic flying skills. Last year's bill said that such continuation of flight pay would no longer be allowed after May 31 of this year for colonels and Navy captains and above.

In taking that action, the Committee on Appropriations clearly was encouraging the Department of Defense to come up with revised procedures for the payment of flight pay.

In line with this imperative, the Department of Defense has submitted a major legislative proposal to revise the flight pay system. However, the proposal arrived on May 17, too late for consideration before the May 31 deadline. The Department, therefore, asked that the May 31 deadline be extended for 6 months until the major proposal is considered; it is this extension that the Senate has placed in H.R. 8537.

It is this extension of flight pay which is in controversy today. Well, it may be that some billets are improperly designated flight billets when they should not be so. But you will not change that by voting against this bill. If some billets are improperly designated, they would continue to be so even if this provision is defeated. A redefining of flight billets and pay procedure requires study and analysis by our committee.

It may be that it is not proper to pay flight pay to officers when they are not assigned to flying billets. I myself believe that review is needed in this system and as chairman of the subcommittee that will consider the proposed revisions, I can assure you that we will look very hard at the whole question. But, if the procedure is wrong, it is a procedure which the Congress has acquiesced in.

The original act to continue flight pay for officers while excusing them from flying was taken by the Appropriations Committee to save money on proficiency flying. In 1954 it provided for automatic excusal from flying from officers who had held an aeronautical rating for 20 years.

In 1962 it reduced the automatic excusal time to 15 years. In 1972 it removed any time constraints on the entitlement of rated pilots to flight pay while in non-flying jobs. Most of these actions were taken to save money on proficiency flying. In view of this record of the Congress over a twenty-year period, it is, therefore, only fair to say that these personnel were led to expect flight pay to continue. If the Congress makes any change, therefore, there should be some reasonable notice to the personnel, and the change should be made in a rational manner which incorporates a modernization of the system.

If you vote against this bill today, you will not be assuring any reasonable change in the flight pay system but you will be assuring that some of our lowest paid enlisted personnel and their families will be facing a cut in their income at the time of the worst inflation in our history.

So, finally, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Members of the House in voting on this bill to keep their eye on the donut and not on the hole. If this bill is not passed today and has to go to conference, it is doubtful, in view of the coming recess, if it can be passed and signed into law before the first pay day in July. Think of the chaos involved if over 300,000 families of privates and corporals

and sergeants suddenly find themselves facing a 15-percent pay cut. The all-volunteer environment begins on July 1. Think how silly we will look if the Congress enters that environment by allowing a reduction in the pay of GI's, by allowing a loss in the authority to pay any special pay to new physicians, dentists, and other professionals, by allowing a cutoff of the bonus for men willing to volunteer for the high-casualty ground combat skills.

We must pass this bill and we must pass it this week.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate my opposition to the motion and my support for the comments made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, the termination of flight pay for O-6 and above on May 31 has had a severe impact on over 5,000 service aviation officers. In the face of a sharp escalation in the cost of living all have experienced an immediate reduction in pay of up to almost \$3,000 per year. Many of these officers have children in college and have planned for years to use this pay to help defray these costs of college education. Many are purchasing homes wherein flight pay was computed as income when qualifying for a loan. Because of this, many find themselves in financial difficulty through no fault of their own.

At the present time Navy commander aviators, many of them recent combat veterans, selected for captain face a pay cut of \$54 per month as a result of their selection. These officers are the top 40 percent of their contemporaries. Navy commander aviators failing selection are presently drawing more money than their contemporaries who were promoted. This situation results in a gross inequity. The flight pay extension is required to correct such inequities until the Congress can arrive at a revised flight pay system that will preclude the existence of such situations.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, Members should not get led down the primrose path that we have to do this tomorrow or it is all gone. The gentleman from New York did properly state that normally this is done in the selective service bill as it has been done in the past. The last time it was done in the selective service bill we did not pass the selective service bill until the end of October, and nobody lost any pay in the meantime.

We do not have to get led down that particular primrose path. Do not let them lead you down that path. Next, they say this has been done precipitously. I presume, when the Appropriations Commit-

tee cut off the pay for generals, colonels, and admirals who do not fly, they gave it a lot of consideration.

Do not get led down the path of this recruiting business, either, because honestly, there is no problem recruiting generals and admirals. There is no problem whatsoever in this area.

If flight pay for nonflying high ranking officers can be defended on any rational basis, it will be on the basis that heretofore it has been a veritable fountain of youth for senior officers, a great elixir protecting them from the ravages of old age, incipient senility, and decrepitude. According to the figures the Department of Defense compiled, for the period January 1, 1964, through June 30, 1972, more than half of the generals in the Air Force, 53 percent, retired disabled with disability pay, but here is the clincher: 77 percent of these same general officers had, within 6 months of retirement, allegedly passed a medical flight examination qualifying them for flight pay. Obviously, flight pay was all that was keeping them glued together, kept them vibrant and alert and healthy. With the approach of the end of flight pay and retirement, disintegration of bodily functions appears not only certain, but darned near instantaneous.

There are obviously many reasons why we should not give flight pay to colonels and generals and admirals who do not fly. When General Westmoreland came before the Armed Services Committee with a proposal to give proficiency pay to Army enlisted men who were not proficient, we laughed him out of the room, but these were E-2's, E-3's, and E-4's, not colonels and generals and admirals. We are infinitely kinder to colonels and generals and admirals, and there are some arguments for them.

Let us face it, being a desk jockey is a dangerous business, and those who do not appreciate this just do not understand the aerodynamics of a desk. I am not just talking about closing the drawers on one's fingers and those nasty hip bruises, but if the "in" basket is continually loaded on the starboard, or right-hand side, and the "out" basket is continually empty on the port, or left-hand side of the desk, wood fatigue sets in and the whole landing gear tends to buckle and the fuselage comes down on their feet. Happily, most of these colonels and generals and admirals have been flying these desks for a long, long time, and they have learned to keep their feet on the top of the desk out of danger's way.

Here, too, there is extreme risk, because if the general's orderly has overly polished both his shoes and the desk on the same day, the coefficient of friction can become so low as to cause foot slippage and a hard descent to the carpet below. Tibias have been known to fracture under less shock and stress.

Another risk in this hazardous duty is the remote possibility that if all the papers are ever removed from the top of the desk at one time, the unaccustomed lightness would cause the desk to become airborne. Certain later model desks have a tendency to stay behind the power curve, as we pilots call it, and

stall out at about 600 or 700 feet. These desks fall into a very dangerous aerobatic maneuver called "the falling leaf," and usually crash and burn. No colonel has ever been known to survive the crash of a desk which stalls out at 600 feet. Earlier model desks are over-powered and tend to go into an outside loop, a very difficult maneuver, which causes a negative G force, a rush of blood to the head and apoplexy, which is not always fatal.

The symptoms, however, are clearly discernible in all of the desk jockeys who have been buzzing Capitol Hill in squadrons and even wings for the last few weeks.

Let us consider the tragic case of Rear Adm. J. Heavy Bottomley, who was sitting in his swivel chair at his desk doing his job at the Pentagon. His job consisted of reading secret documents, largely about Congressmen. This was what he was doing when he first heard the word that he might lose flight pay. He spun around rapidly in his chair. Unfortunately, his shoulder boards were at that particular angle of attack which combined with his rapid rotation, caused him to become airborne.

Unfortunately, also, the window had been left open because the air-conditioning was too cold that day and Rear Adm. J. Heavy Bottomley went soaring out of the window and into space where he achieved an orbit with an apogee of 190 miles and a perigee of 125 miles. For the first time in 10 years he is flying. He is visible to the naked eye out there as he circles the earth once every 91 minutes. He is particularly beautiful just before sunrise and just after sunset with the light flashing on the stars on his shoulder boards, but some of the effect is lost in the daytime. I am told that he will be passing over the Washington Monument just after sunset on the Fourth of July.

If Members believe in Rear Adm. J. Heavy Bottomley, then vote for the Senate amendment. If they do not, vote to instruct the conferees and let us cut out this ridiculous waste.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the gentlemen from New York (Mr. PIKE) knows, in the Committee on Armed Services I supported the effort to instruct the House conferees to oppose the Senate amendment to H.R. 8537 relative to extending flight pay until December 31, 1973. But, Mr. Speaker, I resent his irresponsible and pathetic attempt to ridicule, belittle, and degrade members of the Armed Forces of the United States, many of whom are the very men who many times have risked their lives for this Nation. Yes, risked their lives so that a Congressman like Mr. PIKE would have the right to make such a speech in the elected Congress of a free Nation. When I came to the floor today, I intended to support my original position as established in committee, but, after Mr. PIKE attempts to ridicule American servicemen, I change my vote to "no" to guarantee that no one will misunderstand and think that I join Mr. PIKE in his unworthy attacks on men who have risked so much to guarantee him the right to make such "unfunny" remarks.

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the provisions of this legislation that pertain to flight pay.

As an experienced pilot with over 6,000 flying hours I can appreciate the necessity for all aviators to make frequent and regular aerial flights and be properly compensated for the hazards involved—and there are hazards, especially in military flying. For example, of 1,000 Air Force pilots entering operational flying, 70 will succumb to flying hazards before completing 20 years of duty.

I know that aviation, both commercial and military, is an attractive career and many young men desire to spend their lives in this endeavor. However, I also know that in addition to the hazards involved there are other burdens that must be borne such as family separations and increased expenses. In this latter regard, we must recognize that many insurance companies charge flying officers 30 percent more for life insurance premiums than that charged nonfliers. Over a life span of active flying these factors can be demotivating unless the individual in that career field can feel confident that continued and adequate compensation will be forthcoming throughout his career.

The main criticism against flight pay, concerns the so-called desk pilot. He flies very few hours per month and is not primarily assigned to a full-time flight job. Many ask, "Why pay this guy flight pay?"

There are several very good reasons why he should be paid flight pay. One of the key reasons for paying him extra money is because he is saving a tremendous amount of money for this Nation.

On the surface, it would not seem to make sense that, by paying extra money to an irregular flyer, the country would save money. However, if you will simply think it through, you will see that my statement is true.

It costs this Nation several hundred thousand dollars to train a pilot. Even a refresher course to retrain a pilot amounts to almost half the cost of training a recruit. You see, pilot training consists of much more than simply manipulating the controls of the airplane. That portion of the training is actually only a minor party.

In today's complex airplanes and in our crowded skies, a pilot must spend a tremendous amount of time in self-study to maintain currency in a multitude of related technical matters. His real need for "stick time" is minimal.

Our Government has a choice. We can motivate the pilot to maintain currency by giving him additional pay to spend extra hours in self-study, or we can send him to an expensive school when we actually need him as a full-time active pilot.

It has been proven that the flight-pay route is far less expensive. There is still another—far more important—reason for the flight-pay incentive. That amounts to the vital element of time.

During the Vietnam conflict, the Air Force alone activated 1,150 "desk pilot" colonels and 62 generals. These commanders were able to move immediately into active full-time flight jobs because

they had maintained their proficiency. If refresher courses had been required, they could not have been activated for several months.

My colleagues, you have been talking mostly about the Air Force during these discussions of flight pay. In so doing, we are forgetting that the U.S. Army has more airplanes and more pilots than the Air Force, Navy, and Marines combined. Furthermore, the flight-pay incentive in the Army is probably more important than in the other services.

The Army pilot spends his junior and intermediate years as an Army aviator. In the meantime, his associates build proficiency and command experience in the basic branch. That is, nonflying officers pursue careers as infantrymen, artillerymen, armored, et cetera. The pilot officer is unable to remain competitive without a tremendous amount of extra self-study. He deserves his flight pay.

Mr. Speaker, my point is simple. Our Government clearly saves money by retaining flight pay for officers that are not primarily assigned to full-time flight duties. It is vital to this Nation to have a ready reserve of trained pilots, yet we are unable to afford the tremendous expense of operating the aircraft to keep the needed number of pilots on full-time status.

The flight-pay incentive provides the answer to both problems. I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the House has just been entertained by a rather cute attack upon the military "brass."

Just who are these "brass" who are subjected to this burlesque abuse?

Why, they are only the men who have spent the better parts of their lives in the service of their country, and who, by their superior performance of duty, have attained the ranks of leaders of our Armed Forces.

Of course, there are not very many of them, by comparison, and it is unlikely that any politician has more than a token few among his constituency, so it is perfectly safe to have your fun at their expense.

And since they have no forum in which to reply, and since it is both illegal and unthinkable for any one of them to answer the attack, it really takes a lot of courage for a politician in the sanctuary of this privileged Hall, to roast and ridicule these members of our military with complete immunity.

In the gigglish wake of these invidious insults it is unlikely that reasonable debate can be resumed.

The committee asks only for a little time—6 months—to resolve the matter under discussion in an orderly manner.

It is shameful that the question has deteriorated into a classist appeal. Either flight pay is wrong for all persons in nonflight status—and I happen to think it is—or it is not wrong, regardless of rank.

Either flight pay is justifiable for all persons whose duties require them to fly—and I believe that it is—or it is not justifiable for any.

It is an insult to all who have attained

a measure of success, and disheartening to those who yet aspire to devote their lives to a career in the defense forces of our country, to find that matters of such importance to them can be treated so lightly and ludicrously by the very Congress that can order them into war at will.

The military "brass"—the perennial target of pettifogging partisans—are certainly not perfect. Indeed, they may be almost as imperfect as some of us here in Congress. But their license is limited to the letter of the legislation we write.

Need I remind you that theirs is a most serious business, and it would much better become us to deal with the problems of our armed services in a serious and thoughtful manner.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE), to instruct the managers.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 175, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

YEAS—238

Abzug	Davis, S.C.	Heckler, Mass.
Adams	Davis, Wis.	Heinz
Addabbo	de la Garza	Helstoski
Anderson	Delaney	Hogan
Calif.	Dellums	Holifield
Anderson, Ill.	Denholm	Holtzman
Annuzio	Dennis	Howard
Archer	Devine	Huber
Armstrong	Diggs	Hudnut
Ashley	Dingell	Hungate
Aspin	Donohue	Hutchinson
Baker	Drinan	Ichord
Bell	Dulski	Johnson, Colo.
Bergland	du Pont	Jones, Ala.
Biaggi	Eckhardt	Jones, Okla.
Bieber	Edwards, Ala.	Jordan
Bingham	Edwards, Calif.	Karst
Boland	Eilberg	Kastenmeier
Bolling	Erlenborn	Keating
Brademas	Esch	Kemp
Brasco	Evans, Colo.	Kluczynski
Bray	Evins, Tenn.	Koch
Brooks	Fascell	Latta
Broomfield	Findley	Lehman
Brotzman	Foley	Litton
Brown, Calif.	Ford	Long, Md.
Brown, Ohio	William D.	Lujan
Broyhill, N.C.	Forsythe	McCollister
Burke, Calif.	Fraser	McCormack
Burke, Fla.	Frenzel	McDade
Burke, Mass.	Froehlich	McFall
Burlison, Mo.	Fuqua	McKay
Burton	Gaydos	McKinney
Carey, N.Y.	Gettys	Macdonald
Carney, Ohio	Gialmo	Madden
Carter	Gibbons	Mallory
Chisholm	Grasso	Matsunaga
Clancy	Green, Oreg.	Mayne
Clay	Green, Pa.	Mazzoli
Cleveland	Griffiths	Meeds
Cochran	Gross	Melcher
Cohen	Gude	Metcalfe
Collins, Ill.	Gunter	Mezvisky
Collins, Tex.	Guyer	Miller
Conable	Haley	Minish
Conlan	Hamilton	Mink
Conte	Hanley	Mitchell, Md.
Conyers	Hanna	Moakley
Corman	Hansen, Wash.	Moorhead, Pa.
Cotter	Harrington	Moss
Coughlin	Harsha	Murphy, Ill.
Culver	Harvey	Nedzi
Daniels	Hastings	Nix
Dominick V.	Hawkins	O'Byrne
Davis, Ga.	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara

O'Neill
Owens
Patman
Perkins
Pike
Poage
Podell
Preyer
Pritchard
Rangel
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Riegle
Rinaldo
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo, Wyo.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ryan

Abdnor
Alexander
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Arends
Bafalis
Barrett
Beard
Bennett
Bevill
Blackburn
Boggs
Bowen
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burleson, Tex.
Butler
Byron
Camp
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clausen
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Collier
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert
W. Jr.
Dellenback
Dickinson
Dorn
Downing
Duncan
Eshleman
Fish
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Fulton
Gillman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Grover
Gubser
Hammer-
schmidt

Ashbrook
Badillo
Blatnik
Breaux
Clark
Danielson
Dent

St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Schneebell
Schroeder
Sebellus
Seiberling
Shipley
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Staggers
Stanton
James V.
Stark
Steele
Steelman
Stephens
Stokes
Stuckey
Studds
Sullivan
Symington
Symms
Taylor, N.C.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone

NAYS—175

Hanrahan
Hansen, Idaho
Hays
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Holt
Horton
Hosmer
Hunt
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kazen
Ketchum
King
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Leggett
Lent
Long, La.
Lott
McClary
McEwen
McSpadden
Madigan
Mahon
Mailhard
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Michel
Milford
Mills, Ark.
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.
Morgan
Mosher
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Brien
Parris
Passman
Patten
Pepper
Pettis
Pickle

NOT VOTING—20

Derwinski
Fisher
Hébert
McCloskey
Murphy, N.Y.
Peyser
Rallsback
Reid
Rooney, N.Y.
Sandman
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan

On this vote:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Breaux against.

Mr. Tiernan for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Clark with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Badillo with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Danielson with Mr. Rallsback.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Reid with Mr. McCloskey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STRATTON, HÉBERT, NICHOLS, BRAY and HUNT.

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 "4,001" 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

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

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 (Mrs. SULLIVAN)?

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to address some remarks to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mr. Speaker, I have had some consultation with the Coast Guard congressional liaison and others regarding the implication of item 3, page 3, "Explanation of Amendments to the Senate Report on H.R. 5383."

I am told that the Senate committee report is but a part of legislative history. The House debate on the \$600,000 additional appropriation and the House Appropriation Committee bill report are also legislative history that clearly spell out that the reopening of any SAR stations are to be based upon priorities based upon the lifesaving mission of the Coast Guard, not on geography or political decisions.

That, in fact, the additional manpower authorized in the pending amendment are not limited to any location. That, in fact, less than 6 or all 13 SAR stations could be reopened based upon the 30-day study called for by the House. That, in fact, Plum Island in Wisconsin will compete with all 13 stations for reopening, not with just 7 non-Michigan stations.

Is this a correct statement?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is essentially correct.

If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct that the Senate report does have general language relating the six stations in question to the State of Michigan. However, it is noted that this is just general legislative history and that the bill does not anywhere specify priority placing for the six stations, just sets out personnel to man the stations. In addition, it is noted that the Appropriations Committee in its report, on page 12, stated that the remaining search and rescue stations might not be able to adequately assume these essential operations in all areas in which rescue stations are being closed.

As a minimum, the committee felt that the Coast Guard should strengthen the auxiliary, and increase the utilization of the Coast Guard Reserve in these areas. The committee went on to state that it expects a detailed report from the Coast Guard on this matter within 30 days. Thus, it is clear, that with respect to which particular 6 of the 12 stations may be continued in operation—the Coast Guard must report to the Congress in 30 days on this matter.

In addition, it is clear that this is an administrative decision to be made by the Coast Guard. In light of these facts it would seem that the question of which six stations would be continued is not really crucial to H.R. 5383, the authorization bill, and so I would urge my colleague not to delay this authorization bill, which is essential to the Coast Guard appropriations, by objecting to the acceptance of these Senate amendments. I particularly urge this on my

colleague, since there is a June 30 expiration date for Coast Guard lease housing and an inordinate delay in the authorization may cause the Coast Guard some administrative problems.

For these reasons, I urge my colleague to accept the Senate amendments.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

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

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I think we have to understand that the Senate amendments simply provide the manpower for the additional six stations. It is the House appropriations bill for the Coast Guard that provides the additional \$600,000 to finance these six stations of the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard indicated to the Committee on Appropriations that it would, indeed, develop the study for the Committee on Appropriations within 30 days, and based upon that study would open approximately 6 of the 13 stations.

That is an agreement developed by the Committee on Appropriations as far as this particular bill is concerned. The Senate amendments only refer to manpower authorizations of the Coast Guard. They are increased to take care of the additional six stations that we assume will be the result of additional moneys flowing to the Coast Guard by the actions of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for this legislation but more importantly, to thank the gentlewoman from Missouri, Chairwoman SULLIVAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GROVER, and Mr. RUPPE and their respective staffs for their cooperation and acceptance of the Senate amendments.

In particular, your willingness to recognize our need for a helicopter search and rescue unit at Arcata, Humboldt County, Calif., and accept my request to retain Senator TUNNEY's amendment in this legislation rather than go to conference is greatly appreciated.

We are attempting to develop on the west coast an adequate system of search and rescue units that will serve the increasing needs of the area.

The weather conditions are unique and during storm seasons quite hazardous. The remote areas are inaccessible and the time and distance factors relating to adequate coverage make it essential to locate a facility at the agreed-upon site on the Arcata airport where navigation, communications, buildings, and logistical support facilities are readily available.

The county of Humboldt has offered full cooperation in making space available to this Coast Guard unit.

This location will serve the "missing gap" of the Mendocino, Humboldt and Del Norte County coastal areas. I say "missing gap" because it describes the only area between San Francisco and Astoria, Oreg., that does not have adequate helicopter search and rescue coverage.

Again, I thank the committee for its consideration and attention to this important matter.

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, with the explanations given here, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN)?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RE-REFERENCE OF H.R. 8094

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8094) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to redesignate the Alamogordo Reservoir, N. Mex., as Lake Sumner and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 296 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and did vote my presence here. I wish to have the RECORD so reflect.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 280 I was present when the vote was taken, and evidently through a malfunction or through my error I was not recorded as being present. I should like to have the RECORD reflect that I was present.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 471 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 471

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8947) making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions 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 pro-

visions of clause 2, rule XXI, are hereby waived.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 471 permits the Committee on Appropriations to submit the bill making the fiscal year 1974 appropriations for public works for water and power development for action on the floor of the House of Representatives without being subject to points of order.

House Resolution 471 provides that the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI of the rules of the House are waived against the bill.

Title I of the bill appropriates funds for the Atomic Energy Commission in the amount of \$2,297,688,000, a decrease of more than \$335 million from the amount spent in fiscal year 1973. Titles II and III of the bill appropriate funds for the Corps of Civil Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. They also provide moneys for the power agencies of the Department of the Interior. The total amount appropriated by titles II and III is \$2,021,856,000.

Title IV of H.R. 8947 includes funds for independent agencies and commissions such as the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and related Appalachian programs. Title IV appropriates funds in the amount of \$352,151,000. The grand total of all the appropriations in the bills is \$4,671,695,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 471 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 8947.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering House Resolution 471, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 8947, the public works for water and power development and Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill for fiscal year 1974. The rule provides a waiver of points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, because two sections of the bill lack final action on the authorizing legislation. The two sections are:

On page 2, lines 10 to 25, all of page 3, and page 4, lines 1 to 9, the Atomic Energy Commission.

On page 25, lines 7 and 8, under Water Resources Council.

The purpose of H.R. 8947 is to make appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian Regional Development Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. The total appropriation for 1974 is \$4,671,695,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule in order that the House may begin debate on H.R. 8947.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. 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. 8947) making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions 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 Arizona (Mr. RHODES) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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. 8947, with Mr. ICHORD 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 gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we bring you today the public works for water power development and Atomic Energy Commission appropriations bill for 1973.

This is an important bill—an all-American bill—a bill that touches the lives of virtually all Americans.

This bill represents substantial investment in the future of America—in our future—an investment that will pay rich dividends in services for our people and in economic benefits to the Nation.

The purpose of this bill is to build a stronger America—to strengthen our country.

In providing for water resource development for our Nation we assure needed electric power, a more adequate water supply, flood control, additional and improved waterways for navigation, recre-

ation, and other essential services for our expanding population.

This bill also strengthens the muscle of America by providing for research and development by the Atomic Energy Commission—for defense and defense-related missions—and for development of nuclear energy for peacetime purposes.

I must advise my colleagues, however, that because of slowdowns, stretchouts and delays, this Nation is falling further behind schedule in the construction of needed public works projects—the current backlog totals 162 projects, for planning and construction. The trend of budget recommendations in the last few years has been on the decline.

Last year, it appeared, that the Office of Management and Budget had discarded its policy of delay, slowdown and stretchout because of a record budget for public works projects presented.

This year, however, OMB is back at the same old stand with the same old policy of slowdown and stretchout with a very few and limited number of new starts proposed.

Our committee has set some of its own priorities—we have added a modest number of new studies and planning and construction starts for the Nation.

Our subcommittee policy is to continue to give the highest priority to projects under construction—to maintain the construction timetable, as much as possible, and keep these projects on schedule.

I will go into this in some detail later in discussing this bill.

The bill we are recommending represents this Nation's continuing commitment to provide needed and essential services for our people at a time when there is a national power crisis—when the very halls of our Capitol buildings are darkened by brownouts as increasing demands overtax our capacity to produce electricity.

That is what this bill is all about—meeting the anticipated needs of the future. We are concerned over the power and energy crisis and we recommend fast and affirmative action to cope with this crisis.

This bill funds projects that will provide more than \$723 million in annual public power benefits.

DISASTER BENEFITS

Certainly I am sure I do not have to remind my colleagues of the natural disasters that occurred this year—including Hurricane Agnes and the Mississippi River floods.

It is estimated that Corps of Engineers projects prevented flood damage totaling \$7.4 billion in the Mississippi River area—and prevented \$1.7 billion in damages from Hurricane Agnes.

BENEFITS IN BILL

This bill we are considering today funds projects that will provide an estimated \$2.1 billion in further annual flood prevention benefits—flood damage averted.

Other annual benefits from projects funded in this bill are estimated at: \$205.7 million in water supplies; \$1 billion in improvements to inland waterways and navigation; \$793 million in ad-

ditional irrigation measures; and \$246.9 million for recreation, among other benefits.

Let me at this time commend all of the members of our subcommittee who have contributed to the preparation of this bill—all have participated and all have been most helpful.

This bill is a product of the entire subcommittee—and we bring you a bill and report, which we trust will be speedily approved.

I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK), and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), the able and genial ranking minority member, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON). It has been a pleasure to work with all members of our subcommittee.

I want also to commend our excellent committee staff: Hunter Spillan, George Urian, and John Plashal. They are able, helpful, and excellent men.

Our subcommittee conducted 3 months of hearings on this bill.

The testimony fills five volumes and 6,500 pages of transcript.

A total of 1,500 witnesses including 200 Members of Congress, testified before the subcommittee on projects of interest to their States and this Nation.

This bill has four titles of—

Title I, the Atomic Energy Commission;

Title II, the Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense;

Title III, the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and

Title IV, related independent agencies—power and water resource commissions.

OVERALL SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, the 1973 Public Works and AEC appropriations bill totaled \$5,607,329,000.

The budget, as submitted and recommended by the President for 1974, totaled \$4,809,969,000.

In other words, OMB recommended a bill this year which is almost \$1 billion less than last year.

Beyond that, we have made cuts and reductions of \$85,774,000 in the budget request.

Our committee is recommending \$4,724,195,000.

I repeat: We have cut and reduced the President's budget request by \$85,774,000.

This bill is 16 percent below the 1973 appropriations and 2 percent below the 1974 estimate. It represents only 1.48 percent of the total budget.

That is a remarkable achievement.

Cuts and reductions totaling \$212,942,000 were effected in the overall budget. Primarily these reductions were made from the Atomic Energy Commission and predominantly in the weapons program, the committee made some off-setting increases for water resources development projects where needed.

Our committee in setting some of its own priorities recommended an increase of \$33,524,000 for a limited number of

new studies, planning and construction items for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Some \$28,960,000 is being recommended for the Bureau of Reclamation which was literally cut to the bone by OMB. The increase provided is for general investigations, construction and rehabilitation.

We are recommending an increase of \$29,000,000 for disaster relief for the areas near the Mississippi River and its tributaries which, as we all know, sustained recent severe flood damages, Hurricane Agnes.

We are also recommending some increases in the Atomic Energy Commission—including an additional \$8 million for production of enriched uranium for sale to nuclear electric generating facilities.

The overall increases total \$127,168,000 which yields a net reduction as indicated in the bill of \$85,774,000.

We are recommending only 15 new planning starts for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation—including six starts recommended in the budget—although the backlog of projects for both agencies totals 162 projects.

We are recommending 15 new construction starts for both agencies—including four recommended in the budget request—although the backlog of projects eligible for construction is 99.

We are recommending 23 studies—including 12 in the budget request.

As I indicated we are recommending that some priorities be set by the Congress, based on months of testimony by hundreds of witnesses before our subcommittee.

Our bill calls for the following breakdown in new starts recommended in the budget and additions by the committee.

	Budget	Committee additions	Total
Studies.....	12	11	23
Planning.....	6	10	16
Construction.....	4	11	15
Loan program.....	3	0	3

With these limited new starts and increases for construction, our committee is seeking to compensate for delays, stretchouts, slowdowns and the freezing and impounding of funds in some areas.

PROJECTS FUNDED

A total of 392 projects are funded in the bill—including old ongoing projects and new recommendations for planning or construction. The projects are listed in the report which we recommend to your reading.

Let me turn briefly to a few comments on the report of the National Water Commission.

May I say at this point that within the next few weeks and months you will probably hear discussions concerning the recent recommendations of the National Water Commission with respect to future funding of water resource projects.

In the view of our committee, the net effect of the recommendations of this Commission will be virtual abandonment of our national water resource develop-

ment program—and an abdication of national responsibility to assure the American people of the benefits of water resource development.

This report by the National Water Commission proposes to transfer to State and local governments the responsibility for water resource development—and further, would make the application of user charges mandatory for any Federal involvement in such projects. The development of our navigable rivers is a national—not a State responsibility—and so considered since the founding of this Nation.

In the view of our committee, this report, in substance, recommends that water and water resource services be treated as salable commodities to our people rather than necessary and essential public services.

This report, if adopted would virtually stop water resource development throughout the United States at a time when our population is continuing to expand with the corresponding increases in demands for water—electric power and other essentials.

This report should be rejected in the public interest, especially in view of the fact that the Water Resources Council in a recent assessment of the Nation's water resources estimated that national requirements for municipal water supplies will triple and requirements for industrial use will increase 300 percent by the year 2020.

The report by the Water Resources Council further estimated that annual flood control damages will triple and that steam-electric powerplants will increase water withdrawals more than six times over the present rate of use.

It is estimated that water tonnage on the Nation's internal waterways will increase six times in the next 50 years.

Now is not the time to play games with the future of America by adopting a policy that will not only reverse present usage, tradition and history—but will effectively halt and curtail water resource development for the Nation.

U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS

For the Corps of Engineers, the Committee recommends \$1,502,016,000—which is \$345,635,000 less than new obligatory authority provided for this fiscal year.

Our recommendation is \$26,716,000 more than the budget request, primarily because of an increase of \$29,000,000 required for disaster benefits as a result of the Mississippi River floods.

In addition, our committee is recommending the addition of \$7,091,000 to the budget for general investigations and construction.

As I indicated earlier, our committee has added a limited number of new planning and construction starts. However, a cut and reduction of \$9,375,000 in the appropriation for operation and maintenance more than offsets these increases.

It is interesting to note that the total budget request for general construction for the Corps of Engineers was less this year than 10 years ago.

Although construction costs have doubled since 1965, the budget request

for the Corps of Engineers for construction for fiscal 1974 is \$858 million—less than the \$879 million requested in 1965.

In other words, this is an austere budget—a bedrock budget—a budget less than the budget request 10 years ago.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

For the Atomic Energy Commission, the committee is recommending \$2,297,688,000—which is \$131,687,000 less than the budget request.

In summary, we have made some cuts and reductions principally in the weapons and testing programs and in proposed facilities construction to effectuate some economies.

While making these cuts and reductions, we are recommending some increases in programs to promote the use of nuclear power for peaceful purposes.

For example, we have increased the nuclear materials budget estimate by \$8 million to increase the production of enriched uranium for sale to utilities for power production.

We have increased funding for several important reactor programs—including an increase of \$4,700,000 for controlled thermonuclear fusion for peacetime purposes.

The committee is also recommending \$600 thousand for solar energy research to explore further the potential of solar energy as a generator of electricity.

In addition to the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and AEC we have funded the several power agencies, the Alaska Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the various river commissions, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Power Commission, the Appalachian Regional Development Commission, and others.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior our committee is recommending \$356,358,000 which is \$111,459,000 less than the current year budget.

Our committee is recommending an increase of \$21,515,000 over the budget estimate to compensate in a very small and limited way for the extremely low budget recommended for the Bureau by the Office of Management and Budget.

The President's budget indicates that the Bureau of Reclamation will change the thrust of its programs from irrigation to providing water and electric power for municipal and industrial purposes.

While the committee has no objection to this added emphasis, we do object to any change in the basic philosophy of bureau programs without specific action by the Congress.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

The programs of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission are continuing to have a beneficial and highly visible impact in the 13-State Appalachian region.

The committee is recommending \$270,000,000 for the Commission for 1974 which is \$2,000,000 less than the budget estimate and \$73,000,000 less than last year's budget.

It is the feeling of the committee that the amount recommended will be adequate to carry out all programs of the Commission for the next year.

The largest single appropriation for the Commission is \$155,000,000 for highway construction.

The following table indicates the breakdown on allocations to various components of the Appalachian program:

Highways	\$155,000,000
Health demonstrations	43,000,000
Mine area restoration	4,000,000
Housing fund	1,500,000
Vocational education	25,000,000
Supplemental grants	34,000,000
Research, demonstrations and local development districts	7,500,000

Total appropriation..... 270,000,000

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The committee is recommending \$27,000,000 for the Federal Power Commission which represents a slight decrease—\$163,000—from the budget estimate.

Our recommendation is \$3,500,000 over the last budget.

Recent court decisions require the Commission to provide its own environmental impact statements for every proposal submitted to the Commission for construction, operation, and maintenance of gas and power facilities.

This entails a substantial increase in workload and funds are provided in this bill for 106 new positions—principally to carry out the Commission's expanded responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The committee is recommending an appropriation of \$45,676,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority—an increase of \$2,500,000 over the budget request, but \$18,874,000 under the last budget.

Appropriations to the Tennessee Valley Authority are limited to the water resources development program and related activities normally financed by the Federal Government.

All TVA power projects begun since the mid-1950's have been financed from electric power revenues and through the sale of bonds and notes as authorized by Congress in 1959.

Through the years, the committee has strongly supported the Tennessee Valley Authority, and, as chairman, I congratulate TVA and commend its leadership on the 40th birthday of this great agency.

The committee reflects with pride on its consistent and constant support of the vital and important programs of TVA which have prevented much flood damage, promoted navigation, produced electric power, created reforestation, encouraged industrial development, and generally improved economic conditions of the Tennessee Valley area.

However, the committee is deeply concerned over the series of escalating power rate increases by TVA over the past 6 years and extensive hearings were conducted into these continuing increases.

The committee urges the Board of Directors of TVA to take any and all actions possible to prevent any further rate increases, and, further, that prior to any

proposed rate increase, a public hearing be held.

The committee has included funds for replacing three spans of an existing railroad bridge at Decatur, Ala., as this bridge constitutes a hazard to navigation—and funds to construct a new bridge to be located between White and Van Buren Counties, Tenn., to replace Reno Bridge, removed by TVA because of its unsafe condition.

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Mr. Chairman, in this bill we are also recommending \$7,417,000 for the work of the Water Resources Council—a cut and reduction of \$395,000 under the budget request.

This appropriation provides for the expenses of the Council and the river basin commissions and for financial assistance to states in developing comprehensive water and related land resource plans as authorized by the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965.

IN CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, again I want to emphasize that this bill is an exercise in fiscal prudence, restraint and responsibility.

This bill is \$883,134,000 less than the preceding year—and \$85,774,000 less than the budget request.

Again may I remind you that:

This bill is 16 percent below the 1973 appropriations bill; 2 percent below the budget estimate for 1974; and represents only 1.48 percent of the total gross budget.

The committee has exercised its prerogatives and discretion by setting some of its own priorities. We have initiated a limited number of new planning and construction starts in the public interest.

This is a good bill—an important bill—one of the most important appropriations bill the House will consider this year, especially in view of the need of providing an adequate power supply for the people of this Nation today and in the future.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill.

It is a bill in the public interest and for Americans.

It is a bill for progress for our country.

I urge prompt approval of this vital appropriations measure in the national interest.

Mr. SIKES. Will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my good friend from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. First let me commend the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, and his committee and staff for the excellent work they have done on this bill. I support all that the distinguished gentleman has said about the importance of this bill. I congratulate him on the fact that he has brought in a bill which is significantly below the budget, and that is indeed a rarity in these times. It shows particular diligence on the part of the gentleman's subcommittee.

May I ask the gentleman this question: Is it intended by this legislation to deauthorize or repudiate any project heretofore authorized by the Congress?

Hr. EVINS of Tennessee. No. I would

say to my good friend that it is not our function to authorize or deauthorize projects. There is no disposition to deauthorize any project.

Mr. SIKES. Then, I can safely assume this answer also applies to the Cross-Florida Barge Canal?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to put in a word of thanks to a great chairman (Mr. EVINS) for doing to my way of thinking a great job. I know in the area I represent flood control is absolutely essential. We have suffered so much and our people have had their lives' belongings taken from them too many times. The gentleman, to my way of thinking, has done an excellent job and should be complimented by this whole Chamber for a job well done.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to echo the words of my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. EVINS), in thanking the members of the subcommittee and the staff for the very hard work which they have put forth in bringing this bill before the House. We have worked harmoniously and effectively under the able leadership of the gentleman from Tennessee.

I happen to think this is a very good bill and a bill that the House should adopt unanimously. I do not know of any way it needs to be amended; in fact, it would be my purpose to be against any amendment and to hope no amendments would be adopted.

It is not that it is a perfect bill, because there is not any such thing, but it is certainly true this is a bill which goes as far toward taking care of the needs of the country for the expansion of water supplies, for flood control, for atomic energy as we can prudently do under the budget stringency which we suffer in this fiscal year 1974.

Personally, I should like to invest much more money on these great purposes than we are able to do today. I feel it is not a matter of pride but perhaps a matter to be deplored that the level of expenditure for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, is lower this year than it was last year. I am sorry, also, that the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission cannot be funded at a higher level. I think it is very important we fund the process known as controlled thermonuclear fusion just as rapidly as we possibly can. We suffer from an energy crisis today, and one of the reasons we do is that we have not been able to get as many nuclear powerplants on the line as we had hoped we would by this time. There are various reasons for that, only one of them being the increased concern for the effects such plants might have on the environment.

Whatever the reasons, we are in an energy crisis today and probably will be for some months and perhaps even years to come.

The controlled thermonuclear fusion process is everything to everybody.

Here you have a possible source of electricity which is unlimited. Here you have heat with which you can do all sorts of things, including taking salt out of seawater. Most important of all, the end product is not radioactive, since it is helium which, of course, is an inert gas.

So, if you had the engineering know-how to put the controlled thermonuclear fusion process to work for mankind, all in one fell swoop you could solve the energy crisis, you could solve the need for fresh water, and you could do it without harming the environment. Unfortunately, this Utopian condition is some time away. The members of this subcommittee have for years been asking the Atomic Energy Commission to speed this process up. This year, for the second time since I have been on the committee, they have come to us and said yes, we can use more money and we can use it effectively. We always respond.

I think we have provided in this budget the amount of money which can be used most efficiently in the years to come. So, I would not support an increase in this particular activity, although I would have hopes that in the years to come such increases not only could be asked for, but could be justified by the state of the art, and the proximity of that day in which this process can be harnessed and used for mankind.

I mentioned desalinization. This is one area where in the last several years we have actually gone downhill in our efforts to produce more fresh water. The brackish supply of water on the continent, and the salt water supplies of the ocean are the most obvious means of augmenting our supply of fresh, clean water. But there again any dramatic increase in the output from desalinization probably must await some breakthrough in the state of the art which we have not yet been able to experience.

One of the things which we are doing in this bill is to forward a study for salinity control of the various streams throughout the United States. One of these, of course, is in certain river valleys of the midwest. The most important one to me is a study of our great river, the Colorado River, which is a saline stream, largely from natural sources. The idea of this study, of course, is to find the reason for the existence of these natural sources, and to plan ways and means of blocking off the natural pollution of that great stream.

When we do this, of course, the water of the river will be more usable for mankind, not only in the United States, but in the great Republic of Mexico, our good neighbor to the south.

So this bill, in dealing with water, deals with three phases. One is to try to get more of it; another is to put it on land so that the land can be made more productive; and the third, and I guess maybe the most important in the short run, at least, is to keep it off the land. Mother

Nature has really taught us a lesson this year, and that is that, try as we will and plan as we will, she still has the ability to make us look very puny. She has done it twice in the last year—in Hurricane Agnes and last spring in the great floods which have plagued so many of our river valleys, throughout the country, most particularly in the great Mississippi River Valley. In this bill we provide augmented funds not only to repair the damage of the floods on the Mississippi and other streams, but also to try to hasten the construction of necessary works to try to control future floods.

So this is an important bill. The chairman called it an all-American bill, and I think that is an appellation which is justly deserved. In this bill we invest in the future of our country. We try to do as the language of Daniel Webster indicates on the wall back of me, to try to do something in our time to improve the country and to try to pass it along to those who come after us in a better condition than it now is.

I think it is a good bill. I think the spending level is about right, and I ask that we support this committee, support this bill and pass it just as rapidly as we possibly can.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, and particularly the committee minority leader in the well, Mr. RHODES, for an excellent bill.

Last November the chairman of the Interior Committee Subcommittee on Water and Power, Mr. JOHNSON, and I and six other Members of the House made a trip to the Colorado River Basin. We saw the discharge of water, beginning with the Big Sandy in Wyoming pouring 80,000 tons of salt into the troubled downstream States and Mexico. We saw a place in Utah—Laverkin Springs—where sulfur water pours 500 thousand tons a year of salt into the Colorado River. We viewed the Gunnison River project and other points of saline discharge into the Colorado River.

We think this bill will provide an excellent service to the country, restoring water quality and preserving the country for the future. I commend my colleagues for setting an example and staying within the budget in doing so.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman—

We could leave to our children all the money in the world, and a worn out land, and in effect we would leave them nothing. On the other hand, if we leave them a rich land with soil erosion stopped, with rivers and harbors free of pollution, and our hillsides once again in trees, they'll make it, whatever our financial plight, for with a rich country behind them, they could establish their own financial system.

Today we are bring to you our Public Works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1974, it would be well, I think, particularly in view of the concern over Government spending and continued inflation, to give consideration to the basic real strength of our country which enables us to maintain our standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, I am ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and feel indeed fortunate to serve on this Appropriations Subcommittee for Public Works and, at the same time, serve as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection, with the main purpose of both being to provide for, protect, and preserve our Nation's natural resources.

You can understand why I enjoy serving in this capacity. It gives us such a wonderful opportunity to aid in things so essential to our well-being. My subcommittee, in our bill passed earlier this year, provided funds for rural electrification, rural housing, water and sewer grants and loans, and in the service area, for the 4-H Club work and many other programs so essential to rural development. We have restored again this year the ACP and the SCS. Our most pressing problem has been that the executive branch is holding up the funds, thereby adding to costs and further damage to our environment.

We are proud of our record on rural housing where, by changing one word "farm" to "rural" in the housing program, we led to the building of millions of rural homes. The money will be repaid. We are merely providing for rural people Government guarantees for loans which those in our urban areas have had for many years.

In preparing the bill before us, we attempted to meet, as far as circumstances would permit, the need for continuing the work of development and protection of each and every region. Now we submit to you a bill which provides funds for the continuation of Federal Government assistance in the development of rivers and harbors, to protect life and property from floods, to aid navigation, and, yes, Mr. Chairman, to aid in the restoration and protection of our environment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have covered most of the details of the bill. However, there are numerous projects in my own area, where I have a great obligation and deep interest. These projects include \$139,000,000 for the Lower Mississippi River and tributaries. We must remember that approximately three-fourths of all the water that falls in the United States flows down this great river valley, gathering in quantity and momentum as it goes.

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY

We have provided for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, \$18,000,000. This is an increase of \$3,500,000, which our Committee added " * * * for the construction, including excavation, of the Divide Cut portion located in Northeast Mississippi of Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway." This action will assure the completion of the project which will mean so much to our entire State.

OTHER MISSISSIPPI PROJECTS

Other projects in our section are the Ascalmore-Tippo and Opossum Bayous, \$350,000 for planning, land acquisition, and initiation of construction; the upper auxiliary channel, \$1,100,000, of which \$400,000 is included for planning and the remaining \$700,000 is provided to initiate construction; Yazoo Backwater, \$2,050,000; Tombigbee River and tributaries, flood control, \$700,000. The Corps of Engineers advised us that if these projects had been completed before this year's floods the water level would have been 4 to 8 feet lower at Swan Lake and Greenwood.

Mr. Chairman, we have once again provided for the four reservoirs—Enid, Arkabutla, Grenada and Sardis—for regular development toward the master plan sum of \$1,240,000. This is a real step in bringing recreational development up to national levels.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. Chairman, I am sure everyone is aware of the vast devastation caused by the recent Mississippi River floods. Our committee recognizes the severe problems created by the flooding where the latest estimate indicates that there was \$494,600,000 in damages, 13,610,000 acres were flooded, and 50,225 people were evacuated. The damage prevented by existing crops projects, in the area, is estimated at \$7.4 billion. We have attempted to appropriate accordingly, so as to provide for restoration and future prevention. Funds for restoration are included in the continuing resolution, amounting to \$103,000,000.

We did recommend that within available funds, the Corps of Engineers restore those federally owned lands, currently under lease, to the condition which existed on those lands, immediately prior to the 1973 spring floods of the Mississippi River. Here the counties receive three-fourths of the land rentals for roads and schools.

TVA

Not to overlook another important aspect of the bill, in our report, the committee, reflecting great pride in the vital and important contributions and accomplishments of the Tennessee Valley Authority, provided \$45,676,000 for its development programs and other related activities. Along with this amount, the committee expressed concern over a series of increases in the power rate. We recommended in the report that the Tennessee Valley Authority exert every effort required to maintain the power rates at the lowest possible level.

APPALACHIA

Funds in the total amount of \$270,000,000 have been provided for the Appalachian Regional Development programs in 13 States which have meant so much to the development of much of my district; projects which in other areas are largely handled by the Economic Development Administration. Under this program, our area has received very valuable aid in sewer and water grants, grants for access roads, hospitals, health and educational programs; and now in addition to access roads, we have finally

obtained funds to start a corridor highway.

REPORT LANGUAGE

We placed the following language in our report:

In reference to the Yazoo Basin reservoirs, the Corps is urged to expedite the updating of the master plan to bring up to national standards the provision of recreational facilities, including the upgrading of access roads.

The following language is used in the bill, and I quote:

"Yazoo Basin" *Provided*, that not less than \$250,000 shall be available for bank stabilization measures as determined by the Chief of Engineers to be advisable for the control of bank erosion of streams in the Yazoo Basin, including the foothill area, and where necessary such measures shall complement similar works planned and constructed by the Soil Conservation Service and be limited to the areas of responsibility mutually agreeable to the District Engineer.

The language used is authorized by Public Law 46, 86th Congress, as amended by Public Law 91-566, 91st Congress.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I urge now, more than at any other time in our history, support of Federal spending to aid in the preservation of our most precious commodity, our land.

At this point let me say that I share my colleagues' concern with our present fiscal situation and presently serve as cochairman of the Joint Committee on Budget Control. We approached budgetary reform with one purpose in mind, that of returning to sound fiscal policy. However, refusing to invest in the future of our country is not the answer, particularly when we stand to profit from this investment, which has not always been the case with our spending.

In this bill we have attempted to provide the same type of development for the whole country, and our budget, when compared to the overall Federal budget—obligational authority—handled through the appropriation process is 2.75 percent. Our bill when compared to the total gross Federal budget estimate—obligational authority—for fiscal year 1974 is 1.48 percent. We are going to provide natural resource development for the whole country which is a little more than 1 percent of the Federal budget.

Is that too much to ask so that we may leave our children with a rich land?

Mr. Chairman, I repeat a statement I made several years ago, when on my motion the Congress overrode the President's veto on a second effort—the only time in history this has been done successfully. At that time, I said:

The more we owe, the greater our problems, the more important it is that we protect the base on which it all depends—our land, our rivers and harbors, and natural resources—for without them not only could we not make it, but our children would not have a chance.

I wish to compliment my chairman, JOE EVINS of Tennessee, and ranking minority member, JOHN RHODES of Arizona, EDWARD P. BOLAND of Massachusetts, JOHN M. SLACK of West Virginia, OTTO E. PASSMAN of Louisiana, GLENN R. DAVIS of Wisconsin, HOWARD W. ROBISON of New York. They, along with our fine staff, headed by Hunter Spillan and his

associates, have done a wonderful job and I urge your support of the actions of our Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I wish to congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) and the ranking minority member (Mr. JOHN RHODES) for the excellent work they have done on this bill, and to thank them for the advice and the assistance they have provided me during these days when I have expressed concern with respect to specific items in it.

I particularly want to express my agreement with the position taken by the chairman that the Congress must not ratify but rather must reject the National Water Resources Commission report. I certainly hope we will do that. I offer any support to the chairman in that effort.

Mr. Chairman, I planned to offer an amendment to this bill, but I decided not to do so. I should like to explain what the amendment was and why I decided not to offer it. I planned to move to add \$3.8 million to the AEC appropriation for controlled thermonuclear research, that is, fission research.

However, I was persuaded by my conversations, with the chairman and with the Members of the other body, that this increase which I seek—or most of it—will be included in the version of the bill enacted by the other body.

Mr. Chairman, the administration requested \$44½ million for operations for fusion research. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy increased that authorization by \$8½ million, to a total of \$53 million. The Committee on Appropriations bill which we are considering here today increased it by \$49.2 million, leaving it \$3.8 million below the Joint Committee authorization that I had requested.

I consider it quite important that the authorization for fusion research be fully funded, and that this vital area of energy research never be budget-limited.

Since the administration budget for fusion research was completed about 8 to 10 months ago, very encouraging progress has occurred in three laboratories in this country in plasma studies, at Princeton, at Oak Ridge, and at Los Alamos.

For the first time in more than 20 years of extremely frustrating research, the best scientists in the world are convinced that now, for the first time, we understand the physics and dynamics of plasma behavior, the plasma in which fusion reactions must occur. This is a major accomplishment and will open the door to accelerated research leading, I hope, to early demonstration of scientific feasibility of controlled fusion reactions.

But, Mr. Chairman, a great deal of supporting work must be completed in the near future if this program is not to be delayed. We have a tendency to focus on the main line of research but

ignore the vast number of important supporting programs that must be carried out if we are to take the next step. This is beginning to create problems in fusion research programming.

Several months ago I inserted in the Record a list of nine specific areas of supporting research that must be completed soon if we are to carry forward this program. None of these were included in the administration request and only part of them can be funded unless the authorization level is met by appropriation levels. These projects include new means of controlling the plasmas we are working with, of studying optional plasma cross sections of computerizing some of the more expensive research, of studying containment and working materials, and the effects of the high energy 14 MeV neutrons upon these materials. If this work is completed as I have recommended, we may then accelerate the program leading to a demonstration planned in the 1990's.

I would like to comment, that next year, if we go forward with fusion research, we may well find ourselves doubling or tripling our present \$50 million budget for fusion research. But, Mr. Speaker, we are now moving on to the accelerating slope of the curve for research for controlled thermonuclear fusion. The rewards are great, but they are long range, and it will not really have an impact until about the year 2000. If we fund this program in a timely manner now, and carry out our research with the long-range goals in mind, we have an opportunity to really solve the energy crisis. So, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring this matter to the Members' attention and point out that when this bill is finally enacted, I hope it will be fully funded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman from Washington 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman on the statement he has made and assure him that insofar as the members of this subcommittee are concerned we have always been convinced of the truth of the gentleman's statement as to the importance of the controlled thermonuclear fusion reaction, and if the Atomic Energy Commission in the future can, as we hope, convince us that they can spend more money, believe me, so far as I am personally concerned they will get it. I believe this is the most important single program we have in the whole U.S. Government today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. I certainly concur with his remarks.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Wash-

ington on his statement. I support him 100 percent. I would like to go further and say this House is most fortunate to have the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK) in this body. Most of us tend to think of plasma as something in blood, and having the gentleman present who is able to understand with clarity these very complicated subjects involved in atomic research is very fortunate for the House. Mr. McCORMACK is a recognized expert in the field of atomic energy. Research in this field is vital. Our economic survival, as a nation, will be dependent upon rapid development of this energy source.

I concur with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to join the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking minority Member in recommending this bill to the Members in the form in which it has been presented.

I suspect that each one of us here could find a project here or there over which he was not completely enthusiastic, but in many of those cases we have found ourselves in the practical position that these projects are already well underway and it would be wasteful and disruptive to discontinue them in their present state. The practical thing for us to do, of course, is to attempt to nip the questionable projects before they do get well down the road.

But, it is a practical consideration that we are constantly besieged by requests for study and investigation funds. The funds for individual projects at this stage are not large, and we are also confronted with the practical political situation that if we do not provide these funds here, they will be put in as a matter of course, frequently simply as a matter of request of an individual Member of the other body, and they will be put in to the political disadvantage of our House colleagues.

So, this bill is a product of compromise, of the recognition of the political facts of life among members of the subcommittee, who represent many years of experience in dealing with the problems of this particular appropriation.

One of the things that I find it difficult to understand is that the product of this bill is invariably and annually attacked by some of those who call themselves the experts in the field of our environment. I would submit that if there is a bill which does more for environment and conservation factors of the economy and life of this country than this one, I do not know what it is.

In this bill are provisions for improving water supply; for making water-short areas produce many of the agricultural commodities which otherwise would be in short supply; for side-by-side development of fish and wildlife and recreation facilities, projects which save millions of cubic feet of the soil of our country each year; that protect the productive

capacity and the quality of life of many of our people; that provide the only truly clean and nonpolluting sources of energy; that provide, particularly in the Appalachian area, for a substantial program of mine restoration.

Mr. Chairman, I think every one of us on the subcommittee has been impressed with the improved attitudes of members of the construction agencies in more recent years, where they have become environmentally oriented; where they are completing the commitments that have been made to this subcommittee and to the other individuals and committees of this Congress to take into careful consideration the environmental factors that are involved.

There are just a few details which the members may have missed in this report, and things which probably will be discussed by others at some later time in our discussion. One of them is the attempt to resolve what has always been a very controversial matter in this House, and that is the old Dickey-Lincoln project.

The Dickey-Lincoln project is not in this bill. Anyone who attempts to suggest that it is would be misleading the members. There is a committee-proposed solution to provide study money for a local project to develop the hydro and flood control potential of the St. John's River without becoming involved in all of the complications we have had with respect to Dickey-Lincoln.

There has also been some discussion since this bill was reported by our subcommittee about the wastefulness of the Plowshare program. I believe to some extent we could concede we cannot reach out and put our fingers on definite and tangible products of the research that has been carried on in this area, but I would also submit to the Members that in this era of energy crisis would certainly not be the time for us to cripple or seriously curtail this program. It may not be the best gamble in the world, but it does seem to me, in light of the facts of life as we now see them, that this is a gamble which has not yet paid off but one we cannot afford to discontinue.

In the report Members will find a discussion of a matter which has concerned us for some years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this matter is the propensity of the Corps of Engineers in particular to want to develop and to use its in-house dredging capacity, though experience has shown in those cases where the corps has been required to put projects out to competitive bidding the Government and the taxpayers have saved a considerable amount of money in putting them out to contract.

The committee in the report has continued this effort of ours to maximize the amount of work that will be put out to competitive contract bidding in this area.

There are many details which I shall not dwell upon, because I believe the report of the committee is a comprehensive

one. It does give specific information relating to specific projects. It does explain reductions that are made. It does explain some areas in which it was felt some increases in funding were required. I believe many questions have been made unnecessary, and many of them are answered, in the report of the committee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. I thank my distinguished friend from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, and my distinguished friend from Arizona Mr. RHODES and all members of the subcommittee for bringing out what I consider to be a very fine bill.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in addition to commending the committee to call attention of all the Members of the House to the fact that during the 19 years that I have served on the authorizing committee, the Committee on Public Works, I have heard this appropriations bill and the authorizing legislation referred to as "pork barrel," primarily in respect to the items contained in our Civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers.

I should like to call to the attention of the House that my district in southern Illinois borders the Mississippi River for approximately 150 miles. During the most recent floods, Mr. Chairman, we found that the system of levees on the Mississippi from Cairo, Ill., to its confluence with the Gulf of Mexico, saved many lives and billion of dollars. The total cost of those levees during the entire history of their construction to the taxpayers of this country was \$3.8 billion. The Army Corps of Engineers has given an official estimate of \$7.4 billion in savings because of the levees being in place, or a net savings to the taxpayers from this one flood of more than \$3 billion if you charge all the costs for the construction to 1 year's floods.

Mr. Chairman, I did not want this occasion to pass without calling to the attention of the members of the press and to those who have been referring to public works as "pork barrel" that this flood control program along the Mississippi River has saved more than \$7 billion in property damage in 1 year and we certainly cannot measure in dollars the lives that might have been lost had not these improvements been made. I want to encourage the corps to speed up plans on internal drainage projects.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should commend this distinguished committee for its far-sighted efforts in providing flood protection, water supply, navigation, recreation and other public works. As one Representative who has served here for 10 terms I want to say on behalf of all the people in Illinois and those who reside along the Mississippi River, we are indeed grateful for this committee's efforts in providing us tools with which to help ourselves. Thank you.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) yield?

Mr. ROBISON of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as the House considers the public works/AEC appropriations bill today, there is one item contained in the bill which I am particularly pleased to see. I refer to page 19 of the committee report:

St. John River Basin, Maine study—A total of \$50,000 is included in the bill to initiate the St. John River Basin Study. The Corps is directed to use these funds to conduct a study oriented only to the needs of the State of Maine. There are no funds included in the bill for a study of the overall St. John River Basin.

The committee has recommended a study of the St. John River Basin with the view to limiting any potential public works project to the State of Maine for power purposes, for irrigation uses, for flood control, for recreation, and for water quality.

Mr. Chairman, the ever-present energy crisis resulted this year in the first message on energy policies ever submitted by an American President.

At one time, we hoped that nuclear plants would provide the solution to our power problems. In recent years, however, questions have been raised about the ability of nuclear plants to heat surrounding waters at levels which do not threaten the ecological cycle of life in or near the water. Because of these environmental considerations, the granting of licenses in several instances has been delayed or deferred.

As our energy demands continue to escalate, it is imperative that we develop new sources of nonpolluting, energy-generating facilities.

The St. John River Basin study would also consider irrigation benefits for the potato farmers in Aroostook County in northern Maine. Although Maine is the second largest producer of potatoes in the Nation, we fall far behind every other large potato producing area in the amount of yield we receive per acre. This happens because we do not have enough annual rainfall to take care of our water needs.

The irrigation benefits derived from a Maine project would be extremely beneficial to our farmers in Aroostook County. In fact, it has been estimated that this irrigation would add the equivalent of \$20 million each year in more Maine potatoes.

Last, but certainly not least, the study would look into providing flood protection to the citizens of Fort Kent, Maine, who have withstood nine major floods within the past 46 years. Flood damage has unfortunately become a biennial event in Fort Kent, where serious floods have occurred as recently as May 1973, May 1971, and May 1969. And, when Fort Kent has not had major flooding, it has experienced some flooding on an annual basis.

The situation at the University of Maine in Fort Kent is particularly precarious. The recent floods caused exten-

ssive erosion along the Fish River adjacent to the campus. Fifteen of the river's banks were washed away. The erosion has endangered the construction of a \$1.5 million dormitory project.

For all of these reasons, I want to commend the Committee, the Public Works distinguished chairman, the Honorable JOE L. EVINS of Tennessee, for having included the St. John River Basin study in the bill. The citizens of Maine have waited a long time for a hydroelectric power project, and I am gratified that we are at least providing funds to consider the feasibility of such a project.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, normally I would want to speak for at least 10 or 15 minutes on a bill as important as this one, and on which I have devoted a good share of my time these past several months.

However, as my colleagues—understanding their mood—will be glad to hear, the pressure of recent events has been such that I have not been able to prepare those detailed remarks and will, accordingly, take only a brief amount of time.

Let me say, first, that I do support this bill, and recommend it to you, even though I have some reservations about a number of the items contained therein. But, obviously, any such measure as this just simply has to be a creature of compromise, and I think that, collectively, we have compromised our differences as fairly and as honestly as possible. I would also like to say—as the one member of the subcommittee who our good and patient chairman sometimes refers to as “our environmentalist”—that I believe the bill, like others of recent years, contains in nearly all critical minds a good deal less “pork” in the so-called barrel than used to be the case. Certainly, this subcommittee now is most conscious of the need to consider the environmental impact of the kinds of public works projects we consider and decide upon, and we strive hard to strike that necessary balance as between economic, or social, and environmental interests. That is a very difficult task and, based on certain of the amendments I understand may later be offered, there are some few of you who feel we have erred in a number of instances. This is an area, however, of judgment, and involves matters over which reasonable men may differ, which is something we understand even as we respect the views of those who do have differences with us.

Speaking of “differences,” I would feel compelled, Mr. Chairman, to take just a moment to state my inability to agree with the whole thrust of the language—as contained on page 5 of the committee report—having reference to the draft report of the National Water Commission. As you will note, that language sets forth, among other things, a purported subcommittee agreement that most of that draft report's conclusions and recommendations “appear to be ill-conceived.”

Well, surely, Mr. Chairman, a goodly number of those same conclusions and recommendations are controversial in that, taken together, they would pos-

sibly suggest—as the report properly notes—at least in part—

A repudiation of long-standing, basic principles of water resource development—which have guided these programs for decades.

The report language then also summarizes them as being—

A giant step backward, and obviously—very detrimental to the national interest.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest this language itself to be too strong under the circumstances. On its own, it represents a jumping to conclusions that—I say in all kindness to my Chairman—is not yet justified. None of us as individuals, and none of the legislative committees of this Congress which may eventually have to consider the draft report, have as yet had time to truly assimilate those conclusions and recommendations, or to sort out those thereof which may have merit as opposed to those which might, conceivably, be against the public interest, the determination of which, in and of itself, is no easy task. So, Mr. Chairman, I suggest we all try to keep an open mind of the matters contained in that draft report—at least until they have had a full and fair hearing.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN).

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the associate members of the subcommittee. They have been most considerate during the proceedings, having given full consideration to the statements being made by the people who appeared before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Works has worked in total concord with the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with these projects, and certainly none of the projects here being considered are out of season, because they have had the most diligent consideration by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations is to be commended for having taken this action.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, this year the Appropriations Committee on which I am privileged to serve received a great volume of testimony from members of the Delaware Basin congressional delegation and others, in support of the Tocks Island conservation project.

This authorized multipurpose development is needed to meet essential, existing public water supply, energy supply, flood control, recreation, mainstem flow improvement, and other environmental requirements of the people of the Delaware River Basin, including my own 15th Congressional District of New Jersey.

Its necessity is documented by a long line of past and recent Government and nongovernmental studies and reevaluations.

Its flood protection is needed to control the Delaware River's periodic flooding,

the last of which, in August 1955, required two Presidential disaster declarations.

Its water supply will sustain New Jersey throughout the Delaware River's prolonged drought periods, the last of which persisted for 6 years, and required the Presidential disaster declaration of August 1965.

In the 1965 Senate Interior Committee hearings on that Northeast drought disaster, Secretary Stu Udall emphasized Tocks Island would have enabled this whole Delaware River Basin region—

That is suffering most now to permanently solve its problems.

He emphasized:

Just this one dam on the mainstem, you would have no problem, because you would have the storage. Northern New Jersey would have no problem because you would have an adequate, assured, long term supply.

Tocks Island's combined energy role will meet the public's peak demand for power and system reliability. It will also permit firm river flow for the downstream power capacity needed to sustain the homes and work force of our region.

And its public lake recreation will provide needed relief from “the long hot summers” of our impacted areas.

Tocks Island project has been consistently supported by all Governors of our State from its inception to the present, including Governors Al Driscoll, Bob Meyner, Dick Hughes, and now Bill Cahill.

Our incumbent Governor, Bill Cahill, supported it as a Congressman here in 1965, urging that our prolonged droughts “demonstrate the great need” for Tocks Island, which “will create a beautiful lake,” he explained, and stressed that “the importance” of this “Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir cannot be overestimated.” He strongly urged it as Governor in 1970, emphasizing that:

Since our State's early need for water supply from the Tocks Island Project is evident, we strongly favor a start on [its] construction in the coming year as proposed by President Nixon.

And he reaffirmed its importance again just last fall, announcing that his own, independent reevaluation of it:

Has confirmed that the Tocks Island Dam would afford public benefits, especially flood protection and provision for three hundred million gallons of water per day for the State of New Jersey, for which there are no readily available, feasible, less expensive, and less environmentally destructive alternatives.

The adjustments incumbent Governor Cahill suggested, to assure Tocks Island provides these essential human needs of New Jersey without adverse side effects, are being implemented now, and will be along the way to its completion.

Since Congress last acted on this matter, it enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, of October 18, 1972. This authorizes programs and funds to handle any water pollution or eutrophication control at Tocks Island.

Accordingly, I strongly urge that the House appropriate the full amount recommended by the administration to fund this needed project, and the agencies' efforts to assure it will be built in a manner compatible with the environment.

I wish to commend the efforts of the committee's Subcommittee on Public Works in bringing us this fine bipartisan bill. It is a bill to fund this great country's necessary efforts to develop and maintain its natural resources, in a manner compatible with its environment, especially those necessary efforts recommended by the administration's Office of Management and Budget.

The committee bill contains the full amount recommended by the administration for Tocks Island. The committee report states this project "can proceed to construction" upon resolution of two questions, concerning water pollution control and possible effect on highways due to its recreation development.

Will the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee that framed this language explain those two questions to be resolved so that this needed project "can proceed to construction"?

Mr. RHODES. The new Federal Water Pollution Control Act contains funding authorization and other provisions to control any potential water pollution or eutrophication problems at Tocks Island. Over the past year the additional work of the Corps of Engineers, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, and their university and other contractors, indicates that Tocks Island's potential water pollution is not as difficult to control as originally thought.

And last month the three or four States concerned unanimously adopted their Delaware River Basin Resolution, committing themselves to provide their share of the treatment facilities needed to protect Tocks Island's water by the time it is finished, and to manage any nonpoint pollution sources in its drainage area in accordance with EPA policy requirements.

On the effect of its recreation development on highways, last month the States also unanimously adopted, also with Federal concurrence, their Delaware Basin resolution cutting Tocks Island's recreation level, or affirming it at 4 million annually, or 42,000 daily, for a maximum of about 21,000 people on its recreation area's two, New Jersey and Pennsylvania sides.

Insofar as existing roads should be improved to facilitate this reduced traffic flow after tocks is finished, Federal highway law also authorizes financial assistance for improving those primary and secondary roads.

The Secretary of the Army or Corps of Engineers are now working with other concerned Federal, State, and interstate agencies on the details of these two matters. When they are sufficiently resolved, this needed project can proceed to construction.

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

I want to thank the committee for including the budget request with regard to this project and tell Members of the House that this is one of the most beautiful projects you will ever see in America.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Appropriation bill, now under consideration, contains a number of items funded for my congressional district. These projects are for flood control, water conservation, harbor navigation, and erosion study.

I want to thank Chairman EVINS, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, the members of this subcommittee and their very able and responsive staff for all the time and personal considerations given to my requests.

These gentlemen have a most demanding and difficult task in sorting out the multitude of requests and subsequently determining which projects are to be funded. I commend them and thank them most heartily.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I thank the chairman very much for yielding me this time.

I will again offer an amendment regarding Plowshare. I do this in order to free \$3 million in the bill that can be used for other purposes. To use this money in nuclear detonations in tight gas formations is fast proving to be unwarranted. We can use it for geothermal research or for thermonuclear research, where there is only \$8 million appropriated. H. R. GROSS has said it was a wholesome act to cut an appropriation in these days. I am here to let you know that this is an opportunity to do a wholesome thing.

The USGS—the U.S. Geological Survey—has stated in an official Government report the damage to the trillions of dollars worth of oil shale that can come from atomic stimulation of the sands under their grounds.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members that we are here as guardians of the public trust. I do not say that Plowshare will destroy these shale sands, I say to you that the U.S. Geological Survey reports say that these shales may well be rendered unrecoverable. So I ask the Members to please consider this \$3 million cut in the Plowshare program.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) a few days ago said that many authorities were not right that I have been citing.

I say that the Member who is speaking was not the authority for these things, but that the U.S. Geological Survey is the authority for the damage to the oil shale. The Atomic Energy Commission is the authority that there will be 5,000 wells in full field atomic stimulation. And they will be blowing the hell out of the Rocky Mountain States—please forgive me for that statement—but I am deeply concerned about this matter.

The Atomic Energy Commission—and I wish that the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) were here to hear this—that it is not Mr. RONCALIO but that it is the Atomic Energy Commission that says this. Dr. Fleming of the Atomic Energy Commission says that there will be large quantities of water that will contain tritium. And I suggest to my fellow Members of the Congress they learn what

that means. What are you going to do with it? Are you going to shoot it back down into somebody else's aquifer? Or are you going to put it out into space and shoot it back into the sun? We have to dispose of these nuclear wastes.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Members not concur in the observation that now is not the time, I say that now is the time to help in our energy crisis, and in order to do that we must get rid of these wasteful programs and move on to programs that are truly worthwhile.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUSH).

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss a project contained in this bill. The Big Pine Creek project, located in my home State of Indiana, raises some questions in my mind.

Let me stress that I do not unequivocally oppose the Big Pine project. Rather so many unanswered questions have been brought to my attention that I have difficulty justifying expenditures on this project at this time.

The first difficulty is that the Department of Natural Resources in Indiana has not yet even determined whether it will agree to the project at all. It seems to me that the Federal Government should not be committing funds for land acquisition until we know what the State of Indiana is willing to do.

The second problem is that the legal requirement that an environmental impact State be filed has not been met. Until one is filed I cannot justify proceeding with the Big Pine project.

The third problem raised is that of the economics of the project. You may have noted some substantial discrepancies among the benefit-to-cost ratios for Big Pine published in the corps' testimony. Conversations between my office and the corps office in Louisville yesterday prove that the situation has become even more confused since that testimony was provided to the committee. The corps, as indicated in the testimony, is in the process of recomputing the costs and benefits of the Big Pine project and is finding that at least some of the sites for the project have benefit-to-cost ratios substantially lower than the 1.7 to 1 published in the hearings. The corps indicates, however, that its review of the project is not yet complete.

In fact, the corps indicates that it will not engage in any land acquisition until it has held public hearings in the area, until it has an environmental impact statement on file, and until the State authorizes the project.

Mr. Chairman, all of this is to say simply that it is not yet time—especially in an era of fiscal restraint—to appropriate money wholeheartedly for a project that is marked by such uncertainty.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of the committee to a study of the Big Pine that has just been published—so recently, in fact, that it has not yet been utilized either by the Army Corps of Engineers or by the subcommittee in its deliberations. This is a study of the geology of the Big Pine area under-

taken by the Indiana Geological Survey. While I have not yet had an opportunity to see this study, I understand that it does contain some engineering implications that the corps should be aware of before proceeding with the project. For this reason, too, I think a delay in action would be appropriate.

Lastly, I want to say just a word about the natural beauty of the area. The Geological Survey report I just mentioned notes that Big Pine Creek is one of only two rivers in Indiana that is both navigable and has sandstone outcrops or bluffs. This is a rare natural phenomenon that I would be reluctant to see destroyed, at least until all of these other matters are resolved.

These problems are pointed out in the following passage contained in a letter from Mr. Travis S. Roberts, the Regional Director of the U.S. Department of Interior's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to Col. Charles J. Fiala, the Army Corps District Engineer in Louisville:

There are . . . project aspects relating both to planning deficiencies and potential adverse effects on other natural resources (besides fish and wildlife) that greatly disturb us. We must now take the opportunity to reassess our position on this project and view its consequences, not only from the standpoint of fish and wildlife, but in respect to new responsibilities imposed by the Environmental Policy Act of 1969. From this standpoint, we concluded that the authorized plan for the Big Pine Reservoir (dam site on Big Pine Creek 2.5 miles above confluence of Wabash River) is environmentally unsound.

The committee has already reduced the budget request for this project, and I commend it for doing so. The funds in this bill for land acquisition for the Big Pine are so small—\$64,000 in carry-over funds and \$50,000 in new appropriations—that I do not intend to try to amend the bill so as to delete them. But I do feel obligated to admonish the corps to withhold the funds from what would at best be a questionable project, and could turn into a destructive and wasteful project, until the unresolved matters have been answered.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8947, the fiscal year 1974 Public Works Appropriations bill. This bill contains funding for two important flood control projects in the metropolitan Denver area which are urgently needed.

First, there is \$7.5 million for the Chatfield Dam and Reservoir. This funding will allow the Corps of Engineers to maintain a schedule which calls for closure of the dam late this summer. Second, \$3 million is included for the dam on Bear Creek. Most of these funds will be utilized for land acquisition. Finally, the bill provides \$305,000 for general investigations of future flood control needs on the South Platte River below the Chatfield Dam. These studies and investigations will center on the creeks in the metropolitan Denver area which pose a continual flash flood threat.

Mr. Chairman, in May, low-lying areas along the South Platte River, including portions of the metropolitan Denver area, were again caused serious damage by

flooding. In fact, all three counties which comprise the Second Congressional District were declared eligible for Federal disaster assistance by President Nixon. Had the Chatfield and Bear Creek projects been completed in May, it is very doubtful that the damage would have been very serious.

In addition to important flood control projects, H.R. 8947 also includes \$162,000 for fiscal year 1974 for the continuation of the Colorado Front Range feasibility study. This project, scheduled for completion in 1976, is expected to show ways of adding more than 100,000 acre-feet of water to the annual supplies of such communities as Boulder, Longmont, Broomfield, Louisville, Fort Collins, Greeley, Loveland, and Estes Park. I am sure that my colleagues who are from the Southwest or who have been there can appreciate the vital importance such a projects holds for that area.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the Appropriations Committee for its decision to provide the funds necessary to keep these important projects on schedule. I urge the passage of H.R. 8947.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, during the past several years, I have been working with the Appropriations Committee on a public works project which is of substantial importance to the city of Clinton, Iowa. For many years, Clinton, located upon the banks of the great Mississippi River, has lived under the threat of annual flooding and high water. In 1961, the Corps of Engineers approved a flood control project for Clinton. After the tragic flood of 1965, the urgency of the project was realized and local support for the project intensified.

This bill appropriates \$300,000 for the Clinton Flood Control project. These funds will be used to construct permanent floodwalls for Clinton. I have been advised by the Corps of Engineers that, with the adoption of this appropriation and the granting of necessary rights-of-way, construction could begin in May or June of next year.

Clinton was spared from severe losses by flooding this year, but this project is vitally needed to provide permanent flood protection. I have been in Clinton during periods of substantial flooding, including the 1965 disaster, and I know the destruction and expense which these recurrent tragedies have brought to individual families and to the entire city. This is the reason I have been working since I came to Congress for permanent flood control protection for Clinton and other areas vulnerable to serious flood damage.

Also included in this bill are funds to study the feasibility of relocating the small boat harbor at Clinton. The anticipated location and design of the floodwalls will make the present harbor unusable. Therefore, I requested the Public Works Appropriations Committee to include funds for a study of a new location for this important recreational facility. I am pleased that the committee recognized the justification for this project.

The funds appropriated for these two

projects in this bill are a sound investment in the future. Reducing the incidence of flooding diminishes the need for Federal financial assistance for disaster relief programs. More importantly, however, the construction of permanent floodwalls will permit the people of Clinton, Iowa, to live without the annual fear that flooding may bring death, destruction, and severe financial loss to their fine city.

I urge your support for this bill.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us contains the administration recommendation for Tocks Island conservation project. The environmental and economic improvements provided by this authorized multipurpose undertaking are urgently needed by the people of the Delaware Basin area, including the people of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey. I strongly urge adoption of the appropriations for Tocks Island.

Environmental questions have been raised that have delayed the beginning of work on this essential project, and I would certainly not lend my support to it if these questions were still to be answered. However, actions already taken and others underway fully assure that the waters of this particular reservoir will not become polluted. Specifically, the Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 authorizes Federal funds to prevent any existing or future sources of pollution in Tocks Island Reservoir, and on May 31, 1973, each of the four Delaware Basin State Governors and Secretary Morton unanimously resolved to take all appropriate water pollution control action to this end.

Other suggestions for environmentally perfecting Tocks Island—brought up last fall by New Jersey Governor Cahill, after new study convinced him that this conservation project is essential for our State—have either already been adopted, or are now being implemented in substance.

Mr. Chairman, it is imperative to proceed with construction of Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir. Every day we delay, the existing need for it grows greater. I urge the House to approve the full amount requested and already available for this needed conservation project.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee's bill, H.R. 8947, funding the full appropriation request for the Tocks Island conservation project.

This project was authorized by the Congress in 1962 as a multipurpose facility to provide flood control for the mainstream of the Delaware River, a needed new source of water supply for New Jersey and its sister States, for the generation of electric power, and as a significant new lake recreation area.

Land acquisition for the reservoir site and its surrounding national recreation area has proceeded apace. But last June the committee directed that construction of the dam be delayed pending assurance that appropriate water pollution control devices would be provided to safeguard Tocks Island Lake.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works which wrote the new Fed-

eral Water Pollution Control Act of October 18, 1972, Mr. Chairman, I remind the membership that we placed in that legislation language which specifically addresses itself to any pollution problem which might arise with respect to the Tocks Island reservoir. Moreover, this act authorizes the Federal Government to pay 75 percent of the cost of any pollution control facilities which might be deemed necessary to protect the Tocks Island reservoir.

Mr. Chairman, lately we hear a great deal about the public energy crisis. As chairman of our new Subcommittee on Energy of the House Public Works Committee, I assure you we, indeed, do have energy problems in the Delaware Basin area, as elsewhere. Although generation of electric power was not a primary benefit when the Tocks Island project was authorized, Congress subsequently amended its authorization act to enable an applicant to apply to the Federal Power Commission for the licensing of an underground hydroelectric pumped storage installation at Tocks Island Dam. If and when approved, this new underground installation will generate 1,300 megawatts of needed hydroelectric power which will be available to the Northeast power grid at times of peak public usage. Appropriate statutory and other steps have been taken to safeguard the scenic attributes of the project area so this hydroelectric facility will not detract from the recreation potential of the reservoir lake and surrounding area.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe the time has come to move this project forward. I therefore urge that the House approve the \$3 million in carryover funds and the \$5.1 million appropriation requested by the administration for the Tocks Island conservation project.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (FRANK THOMPSON) has asked that I associate him with my remarks. He is presently returning from the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, where he has been representing the House as a congressional adviser.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress are becoming increasingly aware of the need for a reassessment of energy consumption in this country. The fuel shortage of last winter and the gas shortage of this summer are but two indications that there is indeed an energy crisis.

Dr. Paul E. Gray, chancellor of MIT and one of our most eminent scientists, delivered a statement on the energy problem several months ago that is particularly comprehensive and enlightening. I would like to paraphrase his remarks here, as they reflect my own view of the massive problems at hand.

Present energy consumption in this Nation is prodigious. Energy sales constitute approximately 10 percent of the GNP. The per capita rate of consumption is 10 kilowatts or 13 horsepower hourly. In other terms, each U.S. resident uses for personal needs in light, heat, and transportation and in the provisions of services we depend on, energy totaling 80 times the average daily caloric input. This is markedly more than consumption in any other country. The

United States, with 6 percent of the world population, consumes 35 percent of the energy used throughout the world.

This rate of consumption is not merely a reflection of our level of industrialization in all sectors of our economy. In addition, it is the most conclusive indication of the American habit of luxury items. We drive larger cars that consume more gas than any other people; we are accustomed to central heating and air conditioning; and we have a national love for TV, dishwashers and washing machines. Every home that can afford such appliances possesses them.

In the last century the use of energy in the United States has doubled, on the average, every 22 years. The rate of energy use today grows at 4.3 percent annually, or it doubles in 16 years. When further broken down, it appears that electricity consumption is growing nearly twice as fast—at a rate of 10 percent per year, or a doubling time of 7 years.

Certain ecological standards, such as those for automotive emissions, tend to increase the rate of growth of consumption. For example, the cost of removal of lead from gasoline equals a 12 percent increase in gasoline use for the same power output. Reduction of carbon monoxide and other exhaust to meet the 1975 standards will also be accompanied by a 26-30 percent increase in gas consumption. The day of the 6 mile per gallon automobile is no longer in the distant future.

Similar growth rates can be cited for the air conditioning in private homes, in industry and in transportation.

It must be noted that energy consumption and growth of the economy are closely related factors. A book entitled "Energy in the World Economy" by Darmstadter, Teitelbaum and Polach, documents the interdependence. This universal relationship, found in countries as diverse as the United States and Thailand, leads to the conclusion that economic growth is inevitably dependent on energy supply.

However, data leads us to the inescapable conclusion that our reserves are dwindling. If the demand for energy continues to grow at its historic rate we will exhaust our fossil fuel reserves, proven and anticipated, in less than a century, and possibly in 50 years. Such an accomplishment will mean that we will have used up in less than 200 years a resource that was made over hundreds of millions of years.

We do have several alternatives. The first choice, and perhaps the least wise, will be to turn increasingly to foreign sources of energy—Mideast oil or Russian liquefied gas. There are large reserves in these areas but such dependence would be a blow to our diplomatic integrity. And the strain on our balance of payments would have serious ramifications to the world economy.

A second course of action is the development of alternative non-fossil-fuel energy sources. Solar energy, geothermal energy, and nuclear energy are some possibilities.

Solar energy is in abundant supply, but the capital costs associated with conversion to a more useful form are prohibitive. The matter of energy storage also presents many problems.

Similar objections are raised about geothermal energy—that energy associated with the hot, radioactive core of the earth. We are still many years away from an accurate assessment of costs and impacts of its use on large scale.

Nuclear energy is, of course, our primary non-fossil-fuel energy resource for the future. The breeder reactor, using the relatively inexpensive isotope of uranium as a fuel, can provide an unlimited supply of energy. However these are still problems associated with nuclear powerplants. For example, such plants emit small amounts of ionizing radiation into the environment. The risk associated with this emission is still undetermined. The possibility of an accident cannot be dismissed and memories of Hiroshima and Nagasaki still linger. And nuclear fission generates poisonous radioactive waste that is long-lived and potent. We have not yet adequately prepared for the management of this waste.

These problems can undoubtedly be solved, but it is difficult to predict how far in the future such resolution is. Thus, fusion power, while still a feasible long-range alternative, will not be a factor in meeting our energy appetite this century.

Clearly the most viable course of action involves reducing the rate of growth of energy demand. It would reduce future demand for energy and would buy us valuable time to develop non-fossil-fuel alternatives. This is not an impossible proposition. Full insulation of homes, and proper siting, could reduce home heating and air conditioning energy demand by 30 percent. Smaller automobiles and efficient mass transit systems would result in tremendous gasoline savings. Home appliances could be manufactured with energy utilization as a prime consideration. Many industrial processes could be redesigned. For example, Alcoa has a new process for smelting aluminum that requires 40 percent less energy. Adoption of this process by the aluminum refining industry could have a significant effect in reducing energy consumption. Finally, office building designs could be altered so that the dependence on energy for comfortable air is not so great. Tremendous economies are feasible in all areas of our society.

For the present, it seems unavoidable that energy conservation will become imperative. Market forces will require it. As energy becomes a more precious resource, rapidly rising costs will cause all of us to be much more frugal with it.

Our response to this energy crisis must be multiple: We must consume energy more carefully. We must develop alternatives to fossil fuels. Most important, we must develop a national structure to deal with the complex problem of energy in an integrated fashion. We must learn to plan more than a century ahead. At present there is no clear level of responsibility for exploring energy alternatives, let alone for developing policy. Concern at the Federal level is fragmented and the power industry has shrugged off any responsibility.

We must be hopeful that the heat of the debate, growing more powerful each day between the factions concerned with energy, will yield fruitful plans for confronting the crisis head-on. A rational,

comprehensive and viable energy policy, emanating from the national level, is imperative.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Reclamation, during its hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, sought additional appropriations of \$17,000,000 for work on the Garrison diversion unit in North Dakota, a part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program. This is an increase in obligation programs for this project from \$17 million in fiscal year 1973 to \$19,540,000 in fiscal year 1974. This construction is for the project authorized by Public Law 89-108 enacted in August 1965. In the original law, an authorization of \$207 million was provided. Today, the total Federal cost is estimated to be about \$340 million. Some \$76 million has already been allotted—another \$259 million will be required to complete the project. In other words, the project is between 15 to 20 percent completed—and there has been a cost overrun of about 60 percent. One can only guess at what will be the final cost of the project and the final percent of cost overrun.

If this was a justifiable project, I would not object. If benefits had increased as well as costs, then there would be little to complain about.

But the justification for this project has always been questionable—and the further the bureau proceeds, the more it finds that its planned and calculated benefits are turning into disastrous and unforeseen costs.

IRRIGATION

In the budget justification provided by the bureau this year, costs attributable to irrigation for the Garrison project were estimated for fiscal year 1974 at \$305.4 million—an increase of \$25.6 million over the estimate for fiscal year 1973.

Does this area of the country in North and South Dakota need irrigation? The fact is, as the North Dakota chapter of the Wildlife Society has pointed out:

Under the project 250,000 acres are to be irrigated to increase agricultural production in a State where in 1970 over 4 million acres were idled to reduce crop production.

Furthermore, the 250,000 acres to be irrigated represents less than 0.6 percent of the 42 million acres of agricultural land in North Dakota. It is impossible to justify how irrigation of 0.6 percent of the State's agricultural land, which has a direct impact on less than 3 percent of the population of North Dakota, will result in the stabilization of the State's agricultural production, economy, and population.

The 19 North Dakota counties in the project area and the two South Dakota counties already produce a bountiful agricultural harvest through dry farming methods.

According to the 1969 census of agriculture the average size of the farms in the 21 counties was 831.4 acres, with 96.7 percent of the total area utilized for farming. Some 63.5 percent of the farmers have farms with over 500 or more acres: a shocking figure considering the bureau of reclamation prohibits the use of irrigation water on husband-wife farms of more than 320 acres. In short, the area is heavily farmed. It is not a

desert waiting to be turned into an oasis by the Bureau's System of Canals.

In fact, the size of many of the farms in the area creates a problem in light of the bureau's original 1902 purpose and law. The bureau was established to help settle farmers on homesteads out west. The goal was the creation of a large number of small family farms. To obtain that goal, a single person was entitled to bureau irrigated water on only 160 acres of property; a couple was eligible for irrigation on up to 320 acres of land.

Now this law has frequently been ignored. Last November the General Accounting Office examined the 160-acre limitation and the way the Bureau was enforcing it in the Central Valley project of California. According to the GAO report, in the seven irrigation districts of the Central Valley project of California which were studied, "71,645 of the 502,499 acres (receiving irrigation benefits), or about 14 percent, were owned or leased by the seven largest farm operators. Their farms ranged from 1,774 to 40,404 acres."

Now perhaps it is time that we changed the 160-acre limitation on unsubsidized irrigated land. I personally doubt that one could receive an adequate return on investment on a Midwest farm, growing grain, if your landholding was limited to 160 acres.

But it is obvious that if the Bureau is going to enforce the acreage limitation laws, then many farmers in the area will only partially benefit or will even have to divest their property.

I have checked with the Department of Agriculture and they have provided me with county-by-county totals of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service's producer payments—excluding loans—which were made in calendar year 1972.

In North Dakota, in 19 counties, some 29,182 payees received \$80,870,000 or about \$2,780 per payee. In the two South Dakota counties, 3,147 payees received about \$7.9 million—about \$2,600 per payee. Crops presently grown in the area include wheat, feed grains, alfalfa, and corn for silage. Under irrigation, increased production of feed grains, forages, potatoes, and sugar beets are likely, the conclusion of my speech the table crops will be eligible for price supports.

I would like to enter in the RECORD at the conclusion of my speech the table of statistics I have compiled concerning the characteristics of the counties which will be participating in the garrison diversion unit irrigation program.

I do not know how much of the future agricultural crop subsidy payments in the area will go to farms receiving subsidizing irrigation waters from the bureau. It will take a detailed, on-site investigation to determine this data. But this is certainly something we should determine before we provide any more monumental irrigation projects.

It is clear that, not only is the area heavily farmed already, not only are there a number of large farm holdings, but the area produces so much food that it has to participate in the farm price support and stabilization programs.

If the land is irrigated through ex-

pansion of the garrison diversion project, apparently this will result in more intensive farming. More intensive farming will lead to more production—more production will decrease the price of similar products for farmers throughout the entire nation—and this will mean that the taxpayers will have to provide more in the way of stabilization payments.

This problem is confirmed by the review draft of the "proposed report of the National Water Commission" which was first released last November. That report stated on page 5-54:

Not only must the taxpayer pay a large portion of the costs of bringing new land into production, but he must also pay for farm price support programs, the costs of which go up as farm production of supported crops increases. It has been estimated that in the period 1944-64, something between \$83 million and \$179 million in annual payments to farmers under Federal Farm price support programs can be directly attributed to increased production from reclamation lands.

It is a vicious circle—and the taxpayer is caught in the middle. The more the taxpayer pays for irrigation projects to create more farmland, the more he has to pay to farmers to provide them with a decent price for their products.

The need for expansion or continuation of these fantastically costly bureau projects is highly questionable. Again, as the review draft of the "Water Commission Report" stated last November—and reaffirmed in its final report issued 2 weeks ago:

There is adequate productive capacity in the Nation's agriculture to meet food and fiber demand under various alternative futures at least until the year 2000. There consequently is no need in the next 30 years for federally subsidized water resource development programs to increase the agricultural land base of the country.

I would like to add at this point that it would be interesting to try to determine how many farmers in other parts of the country—especially in the southern cotton lands—have been driven off their lands and into the cities because of subsidized competition from large, irrigated agribusiness farms supported by the Bureau of Reclamation. Again, quoting from the "review draft" of the "proposed report of the National Water Commission" on page 5-54 there is a footnote reference to a book by Howe and Easter entitled, "Interbasin Transfers of Water" in which the authors estimate that—

The 3.3 million acres of additional irrigated cropland developed by the bureau in the period 1944-1964 displaced from 5 to 18 million acres elsewhere in the country. This amounts to something between 8 and 20 percent of the 66 million-acre decline in harvested cropland in the 20-year period.

It is because of federally subsidized projects such as the Garrison diversion unit that causes the farmers from my State—a State of fertile soil and good climate—to come to me complaining of low farm prices. Because of these Federal subsidies there seems to be no profit in farming, causing young men and women to leave the farms for the cities. Driving through Ohio—or for that matter such of the surrounding Maryland and Virginia countryside—you can see

thousands upon thousands of acres of farm land unused and abandoned. These farms and their economies have been destroyed by competition from subsidized irrigation projects which have opened up new lands—and driven the old lands out of production.

EFFECT OF THE GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT ON THE INDIVIDUAL FARMER

The Garrison project is now opposed by the 31,000-member North Dakota Farmers Union, the NFO, and the North Dakota Wildlife Federation—the State's largest conservation organization.

If the farmers of North Dakota do not want this project, who does?

It is interesting to note that if the individual farmer invested an amount of money equal to the per-acre costs of subsidized irrigation provided by the project into expanding and improving his dryland operations, his return would be larger than if his money was used for irrigation.

What is the per-farm cost of this irrigation project? Assuming that all 21,000 farms in the 21 counties receive irrigation water, at a total project cost of \$340 million—allowing for no more cost overruns—then the irrigation investment per farm would be \$16,000. A fantastic cost for farms that are already producing an abundance of food.

FISH AND WILDLIFE BENEFITS

In the area of fish and wildlife facilities, the Bureau of Reclamation seeks an increase in cost allocations from \$29.8 million in fiscal 1973 to \$32.3 million in fiscal year 1974. The increased funding over the life of the project is for the establishment of lakes and ponds to offset the loss to waterfowl habitat resulting from irrigation development and the draining of wetlands.

This request points out one of the unavoidable adverse effects of the project. Not only will 26,311 to 39,533 acres of natural wet prairie wetlands be destroyed by the project but 34,000 acres of existing wetlands and 22,075 acres of new wetlands will be adversely affected from the introduction of rough fish species and the

degradation of water quality throughout the area.

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WATER USE

The Bureau is increasing its estimated project costs in the area of municipal and industrial water supply from \$17.5 million to 18.9 million. It is also asking for 58,000 for a new study of supplying water to local communities. This request has been submitted despite the fact that the major community in the area has just discovered a natural ground supply of water estimated to last for a minimum of 50 years.

There is one other disturbing aspect about the Garrison project in addition to all the other points which have been raised on the floor of the House today. In the committee's hearing record, in volume 3, there is a statement on page 216 of a possible future investigation program for the Garrison division.

This investigation is part of an effort to determine:

The extent and location of the initial 250,000 acre stage of the Garrison Diversion Unit. The studies may result in recommendations for study of future stages of the 1,007,000 acres.

A total of 1,700,000 acres of arable land has been delineated. This land would form the backbone for selection of about 757,000 acres as potential additions to the unit.

It is obvious that this project will continue to mushroom ever bigger and bigger.

It was originally scheduled to serve a quarter million acres for about \$200 million. That cost has now doubled with only 15-20 percent of the construction work completed.

If the project is expanded to serve a million acres, then it is probable that the total cost of the expanded project would run between \$1.6 billion and \$2 billion.

It is time that this madness be stopped.

WHAT PERCENTAGE OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION BENEFITS ACCRUE TO EXPORTERS?

I have another objection to aspects of Bureau projects. Several weeks ago, when we considered the Agriculture Department appropriation bill, I indicated my displeasure with current agricultural

policies under which the Nation was exporting agricultural products to such an extent that it was creating food shortages and high prices for the American people. While agricultural exports totaled \$11 billion last year, these exports, including sharp increases in wheat and soybean sales, have raised prices to the American consumers by \$24 billion—more than double the dollar value of the exports.

Subsidies, incentives, and land improvements may deserve taxpayer support. But in my judgment, subsidies, incentives, and land improvements make sense only when they are designed to provide food and fiber for the American market. I do not believe that the American taxpayer should be taxed to pay for subsidies, land improvement, and payment to create products for export. Let the producers for export risk their own capital and develop their own land.

IS THERE A BENEFIT TO THE NATION IN INCREASED REVENUES?

Finally, to a great extent, the benefit-cost ratios of these projects can be measured by the increased revenue reflected in Federal income taxes. While data are not available for specific irrigation districts, the Federal income tax payments of American agriculture are shockingly low.

According to estimates provided by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, it is estimated that for calendar year 1970, proprietorship, partnership, and corporate businesses engaged in agriculture, forestry, and fishing and showing a net profit had an income tax liability of \$1.6 billion. Within this figure businesses classified as "farms" had an income liability of 1.4 billion and the corporate share of these estimates of income tax liability was approximately \$100 million. These figures are so low—even after 71 years of Bureau activity—that they would indicate to me that the Bureau has generally failed in its effort to improve the income of American farmers. It is time that this entire program be reexamined and reevaluated.

A table follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE COUNTY TOTALS OF AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE PRODUCER PAYMENTS EXCLUDING LOANS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1972, IN WHICH FACILITIES ARE LOCATED: 1969 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

County	Proportion in farms (percent)	Payees	Payment	Average size of farm in acres	Number of farms	Number 2,000 plus acres	Total market value of agriculture
North Dakota:							
Benson	93.2	1,531	\$5,240,014	856.1	977	52	\$14.4
Bottineau	99.7	2,336	6,641,648	838.1	1,277	72	16.1
Burleigh	98.5	1,185	2,646,863	1,099.7	932	122	15.0
Dickey	95.3	1,189	2,745,277	833.1	837	36	15.7
Eddy	102.0	604	1,674,242	931.1	445	30	7.0
Foster	95.5	642	2,124,063	916.9	430	36	9.4
La Moure	99.7	1,431	3,899,178	717.1	1,011	22	17.2
McHenry	94.1	1,886	4,311,405	934.2	1,211	144	15.0
McLean	95.3	2,530	6,729,078	874.8	1,439	79	19.7
Nelson	101.0	1,342	4,276,003	817.7	787	30	12.9
Ramsey	94.0	1,445	6,724,527	846.0	888	46	14.2
Ransom	101.0	1,064	2,625,927	723.0	770	27	12.3
Renville	93.5	1,340	3,447,722	861.1	616	58	8.4
Richland	92.8	2,336	5,158,141	528.7	1,627	17	29.6
Sargent	98.1	1,125	2,603,193	680.6	787	26	12.3
Sheridan	94.8	1,022	2,287,516	916.8	654	46	8.8
Stutsman	93.3	2,031	6,656,473	957.6	1,412	110	26.4
Ward	96.9	2,627	6,577,549	815.1	1,555	76	22.0
Wells	99.8	1,516	4,511,984	854.7	971	44	18.9
Total	1,838.5	29,182	80,880,803	16,002.4	18,626	1,073	295.3
South Dakota:							
Brown	99.7	2,137	5,501,871	759.8	1,406	69	35.4
Marshall	92.1	1,010	2,362,674	698.2	716	16	20.6
Total	191.8	3,147	7,864,545	1,457.9	2,122	85	56.0
Grand total	2,030.3	32,329	88,745,348	17,460.3	20,748	1,158	351.3

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

**TITLE I—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
OPERATING EXPENSES**

For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed \$30,000); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,676,563,000 and any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount \$100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred.

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RONCALIO
OF WYOMING**

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming: Page 2, line 21, strike out "\$1,676,563,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,672,763,000".

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I would like my colleagues to note that this is not a sudden last minute attempt to revise the will of the House, but it is the product of repeated attempts to bring to the attention of Members what we are dealing with in regard to Plowshare and why this program must be abandoned.

The intent of my amendment is to eliminate funds for the continuance of Plowshare's nuclear stimulation of natural gas. A year ago, after months of study, I offered a similar amendment intended to delete funding for Plowshare in the appropriations bill. Now after concentrated research, discussions, and study of alternatives, I again offer an amendment with even stronger personal convictions. I submitted testimony to the Public Works-AEC Appropriations Subcommittee detailing objections to nuclear stimulation and requested that funds not be appropriated for this effort. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I worked to have the program shelved there during consideration of AEC authorization. Finally, on Monday of this week, I offered an amendment to the AEC authorization bill to remove funds for nuclear

stimulation from Plowshare and transfer such authorization amounts to controlled thermonuclear research.

My amendment today would simply delete such funds, but I would hope that they could be made available for use in the needed area of geothermal energy research and development.

We are dealing here with \$3.8 million which is proposed for use by the AEC for its program of nuclear stimulation of natural gas trapped in deep, tight, formations in the Rocky Mountain West. I contend that this is a wasteful expenditure and that it would do far more to relieve our energy dilemma if it were made available for use in the area of geothermal energy research and development.

I am by no means opposed to going after this gas. There are economically feasible alternatives which can be developed for freeing and extracting it. The Bureau of Mines appropriation, passed by this body yesterday, included \$500,000 for research on just this effort. The AEC appropriation we are considering today contains \$800,000 for such research. I submit that if the amounts of funding which nuclear stimulation has enjoyed would have been available for development of conventional methods, hydrofracturing, we would not even be considering nuclear stimulation funding.

Let me briefly review for you once again my major objections to the development of the nuclear stimulation technology. The AEC has projected as recently as April 27, 1973, that 5,680 gas wells will be stimulated with nuclear devices over the next 35 years to release the amounts of gas estimated to be available. These wells would each have from three to six 100-kiloton nuclear explosives. By simple multiplication, that is 17,000 to 34,000 100 kiloton nuclear explosions racking the Rocky Mountain West.

Proponents of this technology argue that we have only stimulated three wells thus far, Gasbuggy, Rulison, and Rio Blanco, that these were test wells and that none are scheduled definitely for stimulation now. However, let me emphasize that this technology is not being developed for textbooks. If we allow it to continue, it will be employed. Gas companies are waiting for the go ahead from the AEC now. The very able chairman of the AEC, Dr. Dixie Lee Ray, has stated that Wagonwheel, the next projected test detonation for nuclear stimulation, is dead as a doornail. Nevertheless, the cooperating gas company on that experiment is still very much promoting it.

The three completed test wells were that, test wells, but from them we can gather an insight into what may be anticipated in full field development with this technology. In fact, any consideration of nuclear stimulation must be taken in the context of full field development. In this regard, it is interesting to note that there has been no Environmental Impact Statement compiled for full field employment and the consequences of such development of nuclear stimulation is where my concern,

and that of many others in the vicinities to be stimulated, lie.

There remains a definite possibility of ground water contamination from these wells. Water has entered the Gasbuggy chimney through a defect in the emplacement well casing. Within the chimney are Strontium-90 and Cesium-137 which if dissolved in this water, or water entering future chimneys, may migrate from the well mingling with existing aquifers and possibly bringing radioactive contamination into usable ground waters. These nuclides have half lives of 28 and 30 years meaning that there will be a good deal of time for them to move significantly before they have decayed—1,500 years or more.

In late 1972, the U.S. Geological Survey reported its apprehensions over employment of nuclear stimulation. It stated the possibility of the mixing of low quality aquifers with good ground water as a result of fracturing of the separating underground formations. The USGS also discussed the ramifications which nuclear stimulation hold for recovery of the vast oil shale resources in the West. Here we are dealing with a serious energy trade off. At a time when we are seeking various avenues for alleviating energy shortages, we cannot afford to sacrifice crude oil shale to a technology which has workable alternatives. The Green River formation is estimated to contain 1.8 trillion barrels of crude oil shale, 54 billion barrels of which are economically recoverable. Large amounts of this oil shale overlay those trapped gas formations which are projected for nuclear stimulation. The Geological Survey has stated that the mining of oil shale would not be compatible with concurrent nuclear stimulation of gas wells.

Other serious concerns include the problem of disposing of 100,000 barrels of tritiated water which Dr. Edward Fleming of the AEC stated in March 1973 would be biproduced from each well. Using the AEC's full field development figures, we are talking about the disposal of up to 568 million barrels, or about 55,000 acre feet, of contaminated water. The recent Rangely Study conducted by the USGS demonstrates the correlation between injection of water into deep formations and ground movement along existing faults. The prominent proposals for disposal of the tritiated water are to reinject it back into wells from which it comes, inject into other deep wells, or inject it into cavities created for that purpose by nuclear explosions. The Rangely Study results definitely show the dangers inherent in such disposal. The containment of such volumes of contaminated water by any means is a serious question to be dealt with.

If uranium is used in the stimulation devices, there would be a serious detracting from our on-going reactor program. There is already a lag in uranium exploration and extraction. The AEC estimates that it will require 120,000 tons of uranium annually by the year 1990. Only 13,000 tons were produced in 1972. We cannot afford this detracting of uranium for nuclear stimulation. Even if plutonium were used, there is concern that not enough would be available for full field

development until the breeder reactors are on line.

With nuclear stimulation, we are asking the consumer to pay twice for the natural gas, once as a taxpayer to support this program, and once again purchasing the gas. In order for nuclear stimulation to be economically feasible, the wellhead price of gas would have to raise considerably. If it is allowed to so rise, then conventional methods currently available become economically attractive. A recent University of Colorado study reported that nuclear stimulation of the Rulison well in 1969 cost \$11 million and produced only \$1.5 million worth of low quality, radioactive gas.

Experts in hydraulic fracturing now state that conventional fracturing treatments of these tight gas-bearing sands will reach out 500 to 1,000 feet from the producing well. It is now commercially feasible, according to a Texas A. & M. University expert, to produce gas from reservoirs having permeabilities of less than 0.05 millidarcy. Continued development of conventional hydro-fracturing will mean recovery from formations with permeabilities of less than 0.01 millidarcy.

Not only is nuclear stimulation economically and environmentally bad sense, but its employment will destroy the quality of life enjoyed by those persons living in the areas in which field development occurs. There will be seismic damage to their homes, buildings, and other permanent structures from the detonations. These people will be required to leave their homes during each set of stimulations. They will experience extreme inconvenience and uncertainty of the amounts of damage to their property from each new set of detonations.

Consider the implications which the development of this technology hold for the Rocky Mountain West. There are other alternatives to get at this gas. I appeal to you to vote for this amendment to stop further funding and development of nuclear stimulation.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I personally have great respect for the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming. He is a valued member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Last week on the authorizing legislation for the Atomic Energy Commission he offered a similar amendment to delete funds for Plowshare. It was defeated.

I have to tell you what the committee has done. The budget estimate was \$3.8 million for Project Plowshare, which is not for atomic testing but for the stimulation of natural gas. We are facing an energy crisis in this Nation today. The purpose of this program is to provide funds for gas stimulation to help solve the energy crisis. The committee added only \$800,000 to the program and there is \$4.6 million in the bill.

In 1973 there was \$6.8 million in the AEC budget for Plowshare; in 1972, \$6.8 million. Thus the program has been cut back rather extensively from recent levels.

One of the objectives of this program is to determine economic feasibility of

several non-nuclear stimulation techniques. The long range objective is to provide this Nation with the best technique to recover natural gas which is not now recoverable with current technology. Because of the emerging energy crisis especially in areas of natural gas I oppose the amendment to delete funds from the Plowshare program and I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Eighty-three 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. 307]

Ashbrook	Fraser	Roncalio, Wyo.
Badillo	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hébert	Rosenthal
Breaux	Heckler, Mass.	Ryan
Broyhill, N.C.	Hollifield	Sandman
Carey, N.Y.	Horton	Satterfield
Clark	Kastenmeier	Steiger, Wis.
Danielson	King	Stuckey
Dent	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Derwinski	Nedzi	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	O'Neill	Thornton
Dingell	Peyser	Tieman
Edwards, Calif.	Price, Tex.	Wilson,
Esch	Reld	Charles H.,
Fisher	Rodino	Calif.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ICHORD, 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. 8947, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 390 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. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, the committee's bill H.R. 8947 contains the administration's full appropriation recommended for the needed Tocks Island conservation project. I strongly urge its enactment.

For 17 years the Seventh Congressional District of New Jersey, which I have the honor to represent, included the area of the authorized Tocks Island Lake conservation project.

I represented it during the Delaware River's disastrous floods of 1955, and its disastrous drought period of 1960-66, and through all their lingering adverse effects "on the quality of the human environment."

I also represented it in 1962, when we authorized the Tocks Island multipurpose project to prevent repetition of those disastrous floods and protracted drought crises, and to meet the additional energy and lake recreation needs of the people of New Jersey, and elsewhere throughout the Delaware River Basin area.

While the other purposes of Tocks

Island are important, Mr. Chairman, its water supply purpose is paramount. Our need for it was great at the time of the Presidential Drought Disaster Declaration of 1965. Our need for it is far greater today. For our numbers and requirements are now far greater, and will be still greater in the future.

In the congressional hearings called at the height of our last drought crisis, the head of the Water Resources Council then explained that the Tocks Island conservation impoundment:

Is an opportunity for this very region that is suffering most now to permanently solve its problems," and "if we had the Tocks Island Dam in today, just this one dam on the mainstream . . . [in 1965] you would have no problem, because you would have the storage. Northern New Jersey would have no problem because you would have an adequate, assured, long term supply.

Again, last year Major General Groves reported that, under the Northeast Water Supply Act of 1965, all water supply feasibility studies, including desalination and all other studies, establish that there is:

No viable alternative to Tocks Island if we are to meet the foreseeable water supply needs of this region, the needs toward which the Congress has directed our attention.

Finally, just this past fall, our incumbent Governor, William Cahill, reported that his own, independent reevaluation of Tocks Islands:

Has confirmed that the Tocks Island Dam would afford public benefits, especially flood protection and provision for three hundred million gallons of water per day for the State of New Jersey, for which there are no readily available, feasible, less expensive, and less environmentally destructive alternatives.

The Tocks Island Conservation project has been authorized. It is essential. Its environmental effects have been determined and disclosed. It will be constructed to avoid or minimize adverse effects on the environment. I strongly urge appropriation of the funds necessary to bring it into being.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO) would strike all but \$800,000 of the funds for Project Plowshare—\$4.6 million is in the bill for that project.

This is a rather modest project, Mr. Chairman. The comparable amount for last year was \$6.8 million. So actually the program is down.

Mr. Chairman, there are no nuclear explosion experiments projected for fiscal year 1974. This is a project which has as its purpose the freeing of supplies of natural gas so that they can be more readily captured and used for the benefit of mankind.

There is a lot of natural gas imprisoned in rock and hardpacked sand which cannot be recovered except by unusual means. The gentleman from Wyoming seems to indicate that this gas could be captured if wells were drilled in the proper places. That is just not the situation, because even though wells were drilled very likely the gas would not be freed in sufficient quantities to be commercially available for use.

So this is a very necessary thing. This is an experimental project which is important insofar as the conquering of our energy crisis is concerned.

It would certainly be my hope, Mr. Chairman, that we would vote down the amendment and keep this very important and very necessary item in the bill.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. It is not my intention—and I am sure you do not want to mislead the Committee—to cut the entire appropriation for the Plowshare program, but only that portion which is used for research for nuclear detonation. There are still remaining very substantial sums, \$800,000, for non-nuclear research looking to tight gas field stimulation.

Mr. RHODES. In that event, I really have problems understanding the gentleman's amendment, because, as I understand it, there are no nuclear detonations which are projected for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I am grateful to the gentleman for raising that point. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES. Yes.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. The fact is that this is precisely what we are voting on. This is an authorization in an appropriation bill for \$3.5 million for laboratory work for nuclear development on detonating mechanisms for underground use.

Mr. RHODES. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me this is for experimentation and development of possible nuclear charges to be used at some time in the future if they can work, but, of course, if they do not work, they will not be used. So the idea is to try to get a better technique so that this very important project for the development of natural gas may proceed.

Mr. WAGGONER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Certainly I would like to concur in his decision that this amendment should be opposed. The gentleman has said that it is felt by the sponsor of the amendment that if wells were drilled, this gas would be released. The basic problem in finding gas is to know where to drill wells. That is the reason, among others, or one of the reasons why we have a shortage; we do not know where to drill the wells. And we are dealing with a totally different set of circumstances in Plowshare.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. He is precisely correct.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Sometimes I think we sound like sixth graders when we talk this way. Tight gas formations are tight gas formations. They are where they are—Wyoming, Colorado, and few other places. Now, whether it is nuclear or not, the only places they drill

to fracture is where necessary. There is no need to look for tight gas structures.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would strike funds which are very important for experimentation for possible future use of nuclear means for the purpose of freeing natural gas, which we need, and I hope that the funds will be retained in the bill.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Wyoming has taken my name in vain in repetition of his "what if's" syndrome whereby he says "what if this and what if that happens. won't the world fall in and the sky fall in along with it?"

I understand he has quoted an alleged report attributed to the Geological Survey, which is supposed to say that there is some leakage at the Rulison plowshare shot hole in Colorado.

This whole thing started when a man named Tom Adams whom I know nothing more about, started making some complaints to some unidentified authorities in Colorado against the Plowshare projects. These were made on a hearsay basis and attributed by Adams to somebody in the CERGO Nuclear Corp. The second hand story was about some supposed leakage of water into the Rulison hole and somehow it was attributed to some unspecified Geological Survey report.

I understand further, and I am going to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming shortly, that the Atomic Energy Commission has made a search for such a report, and such a report has never been found. Insofar as the Atomic Energy is concerned such a report does not exist.

Furthermore, the Atomic Energy Commission states unequivocally that there has been no leakage of water into the Rulison hole. The Atomic Energy Commission states that when such an underground explosion goes off, as a natural consequence a certain amount of water is formed. It is called connate water. At the time this connate water is formed by a nuclear explosion there is also created a finite amount of tritium. This tritium at Rulison was monitored and measured and its concentration in the connate water established.

Since Rulison went off last year, or the year before, the concentration of tritium has not decreased any more than it would decrease in the natural decay. This, of course, is proof positive that no water is leaking into the hole. If so, the measureable concentration of tritium in the Rulison connate water would be found to be diluted. The fact is, that its measured concentration is exactly what it ought to be. No dilution has occurred. Therefore, no leak of water into the hole has occurred.

The only thing we know about any leakage in a Plowshare shot was that which occurred in the initial shot, the first shot that took place back in 1967 called Gasbuggy. In that case there was a small amount of leakage of water into the hole, but very quickly, however, it ceased and the casing sealed itself.

And I might add that in the Canni-

kan nuclear weapon test at Amchitka, which was almost 5 megatons, has been accompanied by no leakage of any kind.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get this thing straightened out, and I will be glad to see any papers that the gentleman from Wyoming has.

I now yield to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me, and I too would appreciate some light being shown.

The gentleman from California said that I said there was some leakage. I said there was water in the casing, and my authority is the AEC which has admitted that water entered the chimney via faulty emplacement well casing.

Mr. HOSMER. We are talking about water, connate water, and not leakage of water.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I stand on what I said.

Mr. HOSMER. Does the gentleman from Wyoming know the difference?

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I do not, and I submit that the gentleman does not know, and few others on the floor. That is the trouble with the nuclear field, so few know what we are talking about in this technical field.

Mr. HOSMER. I believe that I know what I am talking about when I say that I know the difference between leakage and connate water.

Does the gentleman from Wyoming understand the difference?

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I do not.

Mr. HOSMER. Does the gentleman from Wyoming admit he is speaking from hearsay?

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. No.

If the gentleman will yield further, I am not speaking from hearsay. I quoted my authority in my argument that I presented when the gentleman from California was not present.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman from Wyoming says he is not speaking from hearsay, and cannot produce any document, so the gentleman must have been down at the bottom of the well and seen the water.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. If the gentleman will yield further, my authority is the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Atomic Energy Commission. And also the fact that despite the nice things the gentleman from California has said about these wells, they have been detonated with nuclear stimulation, the results are still unknown, and not 1 foot of natural gas has been produced for commercial sale. It is all contained, because it is still too contaminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOSMER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute).

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman from Wyoming says that his authority is the Atomic Energy Commission and that the Atomic Energy Commission has told him that there has been leakage, and the Atomic Energy Commission has told me that there has been no leakage. Can the gentleman from Wyoming explain that?

I will yield the balance of my time to him for any explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 303, answered "present" 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

AYES—108

Abzug	Gilman	Podell
Addabbo	Gonzalez	Rangel
Aspin	Grasso	Rees
Bafalis	Green, Pa.	Regula
Bennett	Gross	Reuss
Bergland	Gude	Riegle
Biaggi	Gunter	Rinaldo
Blester	Hanna	Rodino
Bingham	Harsha	Roe
Boggs	Hawkins	Roncalio, Wyo.
Brasco	Hays	Rosenthal
Brinkley	Hechler, W. Va.	Roybal
Brown, Calif.	Heinz	Ryan
Burke, Calif.	Helstoski	St Germain
Burton	Hicks	Sarbanes
Carey, N.Y.	Howard	Saylor
Chisholm	Karth	Schroeder
Clay	Kastenmeier	Seiberling
Conte	Koch	Skubitz
Conyers	Leggett	Stanton
Culver	Lehman	J. William
Daniels	Long, La.	Stanton
Dominick V.	Long, Md.	James V.
Dellums	Maraziti	Stark
Denholm	Matsunaga	Steelman
Drinan	Mazzoli	Stephens
Eckhardt	Melcher	Stokes
Edwards, Calif.	Mezvisinsky	Studds
Ellberg	Minish	Sullivan
Esch	Mink	Thone
Evans, Colo.	Mitchell, Md.	Vanik
Fascell	Moakley	Vigorito
Flindley	Moss	Waldie
Fish	Murphy, N.Y.	Whalen
Fraser	Nix	Young, Fla.
Frenzel	Obey	Young, Ga.
Gettys	Pike	

NOES—303

Abdnor	Casey, Tex.	Eshleman
Adams	Cederberg	Evins, Tenn.
Alexander	Chamberlain	Flood
Anderson, Calif.	Chappell	Flowers
Anderson, Ill.	Clancy	Flynt
Andrews, N.C.	Clausen	Foley
Andrews, N. Dak.	Don H.	Ford, Gerald R.
Annunzio	Clawson, Del.	Ford,
Archer	Cleveland	William D.
Arends	Cochran	Forsythe
Armstrong	Cohen	Fountain
Ashley	Collier	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Collins, Ill.	Frey
Barrett	Collins, Tex.	Froehlich
Beard	Conable	Fulton
Bevill	Conlan	Fuqua
Blackburn	Corman	Gaydos
Boland	Cotter	Gialmo
Bolling	Coughlin	Gibbons
Bowen	Crane	Ginn
Brademas	Cronin	Goldwater
Bray	Daniel, Dan.	Goodling
Breckinridge	Daniel, Robert	Gray
Brooks	W. Jr.	Green, Oreg.
Broomfield	Davis, Ga.	Griffiths
Brotzman	Davis, S.C.	Grover
Brown, Mich.	Davis, Wis.	Gubser
Brown, Ohio	de la Garza	Guyser
Broyhill, N.C.	Delaney	Haley
Broyhill, Va.	Dellenback	Hamilton
Buchanan	Dennis	Hammer
Burgener	Devine	schmidt
Burke, Fla.	Dickinson	Hanley
Burke, Mass.	Diggs	Hanrahan
Burleson, Tex.	Dingell	Hansen, Idaho
Burlison, Mo.	Donohue	Harrington
Butler	Dorn	Harvey
Byron	Downing	Hastings
Camp	Dulski	Heckler, Mass.
Carney, Ohio	Duncan	Henderson
Carter	du Pont	Hillis
	Edwards, Ala.	Hinsaw
	Erlenborn	Hogan

Holt	Mizell	Sisk
Horton	Mollohan	Slack
Hosmer	Montgomery	Smith, Iowa
Huber	Moorhead,	Smith, N.Y.
Hudnut	Calif.	Snyder
Hungate	Moorhead, Pa.	Spence
Hunt	Morgan	Staggers
Hutchinson	Mosher	Steed
Ichord	Murphy, Ill.	Steele
Jarman	Myers	Steiger, Ariz.
Johnson, Calif.	Natcher	Steiger, Wis.
Johnson, Colo.	Nedzi	Stratton
Johnson, Pa.	Nelsen	Stubblefield
Jones, Ala.	Nichols	Stuckey
Jones, N.C.	O'Brien	Symington
Jones, Okla.	O'Hara	Symms
Jones, Tenn.	O'Neill	Talcott
Jordan	Owens	Taylor, Mo.
Kazen	Parris	Taylor, N.C.
Keating	Passman	Teague, Calif.
Kemp	Patman	Teague, Tex.
Ketchum	Patten	Thomson, Wis.
Kluczynski	Pepper	Towell, Nev.
Kuykendall	Perkins	Treen
Kyros	Pettis	Udall
Landgrebe	Pickle	Ullman
Landrum	Poage	Van Deerlin
Latta	Powell, Ohio	Vander Jagt
Lent	Preyer	Vessey
Littin	Price, Ill.	Waggoner
Lott	Price, Tex.	Walsh
Lujan	Pritchard	Wampler
McClary	Quile	Ware
McCloskey	Quillen	White
McCollister	Railsback	Whitehurst
McCormack	Randall	Whitten
McDade	Rarick	Widnall
McEwen	Rhodes	Wiggins
McFall	Roberts	Williams
McKay	Robinson, Va.	Wilson, Bob
McKinney	Robison, N.Y.	Wilson,
McSpadden	Rogers	Charles H.,
Macdonald	Roncalio, N.Y.	Calif.
Madden	Rooney, Pa.	Wilson,
Madigan	Rose	Charles, Tex.
Mahon	Rostenkowski	Winn
Mailliard	Roush	Wolf
Mallory	Rousselot	Wright
Mann	Roy	Wyatt
Martin, Nebr.	Runnels	Wylder
Martin, N.C.	Ruppe	Wylie
Mathias, Calif.	Ruth	Wyman
Mathis, Ga.	Sarasin	Yatron
Mayne	Satterfield	Young, Alaska
Meeds	Scherie	Young, Ill.
Metcalf	Schneebeli	Young, S.C.
Michel	Sebelius	Young, Tex.
Milford	Shelley	Zablocki
Miller	Shoup	Zion
Mills, Ark.	Shriver	Zwack
Minshall, Ohio	Shuster	
Mitchell, N.Y.	Sikes	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bell

NOT VOTING—21

Ashbrook	Derwinski	Peyser
Badillo	Fisher	Reld
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Breaux	Hébert	Sandman
Clark	Holifield	Thompson, N.J.
Danielson	Holtzman	Thornton
Dent	King	Tiernan

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the committee's action recommending the full amount requested by the administration for the authorized Tocks Island conservation project.

As we note in our report, this needed project "can proceed to construction" upon the resolution now in progress of two remaining matters, concerning its eventual water pollution control program, and possible effect on highways due to its recreation attraction.

The urgency of this needed conservation undertaking was demonstrated anew this year by an overwhelming array of witnesses and informed testimony to the committee.

The case in support of Tocks Island is so lucidly explained by the new Na-

tional Environmental Development Association, Inc., that I set forth their testimony as part of my remarks to this Chamber, and I quote:

National Environmental Development Association (NEDA) is a non-profit, non-stock, non-political corporation, comprised of labor, agricultural, industry, and other private and public interest organizations and individuals. NEDA was established for the purpose of promoting the conservation, use and development of America's resources, in a manner that will enhance the quality of its human environment.

This Association strongly supports the Administration's appropriation request for the authorized Tocks Island conservation Project.

This Project illustrates a situation wherein the matter of excessive environmentalism has been pursued beyond the point of diminishing returns.

The Delaware River is the primary source of water supply for this country's most densely populated, heavily industrialized region. The environmental effects of this River's alternate floods and droughts have been disastrous in the past (*Presidential Disaster Declarations*, of 1955, floods, of 1965, drought), and they will be worse in the future. For the needs and numbers of the people that depend on it are far greater now. The indispensable waters of this River now waste to the sea. The need to impound and conserve its high flows for the public convenience and necessity during its low flow periods is self-evident.

The urgency of the authorized Tocks Island Project to meet the known domestic, municipal and industrial water supply, energy supply, flood protection, public lake recreation, and mainstream flow augmentation requirements of this region has been established many times, by many recent and past Governmental and non-Governmental studies.

Continuing delay in commencing the construction of this Project is causing, and will continue to cause, increasingly adverse environmental effects—including delay of the additional power capacity downstream needed for the sustained public employment, economy, health, and welfare of the people of this important region.

We have studied Tocks Island's multi-volume environmental impact statement, prepared in the depth and detail specifically directed by the Council on Environmental Quality. We are satisfied that this statement determines and discloses Tocks Island's significant environmental effects; that it will meet the human requirements of this region in a manner more acceptable environmentally and economically than any of its reasonable alternatives or series of alternatives; and that its adverse environmental effects will be avoided, minimized, or more-than adequately compensated for. We concur in the Council on Environmental Quality's prepared pronouncement, dated April 7, 1971, that: "The Tocks Island projects involve tradeoffs justifying adverse environmental impacts through social and economic benefits."

In a reasoned opinion rendered last month, involving the authorized Gathright Project, the Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia was constrained to emphasize that: "Chronic fault-finding by itself will not invalidate an EIS" (environmental impact statement). "No project of any size is without its environmental impact", the Chief Judge observed, and: "The court is well aware that when studies of this type are undertaken [i.e., environmental impact statements], complete satisfaction with the results is impossible. As is true with most endeavors, further study and analysis will produce a better document which is subject to less criticism. However, the purpose of an EIS is not to produce an objection free document, but rather to give

Congress and other responsible agencies sufficient information on the project's environmental consequences with which to make an intelligent decision about whether or not to proceed with the project (citations omitted). *Cape Henry Bird Club vs. Melvin R. Laird, et al.*, Civil Action No. 73-C-9-R (April 1973). Measured by this standard, or that suggested by the National Water Commission, construction of Tocks Island conservation Project should go forward.

Tocks Islands' environmental advantages and effects have been determined and discussed, many times, to the satisfaction of the Committee, the Congress, and the President. The Congress has now enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of October 18, 1972. This measure authorizes the programs and funds necessary to provide, by 1983, for water pollution or eutrophication control at the authorized Tocks Island Reservoir, thus meeting the Committee's remaining concern in this matter.

The environmental necessity, and benefits, of this Project are established. Detailed implementation, or exposition, of measures to maximize compatibility with its ambient ecology can best be carried out during, or not until, its construction phase. Continuing environmentalist delay of that construction is having a negative effect "on the quality of the human environment" (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

We respectfully urge the Subcommittee to recommend the appropriation necessary for this authorized conservation Project.

Under permission obtained earlier in the House I submit a recent statement by Mr. Kenneth J. Bosquet on this important matter:

WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF THE
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

Mr. Chairman, fellow members of the panel, ladies and gentlemen of the audience: The subject here, "Metro Power and Related Water Supply Problems", is particularly apt, and particularly timely, here in the Delaware River Basin service area and elsewhere throughout the country.

As a result of the decennial census of 1970, we now know that today, 75 percent of all Americans live in "metropolitan areas". Another 13 percent live in their nearby communities. The definition of "metropolitan area" here means a city of at least 50,000 people and its surrounding areas having a population of at least 1,000 persons a square mile.

I should stress that these "metropolitan areas", containing three-quarters of this country's people, occupy less than two percent of its area.

And this concentration will continue and intensify in the years ahead. According to the recent National Population Commission studies, by the year 2000, over 85 percent of all Americans will live in its "metropolitan areas".

This will not be decelerated or diverted by zero population growth. Even if sustained in this country, zero population growth will not prevent expansion by our existing population base in this country for about 70 years, or until about the year 2040.

Accompanying this metro trend over time, the corresponding forecasts, conservative forecasts, establish an even greater growth in per capita electric energy consumption. Despite energy conservation, and assuming nearly zero population growth, a 50 percent decline in the rate of rise in individual wealth—the consumption of electric energy here in the United States will triple by the year 1990.

Whether or not we like this metro trend, with its various metro power and other problems, it is the environmental reality of most American life. It is the environmental reality that most of us have consciously chosen to create and to live with. And the simple

reason we have done so is that—all things considered—metro life gives us a better life economically, educationally, socially, culturally, and spiritually, than any we can attain elsewhere in our lifespan.

So we, then, can understand the wishes of other Americans to join us here in the metro-regions, in their continuing human effort to improve the quality of their lives, and the lives of their children, as we improved ours.

We have tried to discourage them, of course. We have enacted statutes stating, or warning them, as the "Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970" warns them: "That population increases and urban concentration contribute directly to pollution and to degradation of our environment." But these other Americans will not, and do not intend, to stay away from the metro-regions. According to the Council on Environmental Quality, it is Federal policy in this country to slow down the inflow of population into our metropolitan areas. But it is not working. And it is doubtful that it will work, for the human reasons mentioned.

In the words of the recent Population Commission's report, therefore, the CEQ thus has concluded: that "our large urban regions" will be called on to accommodate virtually all the Nation's future population growth."

All this helps focus the reality of metro power here, specifically, electric power. For metro society first and foremostly is an indoor society: of housing areas, and apartments, and offices, and industries, and commercial, and other organizational structures and complexes, in which most of its inhabitants spend most of their lives.

And these vast human complexes are organized and operable primarily on the basis of the existence—and steady availability—of electric power. They cannot function without it, even its brief interruption, without the most disturbing, potentially dangerous human consequences. And this dependence or danger increases in time, as metro society increases in size.

All of which brings us to the Delaware River Basin area—which is the most densely populated heavily industrialized river basin area in the whole country. Here as elsewhere, metro power supply preeminently involves metro water supply. For this energy transformation which is electricity is effected by heating water, lots of it. And like all energy transformations, this also entails a certain loss or waste of unusable heat. And the essentially effective way of disposing of this unusable heat rise, that occurs in producing this energy form that our metro society has to have, is plain water.

Now we can regret this, or resent it, or rail against it, but we aren't going to change it in the foreseeable future. Between now and the year 2000, for example, the thermal conversion efficiency of new power generating units will not be significantly greater than the present 40 percent.

So the matter of metro power here in the Delaware River Basin service area, thus is the matter of selecting exactly where, in these waters or waterways, to position the power plants that your metro society has to have for the next few decades. You can do so on your rivers, or on your Bay, or on your New Jersey ocean front, or you can try to position them in somebody else's river basin. But you must position them somewhere. And you must do so promptly.

Now you can talk about long term break throughs, and solutions in power supply technology, and, of course, you should. But they frankly are not important to us: for they cannot get us through the next thirty years. And it is only the next thirty years—which is the period we've got to get ourselves through—that is important now.

In its latest report on delays in needed new

power capacity, the Federal Power Commission's tabulations for your Mid Atlantic area (including the four Delaware River Basin State region, parts of Virginia, and the District of Columbia)—the FPC's tabulations show that there are some seven new generating units, totaling over seven million kilowatts of power capacity, which were scheduled to be in operation this summer, and which will not be. And I notice that four of those units, together totaling over four million kilowatts of needed capacity, were scheduled for operation back in 1971 or early 1972.

Now whatever its flexibility, and ingenuity of management, no regional power system—and certainly not that for the country's most populous, heavily industrialized river basin—can long endure a continuing postponement of seven million kilowatts of needed power capacity—without exposing itself to some very real emergency possibilities, and without impairing that evolving economic activity necessary to sustain the employment and incomes of the families of that region.

Some of these unnecessary economic effects are already discernable. For example, in the announcement that one of the large power supply systems in this great commercial metropolis can no longer serve any new commercial loads. And in the recent order of one of your Basin State's Department of Public Utilities, declaring that: "The State of New Jersey today faces the probability that, within the next three years, there will be a critical shortage of electrical energy with the consequent need to ration the existing supply"; and instituting an investigation for the purpose of determining what action should be taken "to minimize the impact of electric shortages, brownouts, and/or blackouts".

Some many accept this—as an offering to some perceived ecological mission or goal. But chance is they will not be among the families to be economically and socially victimized by this impending, damaging deficiency of power supply.

And of course the National Environmental Policy Act, which is concerned with "the quality of the human environment", perceives and propounds no such "goal". For its enacted policy is, and remains and must be administered responsibly and intelligently: 'to foster and promote the general welfare, create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements' of Americans.

Happily, however, the Delaware Basin is endowed with the water resources needed to fulfill these metro power and other human environmental requirements of its people in the decades immediately ahead. As elsewhere, you also have the phenomena of periodic disastrous flooding, and periodic disastrous drought. These have been disastrous here in the past. They will be even more so, now and in years ahead, absent conservation of your water resources. For your needs and numbers are far greater now.

Here as elsewhere, you have the problem of impounding the high or flood flows of your increasingly indispensable waters—which now you waste to the sea—and of conserving them to meet your multiple, urgent public needs during critical low flow periods.

Your approved program to achieve this imperative regional water conservation goal is a good one. To begin, at the top, it entails setting aside and preserving the upper eighty (80) miles of the Delaware River (from Hancock, New York, all the way down to Matamoras, Pennsylvania), for free-flowing, wild or scenic river purposes. And this is now recommended by the Governors of each of your four Delaware River Basin States, and Delaware River Basin Commission, on the basis

of studies now completed by the United States Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. In this way you will forever preserve in its free flowing condition what the Bureau's report states is: "intrinsically a relatively unmodified and unspoiled river, pleasurable in all seasons, and exciting during periods of full flow, capable of supporting, without resources deterioration, a wide range of river-oriented recreation activities", and containing but "minimal" agricultural pollution. You will also be protecting this River's watershed and water quality for its numerous downstream public purposes.

Second, your program entails conservation of this River's high flows, and those of its upper tributaries, in a large mainstem Lake authorized to serve the known and growing public water resource requirements of this densely populated metroregion—including its needed water supply, flood control, metro power, water recreation, downstream water quality, and low flow augmentation requirements.

Third, it entails establishment of a vast, additional National Recreation Area surrounding this multipurpose conservation Lake.

Fourth, it entails continued improvement of the water quality of the Delaware River's downstream reaches, including the water quality of its vast and scenic Delaware Bay.

There are other elements of this water resource conservation program, all of them constructive. But I believe this framework shows you have an effective program to conserve the waters of this great River system to meet your known public water resource requirements in the decades ahead—including water supply for the metro power needed to sustain the great Delaware River metro-basin.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUJAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUJAN: Page 2, line 21 after "vehicles"; strike out the figure, "\$1,676,563,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure, "\$1,681,263,000".

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

Mr. LUJAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a very brief statement regarding a particular project funded by this public works appropriation bill. Specifically, the bill contains \$3 million for the Meramec Park Lake project. While I will vote for the entire appropriations bill, I do so only with the understanding that this project is the subject of a suit pending in Federal district court in St. Louis filed against the Corps of Engineers by the Sierra Club. Federal District Judge Wangelin has not yet ruled on the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, on the corps' motion for summary judgment, or on the Meramec Basin Association's motion to intervene in this suit. The original environmental impact statement pertaining to this project being inadequate and out-of-date, a new statement has been prepared. The court may rest its decision in part on its assessment of the new statement and a determination as to whether it meets the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. In this regard the court may be expected to focus attention, inter alia, on section 102 of the act which requires all agencies of the Federal Government to include in every proposal for major Fed-

eral action "significantly affecting the quality of the human environment" a detailed statement on its environmental impact, alternatives, irreversible commitments, and things of that kind. It is my hope that the court will move expeditiously to resolve the issues joined so that any further developmental initiatives will rest on an adjudication of the question.

Second, I am today announcing my co-sponsorship of the Flood Plain Conservation Act which was originally introduced by my colleagues, Mr. BLACKBURN and Mr. PEPPER. This legislation could save millions of tax dollars by authorizing the Department of Interior to purchase flood prone regions in lieu of the present practice of massive and expensive construction projects in such regions. Federally-owned flood prone areas could become open space and refuge regions which could be utilized as greenbelt recreation areas during dry seasons. Such open space expanses are vitally needed near or in many of the Nation's metropolitan regions.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take very long, because it does not take very long to explain the amendment which I have offered. As a matter of fact, I am going to have a lot of time left that I will yield to any Member who might have some kind words to say about this amendment, because I am sure I am going to need them.

Very simply, what the amendment says is that we would add to this appropriation \$4.7 million for geothermal research and development work. I want to be sure that there is no confusion. The geothermal work is hot steam coming out of the ground. We have tremendous capability within the laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission which is not being utilized at the present time except in some shoestring operation method.

In the laboratory at Los Alamos there has been a research project going on. I am not a scientist, but as I understand it, they just pour some water over some hot rocks, and out comes the steam, and somehow or other energy comes out of that. Many other Members might know more about that than I do.

The interesting thing about this is that there are hot rocks all over, so these geothermal plants can be placed almost anywhere in the country and they are not limited to just where the steam now exists.

Let me say that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, did authorize this project in the amount of \$4.7 million. It is my understanding, and very logical, that when the Appropriations Committee got it there was not enough time to really consider it in depth, because the time was too short.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I will face opposition, but even if the members of the committee would oppose my amendment, please take note that even in being opposed as a result of a policy by the committee not to allow any of these amendments, please, of course, note that they are opposing it in the kindest words possible.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, will

the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) yield?

Mr. LUJAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, am I to understand from the gentleman's remarks that there are no substantial funds for experimentation in the field of geothermal energy at the present time?

Mr. LUJAN. The gentleman is correct. So far as I understand it, Los Alamos has been conducting this experiment out of what they call the Director's discretionary fund. It has just been a very, very meager operation.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

With the whole world facing an increasingly severe shortage of energy, particularly in the form of fossil fuels, I think it is essential that we press forward in every area of research, and this is one in which I think there may be great promise. It is, in my opinion, a great mistake not to insist on greater efforts in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) yield?

Mr. LUJAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be in the position of opposing the gentleman's amendment, but I do want to state in response to the question which was just asked that there is \$4.1 million in the existing budget for geothermal research. It is under the National Science Foundation, the Department of the Interior, and the Geological Survey. There is geothermal research underway.

Mr. Chairman, I think we can treat the amendment on its own merit, but I hope that none of the Members will base their decisions on a misinterpretation of the facts that the gentleman perhaps did not understand. There is \$4.1 million in the budget under NSF and the Department of the Interior for geothermal research.

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

Mr. LUJAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN). The potential for geothermal energy appears to be substantial. Last year, however, the Office of Management and Budget impounded what little money was appropriated by the Congress for research in this area.

In these times of uncertainty regarding the international situation, it is most important, I think, for the United States to strive for self-sufficiency in the energy field. Geothermal power is especially attractive because it is pollution free in addition to being energy efficient. Contrary to popular belief the potential for geothermal power is not confined to those western States with hydrothermal activity. There is every reason to believe that

the "dry hole" will be more useful in the long run, and these can be developed anywhere.

In addition to increasing appropriations for R. & D. in geothermal power, it is important that Government encourage private enterprise to increase their R. & D. activities in alternate sources of energy. Such activity has been under way in my State. Aerojet Nuclear, Inc. has been working closely with the AEC in the development of a prototype geothermal powerplant. With a shortage of fossil fuels looming it is important that development of new energy sources proceed at an increased rate. To neglect a natural resource such as geothermal energy would be to the detriment of the Nation's economy as well as to our national security.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment; I feel that the Atomic Energy Commission is one of the few Government agencies that gives the taxpayers their money's worth in returns. This program deserves our support.

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

Mr. LUJAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON).

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his action in offering this amendment. I support his amendment and urge the Members to offer their support.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very difficult bill. I can understand that many members want to cut the bill, and there are others who want to add to it. We have made some substantial cuts to the Atomic Energy Commission weapons program and we have also reduced other programs. There are other areas in the bill where we have provided some substantial increases.

My friend, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) is a fine gentleman and a valued Member of this House. However, I oppose his amendment because there are funds in several areas throughout the budget for geothermal research. The Public Works—AEC Subcommittee has included \$1,770,000 in geothermal investigation for the Bureau of Reclamation. As the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK) has pointed out, there are funds in the budget of the National Science Foundation for geothermal research.

In addition to these amounts, the appropriation bill for the Interior Department which passed the House yesterday contained a substantial amount for geothermal research.

Because there are substantial amounts provided throughout the Government for this research, we did not feel that more funds, which were not asked for in the budget, should be provided.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 205, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

AYES—206

Abdnor	Ginn	Owens
Abzug	Goldwater	Parris
Anderson,	Grasso	Pepper
Calif.	Green, Pa.	Pettis
Ashley	Griffiths	Pike
Aspin	Grover	Poage
Baker	Gubser	Podell
Barrett	Gude	Price, Tex.
Bergland	Guyer	Quile
Biaggi	Hammer-	Randall
Bieber	schmidt	Rangel
Bingham	Hanna	Rees
Blackburn	Hansen, Idaho	Reuss
Boggs	Harrington	Riegle
Bolling	Harvey	Rogers
Brademas	Hastings	Roncalio, Wyo.
Brasco	Hawkins	Roncalio, N.Y.
Bray	Hechler, W. Va.	Rooney, Pa.
Brinkley	Heinz	Rosenthal
Broomfield	Hicks	Rostenkowski
Brotzman	Hinshaw	Rousselot
Brown, Calif.	Holtzman	Roy
Brown, Mich.	Horton	Roybal
Brown, Ohio	Hosmer	Runnels
Buchanan	Howard	Ruppe
Burgener	Huber	Ryan
Burke, Calif.	Hungate	Sarasin
Burton	Hunt	Sarbanes
Byron	Jordan	Satterfield
Carey, N.Y.	Karth	Saylor
Chisholm	Kastenmeier	Schroeder
Clancy	Keating	Shoup
Clausen,	Kemp	Spence
Don H.	Ketchum	Staggers
Clay	Koch	Stark
Cleveland	Kuykendall	Steele
Collier	Landgrebe	Steelman
Collins, Tex.	Leggett	Steiger, Wis.
Conable	Lent	Stephens
Conlan	Litton	Stokes
Corman	Long, La.	Stuckey
Coughlin	Long, Md.	Studds
Cronin	Lett	Symington
Culver	Lujan	Symms
Daniel, Dan	McClory	Thomson, Wis.
Daniel, Robert	McCloskey	Thone
W. Jr.	McCollister	Thornton
Dellenback	McKinney	Towell, Nev.
Dellums	Macdonald	Treen
Denholm	Maraziti	Udall
Dennis	Martin, N.C.	Van Deerlin
Dickinson	Mathias, Calif.	Vanik
Diggs	Mathis, Ga.	Veysey
Downing	Matsunaga	Waldie
Drinan	Mazzoli	Walsh
du Pont	Meeds	Whalen
Eckhardt	Melcher	Whitehurst
Edwards, Calif.	Mezvisky	Widnall
Findley	Miller	Wilson, Bob
Fish	Mink	Wilson,
Foley	Mitchell, Md.	Charles H.,
Ford, Gerald R.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Calif.
Ford,	Mizell	Wright
William D.	Moakley	Wyatt
Forsythe	Mollohan	Wydler
Fraser	Moorhead,	Wyman
Frenzel	Calif.	Yatron
Frey	Moorhead, Pa.	Young, Alaska
Froehlich	Moss	Young, Fla.
Gaydos	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, Ga.
Gilman	Obey	
	O'Hara	

NOES—205

Adams	Brooks	Conte
Addabbo	Broyhill, N.C.	Conyers
Alexander	Broyhill, Va.	Cotter
Anderson, Ill.	Burke, Fla.	Crane
Andrews, N.C.	Burke, Mass.	Daniels,
Andrews,	Burleson, Tex.	Dominick V.
N. Dak.	Burlison, Mo.	Davis, Ga.
Annunzio	Butler	Davis, S.C.
Archer	Carney, Ohio	Davis, Wis.
Arends	Carter	de la Garza
Armstrong	Casey, Tex.	Delaney
Bafalis	Cederberg	Devine
Beard	Chamberlain	Dingell
Bennett	Chappell	Donohue
Bevill	Clawson, Del	Dorn
Boland	Cochran	Dulski
Bowen	Cohen	Duncan
Breckinridge	Collins, Ill.	Edwards, Ala.

Ellberg	McDade	Ruth
Erlenborn	McEwen	St Germain
Eshleman	McFall	Scherie
Evans, Colo.	McKay	Schneebell
Evins, Tenn.	McSpadden	Sebelius
Fascell	Madden	Seiberling
Flood	Madigan	Shipley
Flowers	Mahon	Shriver
Flynt	Mailliard	Shuster
Fountain	Mallary	Sikes
Frelinghuysen	Mann	Sisk
Fulton	Martin, Nebr.	Skubitz
Fuqua	Mayne	Slack
Gettys	Metcalfe	Smith, Iowa
Gialmo	Michel	Smith, N.Y.
Gibbons	Milford	Snyder
Gonzalez	Mills, Ark.	Stanton,
Goodling	Minish	J. William
Gray	Minshall, Ohio	Stanton,
Green, Oreg.	Montgomery	James V.
Gross	Morgan	Steed
Gunter	Mosher	Steiger, Ariz.
Haley	Murphy, Ill.	Stratton
Hamilton	Myers	Stubbsfield
Hanley	Natcher	Sullivan
Hanrahan	Nelsen	Talcott
Harsha	Nichols	Taylor, Mo.
Hays	Nix	Taylor, N.C.
Heckler, Mass.	O'Brien	Teague, Calif.
Helstoski	O'Neill	Teague, Tex.
Henderson	Passman	Ullman
Hillis	Patman	Vander Jagt
Hogan	Patten	Vigorito
Holt	Perkins	Waggoner
Hudnut	Pickle	Wampler
Hutchinson	Powell, Ohio	Ware
Ichord	Preyer	White
Jarman	Price, Ill.	Whitten
Johnson, Calif.	Pritchard	Wiggins
Johnson, Colo.	Quillen	Williams
Johnson, Pa.	Rallsback	Wilson,
Jones, Ala.	Rarick	Charles, Tex.
Jones, N.C.	Regula	Winn
Jones, Okla.	Rhodes	Wolf
Jones, Tenn.	Rinaldo	Wyllie
Kazen	Roberts	Yates
Kluczynski	Robinson, Va.	Young, Ill.
Kyros	Robinson, N.Y.	Young, S.C.
Landrum	Rodino	Young, Tex.
Latta	Roe	Zablocki
Lehman	Rose	Zion
McCormack	Roush	Zwach

NOT VOTING—22

Ashbrook	Derwinski	Peyser
Badillo	Esch	Reid
Bell	Fisher	Rooney, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Sandman
Breaux	Hebert	Thompson, N.J.
Clark	Holifield	Tiernan
Danielson	King	
Dent	Nedzi	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in support of the bill.

It has now been 4 years since Congress first appropriated funds to begin construction of Paintsville Lake in the district that I represent.

Johnson County and the city of Paintsville, Ky., have repeatedly suffered millions of dollars in flood damage throughout the years. The Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy River back in 1957 was at least 10 feet above flood stage in the city of Paintsville. And another devastating flood of approximately the same depth occurred in 1963.

The Paint Creek reservoir is necessary from the standpoint of controlling floods in the Big Sandy area.

The Corps of Engineers is to be complimented for moving ahead on Paint Creek and for the great work performed throughout the whole of eastern Kentucky in recommending flood control projects that have saved lives and reduced property damage.

Several reservoirs yet remain to be constructed before we have an adequate flood control program in eastern Ken-

tucky in both the Kentucky and Big Sandy River sections.

Then again we must move forward now with Yatesville, Red River, and Tygart's Creek reservoirs.

In the event the Paint Creek railway bridge is destroyed by flood—and this liked to have occurred in 1957—the whole Big Sandy Valley will be paralyzed above this point. In other words, the coal could not be moved in railway cars until such time as the bridge was reconstructed. The construction of the Paint Creek reservoir will alleviate this situation.

It is claimed that the Corps of Engineers failed to report the existence of a geologic fault—a flaw in the earth's crust—under the area covered by the lake. It is claimed that this fault was not mentioned in the environmental impact statement filed by the corps in August 1971. The corps did so report.

This fault in the earth is no secret. It has been known for years, and has been described in various geology publications.

During the Public Works Subcommittee's consideration of this project, a question was asked about the effect of the fault upon the proposed dam. And this is the response of the spokesman for the Corps of Engineers:

The existence of the fault in the vicinity of the Paintsville project has been known for many years. The location and description are contained in numerous publications. The Corps was aware of the subsurface conditions during surface reports and studies in the 1960s.

In addition, the geological reconnaissance of the proposed Paintsville Reservoir was conducted during the early design stage with all structural features being mapped and evaluated, including the faults in the area.

Due to the age of the structural features and reservoir design, seismic activity is not anticipated in the Paintsville area. Design of the Paintsville dam and appurtenances, however, will include considerations for seismic acceleration, which is a current design procedure for all Corps of Engineers reservoir projects.

In this regard, an expert in the field of geophysics will assist in the evaluation of the design of the Paintsville project. No problems in the developing of a proper design are anticipated.

That is the statement of the Corps of Engineers, and I think it is reasonable and sound.

Bear in mind that the fault is not under the dam itself, but under an area upstream which will be covered by the lake.

Now, as to a claim that there are oil and gas wells in the area which might contaminate the lake, that is a minor matter. Such abandoned wells are routinely plugged before reservoirs are filled. This presents no hazard whatever, I am informed by the corps.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ECKHARDT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ECKHARDT: On page 3, line 1, strike the words "That of such," strike all of lines 2 through 6, and strike the words on line 7 "have been expended; provided funds."

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to strike the following language:

"That of such amount \$100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided* further, That from this ap—"

This is the amount that goes to the Atomic Energy Commission. I would ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if he is at liberty to tell me what the \$100,000, which may be expended without the Controller knowing about it, is for?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I would say to my distinguished friend that years ago the bill included \$200,000 to allow the chairman to make commitments of a confidential nature. A number of years ago this was lowered to \$100,000. It has been reduced, but it has been carried in the bill for several years as authorized in the basic legislation. We must trust somebody in this Government and I trust the Chairman of the AEC to use these funds with discretion.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman but I would trust the Comptroller also. As a matter of fact this legislation which is positive legislation might be subject to a point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI, were it not for the deplorable fact that the Rules Committee has commenced generally waiving that rule.

I have no objection to waiving that rule with respect to its relationship to the failure at this time of the atomic energy authorization bill having been passed. If it were waived only with respect to those matters, because the authorization bill has not yet been passed, it would be all right, but when we pass this sweeping waiver of points of order under rule XXI, clause 2, we permit all kinds of positive legislation.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, regarding waivers of points of order on appropriation bills, the authorizing bill for the Atomic Energy Commission was passed in the House and in the Senate and is now awaiting the signature of the President. If it had been signed, it would not have been necessary to have this waiver of the rule, but in order to hasten this bill along and to proceed in an orderly manner, we want to proceed with the appropriation bill at this time.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that. I certainly think the chairman is right in asking for the waiver of the rule in that respect, but had the authorization bill been final and had there not been any suspension of rule XXI-C, the point of order I am now making would be good.

That is the point I am making. I object to a waiver of a rule that changes that result. Let me point out here that what this does is to permit the expenditure of money by the agency with only the statement that the matter is of a confidential nature. Therefore, the agency does not want to disclose the purpose for which it is expended.

If this were not in the bill, all the agency would have to do is file the voucher in accordance with title 31, United States Code, sections 71, 72, and 74. That does not mean for a moment that they are going to have to disclose in the voucher any confidential or secret information.

Mr. Chairman, we spend billions of dollars for matters of a most confidential and secret nature through both the armed services appropriation, and through the atomic energy appropriation. All it means, if this provision were not in the bill, is that the Comptroller General would have a right to go in and find out what the money is expended for. He is the only one that is entitled to that right. The Comptroller General has security clearance. He can look at secret matters. I trust the representative of this Congress to look at that information.

Mr. Chairman, why should we write positive legislation in an appropriations bill that never appeared in the authorization bill? The question was not raised before the legislative committee. Why do we need to write such positive legislation in an appropriations bill?

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. The difficulty I have with this language is not only that outlined by the gentleman from Texas, but in addition, there is no standard set forth in this bill as to the basis on which it needs to be confidential. It does not say national defense or anything else.

Mr. Chairman, should we not set some standards?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I assure my friend that this relates to matters of a confidential nature and it is only a small item out of a \$1,676,000,000 amount for AEC's operating expenses.

It allows some discretion for the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission if she feels it necessary to make expenditures of a confidential nature. Then, she would be empowered to do so.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me at the very least it should be written so that she must certify that it must be kept confidential to protect national defense information, or some other specific language such as that as to the general basis on which it must be kept confidential.

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, if there was such a question involved, and if it were important, what committee would be best qualified to determine whether that special status should be granted? It would seem to me the legislative committee, in this case the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and not the Appropriations Committee. This appears in the appropriation for the first time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. The gentleman has a valid point. I would simply like to add that it seems to me we have all gotten a liberal education in the past couple of months as to the abuses such vague words as "national security" can be used to cover. We had better start being a little bit more conscious of the dangers of this kind of vague secrecy authority, which can be used for legitimate but also for illegitimate purposes.

I commend the gentleman for raising this point.

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I merely rise to say we did strike such language out of the Coast Guard legislation, and I believe for exactly the same reason. I thank my colleagues for doing so.

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I should like to point out that the basic Atomic Energy Act, which establishes the five-man Atomic Energy Commission, contains within it certain very grave responsibilities that are assigned to the members of that Commission. Those responsibilities are the kind which control its judgment if it should be called upon to make this kind of an expenditure. As a consequence this is therefore not an intergovernmental type of thing.

I believe it should be noted and understood also that with respect to the atomic establishment there are certain areas of extremely critical security nature. We have had a practice in those cases of keeping the numbers of people who need to know down to the smallest possible number. Striking this would add one more, namely, the Comptroller General, and would open it up for him. As a consequence, rather than just the five-man Commission of very carefully selected people we might have a whole crowd of investigation in on this kind of thing.

For the amount of money involved, \$100,000, there is simply no reason to engage in that kind of security risk taking.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman. I would simply comment that we would be well-advised to make a general review of the language used for this type of security coverage so that we can write or rewrite our legislation to provide more precise guidelines for authorizing the use of secrecy.

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I just wanted to point out the fact that this item has been in the appropriation bill for a number of years and it is an item which is pretty carefully described. In other words, it has to be for objects

of a confidential nature, and in such cases a certificate must be made that the object is of confidential nature. I suggest to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Ohio that this is subject to audit by the Comptroller General. If at any time the Commission makes a certificate which does not comply with the provisions of this law I am sure the Comptroller General could and would take cognizance of it.

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

Mr. RHODES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. If that be the only thing that the Comptroller General can look at, to find out whether or not the head of the Atomic Energy Commission has said this is of a confidential nature, that is all he could find. That is exactly the point I am making. He ought to know what it is really spent for.

Mr. RHODES. I am sorry, but I have to disagree with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES. I yield.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I have just talked to the General Accounting Office, and I understand the process the gentleman describes is the process available under existing law.

Mr. Chairman, if we put this in, it will change it, and all he can look to is whether or not the head of the Atomic Energy Commission has said it is confidential. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, we should make a little legislative history right here. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations handling this bill, I am of the opinion that the Comptroller General can look behind that certificate to make sure that the matter certified is actually of a confidential nature.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) will yield, I will ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) does the chairman of the subcommittee on this side of the aisle so construe the matter?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I do. And if the gentleman would like to confer with us on this matter we would be glad to discuss it with him at length.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that both sides seem to believe the interpretation of this language is that once the matter is listed as confidential material when the voucher is issued, the Comptroller General within the limits of his security clearance can determine whether or not it is in fact confidential material and so properly classify it, looking into the real facts of the voucher, if that is the understanding, I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) has stated my understanding of the matter better than I could do so myself.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arizona yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas make such a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made available for the current fiscal year for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred between such appropriations, but neither such appropriation, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) to respond to a question, if he will please.

On page 19 of the report there is an item which says, "St. John's River Basin, Maine Study—a total of \$50,000 is included in the bill to initiate the St. John's River Basin study."

Does this have anything to do with the Dickey-Lincoln project, or will it in any way serve to revive that project?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman I would say to the gentleman, that this study involves the St. John's River and would involve a small project, only for the State of Maine. It is under a new name, because it is a much smaller project. It is a study; it is not the large overall New England project.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that of two Senators in the other body, one favors the larger project and the other favors the smaller project. The committee would certainly favor only the smaller project.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. WYLIE. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, actually the only resemblance between this project and the Dickey-Lincoln project is that they are both on the same river. This is a much smaller project. The State of Maine has no hydroelectric projects at all. It is an energy-short area, and I would vote the money for this project.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me to be a feasible project as far as the overall benefits are concerned. If the gentleman would yield further, let me assure him that as one Member of the Committee, if there is an attempt on the part of the other body to enlarge this project to even closely resemble the Dickey-Lincoln project in prior years, I, as one conferee, will oppose it.

Mr. WYLIE. What the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Tennessee are saying is that this is a small local project confined to the State of Maine, and is not a huge hydroelectric New England project as contemplated by the Dickey-Lincoln project?

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in my supplemental views, I think there are a number of problems with this bill. First, the bill contains a number of projects which in one man's opinion, do not belong here. One involved a navigation channel through coastal wetlands which according to information I have, will bisect and pollute a State declared wild and scenic river of the highest water quality in the State.

Of 23 formal comments submitted in the corps' draft impact statement, 18 have been critical, including those of the Departments of Commerce and Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Louisiana Advisory Committee on Coastal and Marine Resources.

Still another has been opposed by the Environmental Protection Agency as environmentally unsound and because the benefits of the project would seem to accrue largely to pulp mills which want to flush their pollution downstream.

The Governor of Illinois has just announced his opposition to the Lincoln Lake project in Illinois because of rising costs and environmental complications.

The cost-benefit ratio for many of these projects was calculated any number of years ago and a 3¼-percent discount rate was used.

If the calculations were made again, using the 5½-percent discount rate used today, a good number of them would clearly be economically unjustified. The second problem with this bill is that for some projects the Corps of Engineers has simply not followed the law.

For example, there are six projects in this bill for which construction was initiated after the enactment of the National Environmental Protection Act and for which no final environmental impact statement is yet available as clearly required by that law. In all, there are 119 projects in this bill for which draft and/or final environmental impact statements have not been filed with the Council on Environmental Quality. The bill provides \$438 million to carry on those projects.

While some people contend that no environmental impact statements are required for these projects, I disagree. The

act itself, legislative history, and guidelines for States implementation and the courts all indicate otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I have roughly four choices: I could offer an amendment to make an across-the-board cut for all corps projects in an attempt to symbolically show that I think this budget is too large, hoping that the corps would cut funds from the most questionable projects. But, based on past performance of the corps, we know that would not happen.

Or, I could offer an amendment to cut funds for all 119 projects for which environmental impact statements are not available. But, frankly, given the political facts of life surrounding public works bills, I don't have much hope of such an amendment passing.

Third, I could offer an amendment to knock out the six projects for which construction began after January 1, 1970, the date on which NEPA took effect.

The fact is that none of these would work and I would be wasting the committee's time. The other alternative left for me is simply to vote against this entire bill, which is what I intend to do. I also intend to vote for amendments to delete other projects which will be offered by others.

I realize that the Corps of Engineers can give various reasons for not filing impact statements: that the program was authorized before 1970; that money was appropriated before 1970; that some local work was done before 1970; or that the project was neither controversial nor would produce significant environmental damage. But the fact is that the courts have ruled otherwise and while it is unlikely that the Congress will stop funds for these projects, it is not at all unlikely that the courts will stop them for not complying with NEPA.

Just last week a Federal district court in Wisconsin ordered the corps to stop dredging a segment of the Mississippi. The project had been underway for 5 days and was to have been completed in 2 or 3 more. The corps took the position that a project of less than a mile was not a major undertaking and was exempt from NEPA.

The court ruled otherwise, and a project the corps said was not subject to NEPA has been stopped because an environmental impact statement was not completed.

I say all this for this reason: I realize the Members of this body all value the projects in their districts, I have one of my own in my district. As far as the Congress is concerned they probably have little to worry about in terms of a cutoff of funds. But the courts are a different matter.

I would suggest that those of you who have the 119 projects without impact statements in your districts and want to keep them, ought to encourage the corps to finish the environmental impact statements on them. With my comments on this legislation last year and this year, I have tried to encourage the corps to get those impact statements done because, in my judgment, they are required by law.

Mr. Chairman, I want to serve notice right now that I intend to offer an amendment to the next year's bill recommending that for every project for which a 102 statement has not been filed, that I think 5 years will have been a long enough time to have given the Corps of Engineers a chance to produce them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, restudy of authorized projects, and when authorized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authorization for construction, \$53,939,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565), to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY OF OHIO

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARNEY of Ohio: Page 5, line 8, insert immediately after "Army" the following: "*Provided further*, That \$10,000 of this appropriation shall be available to conduct a feasibility study with respect to canalization of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers".

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, and my fellow Members of the House, this will probably be the easiest vote the Members have ever had in this session or in most any session. In the proposed appropriation for the Corps of Engineers there is an amount of \$53,939,000. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I ask for no additional money. All I ask is that \$10,000 of this \$53 million be set aside for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study of the canalization of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers in western Pennsylvania and northeastern Ohio.

The canal feasibility study was unanimously authorized by the House Committee on Public Works on October 12, 1972, and put in their bill and adopted by this body, but the Corps of Engineers was unable to include these funds in the project book for the fiscal year 1974 budget due to the late approval of the measure.

On April 18, however, I talked to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) who was very cooperative, and I received a capability study from the Corps of Engineers saying that they would be able to utilize for the purpose of conducting studies and holding public hearings \$10,000 for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that this does not conflict with any budget objectives. The purpose of this study is to determine if a proposed stub canal is feasible in terms of economic, social, and environmental effects.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out one other thing, and that is that I have the rather dubious distinction as

a Member of the Congress in filling the shoes of one of the greatest Members who ever worked in this Congress, and that is the late Honorable Michael J. Kirwan who, for many years, was the subcommittee chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Those Members who knew Mike, and most of the present Members did, knew that for many years he worked for a canal from the Ohio River to Lake Erie.

Unfortunately, opposition in Ohio and Pennsylvania, killed that project, and Mike Kirwan's dream. It was never realized.

I want to point out to the new Members, because all of the old-time Members know this, that Mike Kirwan was not only a Congressman for the 19th District of Ohio, but he was a Congressman for the entire United States.

There is hardly a veteran here who at some time or other did not go to Mike Kirwan, and Mike Kirwan always gave them a hearing. I am asking the Members to approve this, which is a modified version of Mike's study, based upon what he did for the Members. I am asking the Members to give the same consideration here, a hearing and a chance to be heard, that Mike gave the Members on their many projects. That is all I am asking for is \$10,000 to see if this project is feasible.

I live in an area in northeastern Ohio near western Pennsylvania which is plagued with seasonal, cyclical unemployment. The unfortunate part is that it costs us more money to assemble raw materials. We are an old steel center with very fine, trained workers. It costs us more to assemble the raw materials. The Lykes Sheet & Tube Co., our biggest employer, has said that unless they can get some relief through a stub canal and water transportation to bring their raw materials in, they are going to be forced to shut down.

I do not know whether this canal is economically feasible. I do not know if there is enough natural water in the rivers to maintain a year around flow. All I am asking is for a chance to have the Corps of Engineers make studies and to have some public hearings to see whether or not this project is feasible. I assure the Members that should the Corps of Engineers say it is not feasible, I will never come back to this Congress and appear up here again and ask for more money. I do tell the Members that if they say it is feasible, I will fight for a canal in my district with everything I have got. There is no additional money asked for here. This is not the Kirwan Canal. This will be the canalization of two existing rivers. The experts tell me that the water is there, and I think that the Corps of Engineers should be allowed to have hearings, public hearings, where everybody involved would have a chance to have their say and then go on from there. I ask the Members for support.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with much regret that I oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. He is one of the

most delightful gentlemen in the House.

Mike Kirwan was my predecessor as chairman of this subcommittee. We all know that for years Mike Kirwan advocated the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal. I don't usually oppose a study, but the Governor of Pennsylvania and members of the Pennsylvania delegation have expressed opposition to it. In addition, I am informed that, at today's prices, the stub canal would cost about \$1.1 billion. This would amount to about \$18 million a mile.

I want to say to my friend from Ohio that he is fighting in the tradition of his illustrious predecessor and he is to be commended. I regret I cannot support his amendment. I ask that it be defeated.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, and I heard him plead for a project in his district. I can understand the economic situation which he has explained to the Members, but for those who have been here for a number of years, his predecessor, Mike Kirwan, was unable to convince the Congress that we should ever build the Lake Erie-Ohio Canal. The figures during Mike's lifetime have skyrocketed to the figures you have just heard the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee reiterate—over \$18 million a mile.

I thought when the late Mike Kirwan passed to his reward that we had heard the last of the canal, but now we have a new version of this project called the Stub Canal.

I have been around here long enough to know that the Stub Canal is like the camel's nose in the tent. If we would just let it in to eat a little, the first thing we know the camel is in the tent and we are on the outside, and that is what will happen if we authorize the \$10,000 for the Stub Canal.

The Corps of Engineers has studied this in every respect. It is basically a fight between two States. If this Stub Canal is built it will adversely affect the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania economically. For that reason the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, who happens to belong to the opposite political party, after a careful search of all the facts to determine whether or not any benefits could come to that section of the country which would enable us to build this canal or to make a study, has come down and asked the entire Pennsylvania delegation, to oppose this because all the information that the State agencies are able to determine and all the information we are able to get from the Corps of Engineers is that there is no reason to waste \$10,000 on studying this dead camel. Let us bury it. Let us keep it where it is, with the late Mike Kirwan, and hope we will not hear any more about the Stub Canal in Ohio.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. I want to point out I got a letter of apology from Governor Shapp of Pennsylvania. He said he

thought this was the lake to river canal. I have a letter of apology in my files signed by him at least in which he apologizes. He did not even know what I was talking about. This is not the Kirwan Canal, this is the canalization of two rivers, and the Corps of Engineers has assured me it should be studied. They have told me that.

Mr. SAYLOR. Governor Shapp has been in touch with the dean of our delegation Dr. MORGAN and myself and even though he has written my colleague a letter, and I do not doubt he did, I must oppose the gentleman.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, in his kind way sent me a copy of the letter from the Governor's office. It was not signed by the Governor himself. It was signed by a man in the Governor's office named Norville Reese, one of his secretaries. It was not signed by the Governor.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I stand in opposition to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

I think there are some facts that must be brought to the attention of the Members. The Mon-Yough Chamber of Commerce, that represents some 80 particular businesses in southwestern Pennsylvania which would be affected by this amendment if it were adopted by this committee, has gone on record repeatedly and has stated that they are unalterably against this program. Second, the Greater Pittsburgh area chamber of commerce, which my good friend indicates would be affected in some indirect respects, also has gone on record through their chamber of commerce and the combined voice of business, that this canal should not be built.

Whatever name we call this turkey, the big ditch, the little ditch, the big-little ditch, it has been kicking around for the last 30 or 40 years in our area. I oppose this amendment. Every Congressman in the Pennsylvania delegation opposes this amendment. The dean of the delegation took time to appear personally before the committee opposing this amendment. Every Governor of Pennsylvania has opposed this amendment.

In 1957, just to illustrate the attention this project has received throughout the years, the Pennsylvania State Planning Commission requested the consulting firm of Ford, Bacon & Davis to study the feasibility of constructing the canal. That firm advised it was not practical and above all gave the further advice that such a canal would not be to the best interest of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This same study recurred in 1965.

I would like to close with another observation.

Just recently the National Water Commission made available a study for this Congress, for the Nation in general, and also the administration, and reported that it recommends a toll or user tax be

put into effect on inland waterways, and the whole proposition surrounding this big-little ditch or the big ditch or the little ditch involves a toll-free concept.

Second, that all costs for the construction in such projects be put on the local communities and local localities on this question.

Again, with great respect, sincere respect, to my friend from our neighboring State, I do have to make this observation, and it is not easy. I oppose the amendment and urge that it be defeated.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, over a period of years I have stood in this well many times to oppose this canal. It is designed and conceived for one steel company in Ohio to make it competitive with the other steel companies in Pennsylvania.

Let me tell the Members that this canal has been studied, and studied almost to death. The first time it was studied is in House Document 277 in the 73d Congress. Here we are, 40 years later in the 93d Congress, asking for the restudy of this same canal.

I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) when he stated this is a foot in the door approach. This canal—known as the Mononogahela-Ohio River-Lake Erie canal was proposed first in 1919.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY) said this is a stub canal between two rivers, the Mahoning and Beaver, but by putting those rivers together and using barges, they can get their steel into Lake Erie cheaper than Pennsylvania steel.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see us going forward with a project costing \$18 million per mile and going to cost \$2.5 billion dollars, the final version of this canal, for one single steel company.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ).

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. GAYDOS, and Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I hate to oppose my good friend from Ohio, but I have long been against this canal.

Mr. Chairman, here we are today attempting to revive the project known as the Stub Canal, but please believe me when I say that the canal is going to grow and grow into a big ditch.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN, corrected me, and now I want to correct him. It is not one steel company. There are U.S. Steel, Republic Steel and Youngstown Sheet and Tube plus all the fabricators of my district.

One more thing, all up the Beaver River, all the towns such as Ellwood City, and Newcastle in western Pennsylvania also are for the canal.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, this is very fine, but the same steel companies

and steelworkers are in my district and they do not want the canal.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the last thing this committee needs is a good battle between Ohio and Pennsylvania, so if the Congressman from Youngstown will permit me, I have a solution for the gentlemen from Pennsylvania who have taken the well.

This Congressman, whose 62,000 acres would have been inundated by the Ohio River-Lake Erie Canal, along with the Congressman from Pennsylvania (Mr. VIGORITO) has a bill in the Committee on Public Works to deauthorize the Lake Erie Canal. I recommend the support of all the gentlemen from Pennsylvania who have taken the well to support our legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the gentleman from Youngstown, I would say to him that this Congressman, the very first time he ever spoke in the well of this House, was to stand up to the late great Michael Kirwan and ask this House to vote against his canal when he wanted \$750,000. After I got through speaking, the gentleman who went on to become the Governor of Mississippi, John Bell Williams, got up and said:

Let's give Mike his damned ditch.

That is exactly what happened on the House floor, and he got it minus two votes.

Mr. Chairman, I do say in all fairness that this is a \$10,000 channelization study. We can deauthorize the Ohio River canal by getting on with Mr. VIGORITO's and my bill to solve this problem. I have no objection to the study and would recommend it to my colleagues.

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

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. I yield to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY).

I wish to associate myself with his remarks and with those of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I believe it has been clearly established by now that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY) is not asking for a canal. He is merely asking for the channelization of two rivers which are already downstream from a major industrial area and therefore do not involve any horrendous ecological problems or the like.

I oppose the concept of the "Kirwan ditch," which I thought would have been a serious mistake from many standpoints, but that is not what the gentleman is asking for. He is asking only for a study of a newer channelization. If the study is impartial, which I would hope it would be, it would bring out whether there are any serious drawbacks to this proposal. I believe the gentleman has made a reasonable suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction): \$864,569,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That \$1,100,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. McCLOSKEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLOSKEY: "on page 5, line 17, strike '\$864,569,000,' and insert in lieu thereof '\$848,569,000.'"

On page 6, line 6, add: "*Provided further*, that no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction of the new Melones Lake project."

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the first time that I have ever had the privilege of rising on the floor of the House to express a position concurred in by the Honorable Governor of the State of California, Ronald Reagan, and the Senator from California, JOHN TUNNEY. It is a bipartisan issue, and an issue of some interest, I believe, to the committee.

I want to apologize to the distinguished gentlemen of the subcommittee for not raising this earlier, before the markup session of the subcommittee, but from the facts I shall relate I believe the gentlemen of the subcommittee will understand that this issue has only been recently raised in the courts of California on the points I wish to make.

This amendment would delete \$16 million from this year's portion of continuing construction of the New Melones Dam. The New Melones Dam was originally authorized on the central California Stanislaus River in 1944, a much smaller dam, primarily for flood control purposes.

In 1962 the authorization was increased, to be an extremely large dam, 620 feet high, to impound 2.4 million acre-feet, primarily for power use and for the use of water for irrigation purposes.

Since that initial authorization nearly \$40 million of the \$218 million estimated cost of the dam has been spent, and this year's appropriation would be for the continuing work on the diversion

tunnel and works in connection with the dam.

Now, what has happened since we authorized this dam in 1962? Well, first, at the present time, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in California, has enjoined further construction of the dam. At present no construction can proceed, and the matter is going to be heard on July 9 of this year.

Mr. Chairman, I will come to my second point, and this is the point which makes this a far greater issue than merely the one of the conservationists who would like to preserve the white water and the raft trips down the river. This river has become in the last few years the second most popular white water river in America, second only to the Colorado.

What has happened is that on April 5 of this year, less than 3 months ago, the State Water Resources Board in the State of California unanimously ruled in a 5 to 0 decision that the impoundment of three-fourths of the water sought by the Bureau of Reclamation could not proceed and that water could be impounded only to the extent which would fill the dam one-quarter full.

What does that mean? If the State Water Resources Board of California is correct, it means that the primary purposes of the dam, the generation of power and the use of water for irrigation, cannot be fulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, here is what the board ruled on April 5:

There certainly has been no demonstrated need for the additional water supplies developed by this project outside of the local area.

The bureau has failed in spirit if not in substance to meet the statutory requirements for approval of a permit to appropriate water for such purposes.

When the evidence indicates, as it does here, that an applicant already has a right to sufficient water to meet his needs for beneficial use within the foreseeable future, rights to additional water should be withheld.

Thus the board has ruled that there is no need for the water that this dam seeks to impound, and will only permit the impoundment of a quarter of the water behind the dam. This means the cost benefits which were considered by the committee when it authorized the dam are no longer valid. The benefits of this dam were \$13.5 million per year, but if they take out the power and the water consumption under this rule of the water board, the benefits drop to less than \$5 million per year, and the costs are roughly \$8 million per year.

So the validity of the dam depends on whether or not the State Water Resources Board is upheld.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what has happened? The Bureau of Reclamation which applied to the State board for a permit to impound the full amount of water has been denied the rights applied for, and the Bureau of Reclamation has said:

We are going to disregard the ruling of the State of California.

And the State of California 2 weeks ago, on June 19, filed an action in the

Federal court for declaratory relief upholding the State's position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. McCloskey) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCloskey was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, the issue before the committee is now one which must be considered against the fact that a Federal court has enjoined further construction of the dam, and with the State of California contending that its rights are paramount in ordering a limit of the use of the dam to one-fourth of the capacity originally intended.

With that issue before the courts, with the State Water Resources Board having ruled unanimously that there was no demonstrated use for the water at the present time, the Congress is faced with this position: Do we appropriate \$16 million at this time for the continuing construction of a dam which can be filled only one-quarter full?

Mr. Chairman, Russell Train—and I call the attention of my Republican colleagues to this—Russell Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, said this in a letter to the Corps of Engineers 2 months ago:

It appears to us the board's decision constitutes a significant new development requiring further response by the concerned Federal agencies before irreversible actions are taken on the project as originally proposed.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is unwise for us to appropriate \$16 million at a time when the Federal Government is reevaluating the project, when we have litigation pending as to whether or not the dam can even go forward, and at this time when we are in fiscal difficulties.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Sisk).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman to say that there was no conceivable need for this water that would be conserved in this particular dam?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I was quoting from the opinion of the State Water Resources Board, citing that the need has not been demonstrated in the foreseeable future.

Let me be specific in their ruling.

What they said is as follows:

By failing to present evidence of a specific plan to use the water conserved by the New Melones project for consumption purposes, the bureau has failed in spirit if not in substance to meet the statutory requirements for approval of a permit to appropriate water for such purposes.

They further say that until the need for use of the water is demonstrated, they will not grant a permit for such use.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman, where is this project located? Is it not a fact that it is located in the San Joaquin Valley in California?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. It is entirely located within the State of California.

Mr. SISK. Is it located in San Joaquin Valley?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Yes, it is.

I do not care what the State board said, but we are in a deficit situation now by over 1.5 million acre-feet of water in the San Joaquin Valley.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. All I can tell you is the State Water Resources Board, which in the past has urged that water for use throughout the State be made available, says that this is not necessary.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is living in a dream world. I will tell you that.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

My colleagues, this project was authorized in 1944. I visited that part of the country about 10 years ago and saw the dam when it was in the first stages of construction. To date \$66.3 million has been allocated for planning and construction on the project. It is true a temporary injunction has been filed by the environmentalists on this project, but the final arguments will be made in July of this year. Because of the temporary injunction, the committee reduced the budget request from \$18 million to \$16 million, a cut of \$2 million.

The flood control benefits are estimated to be over \$2 million annually; the irrigation benefits are estimated to be \$3.6 million annually; and power benefits are \$5.6 million annually. Total benefits are \$13.77 million annually.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to be a good investment to spend \$16 million for an annual return of over \$13 million on this project.

Because funding of the project is thirty percent complete I think we should not stop it at this time, but wait to see what decision the appeals court renders.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, referring to the comments made earlier in connection with the Corps of Engineers responsibility under the National Environmental Policy Act, I want to insert the following statement supplied to me by the corps regarding environmental impact statements.

In order to comply with the spirit and philosophy of the NEPA, the Chief of Engineers directed a systematic review of all corps projects, and although not legislatively required, to have environmental statements prepared for all projects that were complete or under construction prior to NEPA if such projects have impacts that might be considered significant for any reason. Recognition of the heavy workload that requirement imposed, particularly in view of the emphasis concurrently being placed on manpower ceilings and funding limitations, it was necessary to schedule the preparation of statements over a period of time with priority to be given to the projects where controversies or unresolved environmental issues were known to exist.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this project is very vital to the people I represent. It is now in the district represented by the gentleman from California (Mr. Mathias). It was previously in the district represented by

our good friend from California (Mr. JOHNSON).

I started working on this project when I first came to the Congress in 1957, so you can understand I have a deep interest in it. I had hoped that through all of us working together on it we would be able to get this project built by 1977. That is a period of 20 years. That is a career in Congress. So you can understand my deep feeling about the project.

I know that Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. MATHIAS and Mr. SISK and others whose districts are dependent upon this project for flood control and water conservation and all of the good things that we can provide through these projects feel equally about it as I do.

Mr. Chairman, this project is probably one of the finest environmental projects that will ever be built by the Corps of Engineers. We have worked very closely with the local Sierra Club people in the area, and they are for it. They have worked on it, so that we have water quality that will provide clear water going down the river and into the delta area of California.

We have water conservation benefits and power benefits, and in addition to that we will have bird habitats and hiking trails and caves that are being conserved. We have even taken a very valuable species of spider out of one of the caves that would be inundated and have put it into another cave so that this valuable spider will be saved. My local conservationists are all for it.

What we find is that conservationists and environmentalists that come from the city of San Francisco and Sacramento are against it.

But we who live with it, where we have millions of dollars of flood damage about every few years from this river, know we have to have this project.

The gentleman from California (Mr. McCLOSKEY), who lives over in the bay area, talks about the water rights, but the gentleman does not tell us that this has been before the U.S. District Court, and is now on appeal before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in which the environmental report and the need for the water is being determined by the U.S. courts. Certainly it will determine the rights of the Federal Government to build and to determine the rights of the water resources board of California to determine how the dam is built.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members that it is my deepest belief that we have got to move forward with this dam. We have to allow the court to determine as to the rights of the parties and the rights of the State of California, and the Federal Government and the people of the district.

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

Mr. McFALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) will concede, will the gentleman not, that the issue is not whether the dam can be built, but whether the State of California can require that it only be filled to one-fourth of its capacity. Is that not the issue before the court?

Mr. McFALL. It would be entirely in the court's decision. It would be undoubtedly decided by the court as is the environmental report issue which the Federal court is considering. We should point out, the district court has already determined that the environmental report is proper, that there is a sufficient plan for use of water, and that the dam can be built. It is now on appeal.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that there is also a decision, if the gentleman from California will permit me to continue, there is a decision in a Colorado case that is exactly on all fours with this one, which holds the Federal Government has the right to go ahead with this dam.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. If the gentleman will yield further, the dam, yes, but it does not have the right to fill the dam.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLOSKEY) which would delete \$16 million for the New Melones Dam on the Stanislaus River. The dam, the white water, and the lake that are involved are all in my congressional district, and I am, I believe, infinitely more familiar with this important project than my colleague who has proposed this ill-conceived amendment.

The main purposes of this project are to provide pollution-free hydroelectric power, increased water sources, and, most important of all, the dam will control floods that have caused millions and millions of dollars worth of damage to the farms and residences along this river.

The Stanislaus River has flooded 15 times since 1907, each time causing millions and millions of dollars worth of damage.

Four years ago, which was the last time the river flooded, the estimate of damage in total was \$2.5 million. Thirty-five thousand acres are subject to flooding at this present time.

I believe the Members all recognize the need today for necessary water supplies, necessary additional power sources, and necessary flood controls. The New Melones project would do this and, even more, it would provide a vastly improved recreational area.

The district engineer of the Army Corps of Engineers, Colonel Donovan, has worked very closely with the environmentalists, and the result has been a plan to improve the lower river, and actually enhance the environmental aspects.

Because of periodic flooding, the 55 miles of lower river, wildlife habitat and fish, including salmon, may be lost forever without this project.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, the New Melones project has the backing of every governing body in the entire district.

I believe it comes down to this: That the New Melones Dam would sacrifice a 9-mile stretch of white water on the upper river, however, the Corps of Engineers has pledged to replace 5 miles of this lost white water downstream from the dam.

So let us remember that rafting down

a river is great fun. In fact, I am taking a whitewater trip this July 5 down the Tuolumne River.

Let us also remember that rafting down the river is recreation. It has nothing at all to do with environmental considerations. This amendment to cut funding is, in my opinion, conceived by those who either have an imperfect understanding of the project or who are blinded by one narrow consideration. I feel that the pluses of water storage, recreation, hydroelectric power, flood prevention, and improved environmental conditions on the lower river far, far outweigh the desires of a handful of people who want a recreational pursuit of rafting down 9 miles of river, even though 5 miles would still be provided after the completion of the New Melones Dam.

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

Mr. MATHIAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman in his opposition and would associate myself with his remarks. I would point out to this body that every member of the San Joaquin delegation thus far has risen in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MATHIAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine statement he has made. Actually, the \$16 million for the New Melones Dam is budgeted. It was in the President's budget. If for some reason or another the money cannot be expended immediately, certainly the situation which has been described will have resolved itself before next year. If we strike this money out, then there will be no way for the project to continue, even though the decision may well be in favor of continuing the project. I think it would be wrong to pass this amendment and make it absolutely necessary to shut the project down for a year. I would prefer to have the money stay in the bill, and if it is necessary to temporarily impound it—that is an unpopular word, I know—for a few weeks or a month in order to resolve this situation.

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

Mr. MATHIAS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he stated that impoundment might be necessary. I want to point out that the project has stopped now. The court injunction from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has shut down the project.

Mr. RHODES. If the gentleman will yield further, one never knows from the history of litigation, just exactly when the litigation will be determined, and if the litigation is to be determined favorably for continuance, my point is that I think the money should be available at that time.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think I am realistic and understand what will happen

to this. But in order that my colleagues in the House not from California may have a better understanding that this is not a purely local matter that ought to be resolved between the local men involved in the local districts that are touched by this project, I want to say a word or two. Although the dam is not in my district, my district is, in fact, touched by the project, because if the dam were permitted by the State Water Rights Board to be filled to its full capacity, it would divert from the delta area in my own particular congressional district a quantity of water in excess of that which we presently can afford to permit to be diverted. So it has a direct impact upon my own congressional district, but that is not of much importance, I suspect, to a great number of the Members of the House of Representatives as they listen to the debate on this bill.

What may be of importance to some is the fact that this project has been opposed by an environmental coalition comprised of the following groups:

- National Wildlife Federation.
- National Parks and Conservation Association.
- Defenders of Wildlife.
- Environmental Action.
- Wildlife Management Institute.
- Environmental Policy Center.
- American Rivers Conservation Council.
- National Audubon Society.
- Sierra Club.
- Environmental Defense Fund.
- Trout Unlimited.
- Friends of the Earth.
- Wilderness Society.

They have all gathered together in a national conservation movement and have characterized this project as one of the two greatest disasters in water development being proposed for this year in the Federal Congress.

That fact may be of importance to Members who are not involved in the local dispute.

There was a representation that the local Sierra Club chapter in the area involved with this particular project was in fact in support of it. I have a letter dated June 27, 1973, from the Washington representative of the Sierra Club, addressed to Congressman McCloskey, and in his statement in that letter the Sierra Club representative says:

I am writing to you because there has been some question about the position of the local Sierra Club group on the New Melones Dam. Both the Mother Lode Chapter and the Sierra Club itself are strongly opposed to the dam. The Yokut Wilderness Group which is part of the Mother Lode Chapter indicated in its resolution that it could only support the dam if monies for downstream mitigation were simultaneously appropriated along with construction funds. Since none of the money in the fiscal '74 appropriation is allocated for any downstream mitigation, the Yokut Wilderness Group is definitely not in support of this appropriation.

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

Mr. WALDIE. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL).

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, the gen-

tleman's information is contrary to my own. There is a letter to Russell Train which was signed by members of the Yokut Club, the local chapter. I know them personally and I have discussed this with them and I know what their position is.

As far as the provisions for the fish and wildlife habitat downstream, that is possible within the funds allocated to the dam and I am certain that the Yokut Club and the people who have worked so hard on this project are in favor of it.

But I would ask the gentleman how it is possible that this dam can divert water from the delta which we share when all the water quality features of this dam and the fish and wildlife water which will be provided will be running down into his district. How is it possible that we can provide an extra approximately 160,000 acre-feet of water for the delta?

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I presume the gentleman has read the water rights decision on this issue?

Mr. McFALL. I have but I do not believe it.

Mr. WALDIE. That decision said if this dam were filled 100 percent the delta waters would be damaged because the water necessary to implement that delta decision would not be available. Hence I conclude that to construct this dam and fill it to 100 percent would be contrary to the delta water decision which is beneficial to that area.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if that decision is final, the total will require an extra 2 million acre-feet of water which we do not have and this dam will help provide it.

Mr. WALDIE. This dam will not help provide it because the quantity to be captured behind this dam is not to go into the delta, it is to be diverted elsewhere, and the gentleman knows that full well.

Mr. McFALL. This dam will provide 260,000 firm acre-feet of water. We are now 500,000 acre-feet of water short in the delta. If the other water board decision stands, we could be short 2 million acre-feet and there is no other place for us to get it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCloskey). I completely agree with the arguments of the environmental defense fund which maintains that this \$218 million project is grossly overpriced and poorly planned. If built, this dam would destroy 15 miles of invaluable recreational area. Furthermore, the water provided by the New Melones Dam will not be needed for many years to come, if ever, according to State authorities.

Thus, I oppose the funding of the New Melones Dam project, and I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment to H.R. 8947.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

BUFFET SERVICE IN THE RESTAURANT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. We have been getting some complaints about working late and having the same old menu in the restaurant, so in order to try to help, there is nothing I can do about working late but we have a buffet down there tonight, all one can eat for \$4, including steamship round of beef and ham and fruit salad and cake and pie—what have you.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise today to voice my vigorous opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from California. The New Melones project was authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1962. At that time it was a project reflecting benefit-cost ratio of 1.5 to 1, including the multiple purposes of flood control, irrigation, power generation, fish and wildlife water quality, and general recreation. Construction was started in 1966, following a 2-year preconstruction engineering period.

We have invested to date, approximately \$66 million in this project. The appropriation before us would recommend the investment of another \$16 million. Of this total about \$6.5 million is allocated for meeting contract payments on the relocation of State Highway 49, which is now underway and another \$2.4 million of this is for engineering design and other work which ironically includes the continuation of the environmental enhancement features so strongly supported by the local environmentalists in the immediate area who pretty much unanimously support the continuation of this project.

In discussing the points raised in support of the elimination of the appropriations for fiscal year 1974, I would like to first touch on the basic economics of this situation. This is not a money saving proposition. We are talking now about a \$16 million appropriation. If we bring this project to an abrupt halt at the start of the coming fiscal year, it would involve termination of contracts already awarded with a resulting loss to the taxpayers as well as a loss of project benefits which would amount to almost \$14 million annually.

This loss would increase whenever the project was started up again, as we would have to get the contracts awarded once again and try to pick up the pieces which is always a costly procedure. This leaves, I believe, just a couple of other points which should be considered in deciding whether or not we should move ahead with the project.

The basic opposition to it has been voiced by those who are concerned about the loss of some white water canoe resources. There is no question but what there will be a loss of some white water resources. The Corps of Engineers recognizes this and the question has been discussed fully and evaluated in the environmental impact statement which has been filed by the Corps of Engineers on this project. I should point out that Colonel Donovan, who is the district engineer in Sacramento, is something of a canoeing and kayak enthusiast himself and

he has ridden these waters personally and he has gone to great pains to try to come up with some alternative proposals.

Through Colonel Donovan, the Corps of Engineers has made a commitment to the Governor and to others that potential white water reaches along other portions of the Stanislaus River will be developed to the maximum extent possible by the corps. Basically, I think the record will show that the studies to accomplish this purpose will be completed in a couple of years, long before the existing white water areas will be affected by the project.

Questions have been raised about the environmental impact statement. The final statement was filed with the Council on Environmental Quality on July 17, 1972. A supplemental statement was filed with the CEQ on January 23, 1973.

Subsequent to this filing the question of the adequacy of the environmental statement was raised in the U.S. Federal courts. A decision has been made by the U.S. district court in California that the statement and the supplement are legally sufficient. The matter has been appealed by those who would try to block the entire project in order to preserve the white water as is and who do not accept the alternate white water proposals. Final arguments on this appeal will be held in the appellate court, July 9, and I would assume a decision would be forthcoming very shortly thereafter.

We are, of course, optimistic that the project will be approved by the courts and at that time we will be able to move ahead.

Another point raised has been the impact of a California State Water Quality Control Board decision on the water rights involved in the project. I believe there is a great deal of misinformation spread about this decision, including some who would believe or contend that the Federal project would come under the jurisdiction of the State board. This is a basic issue, which has been raised in prior instances and I think the decisions have been pretty much consistent that they are not so applicable and I would anticipate that this will be the decision in this case.

Even if the decision of the State Water Quality Control Board was adhered to by the U.S. Government, the benefit-cost ratio on the project as now designed and conceived, still would be 1.3 to 1. So we would still have a viable project.

Second, it should be emphasized that the decision is somewhat of an interim matter in that the board itself stated:

There is a demonstrated need for the full yield of the project in the four basin counties at some time in the future.

In other words, as far as the water is concerned, we will have to have this storage capacity ultimately to serve the immediate area without any consideration of export out of the basin.

In conclusion, I would like to raise two further points. One is that the key portion of the project is the development of hydro-electric energy. Energy which is pollution-free and which is desperately needed in California. There are none which we face today throughout the

Nation in the power supply for our homes, our business and our industries. Even here in Congress, we are walking through darkened halls because of the energy shortage. Every effort must be made to develop these resources for the benefit of all people.

Once again I should stress that hydro-electric generation of electrical power is the cleanest, most pollution-free means of developing electrical energy.

Finally, I want to point out that while some may believe the current debate over the white water is a conservationist versus developers fight, we have the support of virtually all the local conservation groups for this project as conceived and now under construction. They include the Yokut Wilderness Group, the Mother Lode Chapter of the Sierra Club, the Associated Sportsman of California and the Stanislaus Speleological Association. Additionally we have the support of the Governor of California, California State Water Commission, California State Reclamation Board, California State Assembly and I anticipate in the next few days, the California State Senate will endorse the project. In the litigation, which I mentioned earlier, there were 30 intervenors in support of the United States. They include four counties; six cities; for water, sanitary or reclamation districts; eight water or land use associations; the Associated General Contractors of California; the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California; and local citizens.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues here in the House, we have here a good project, one which, I think, will be beneficial to all people of the area and the Nation. One in which the Nation and its people will recover far more in dividends from their investment than in many other projects that we have funded and I would hope that my colleagues here in the House would not let a few people whose interest in a particular outdoor recreational activity, I recognize and respect, block this project for I am convinced that the Corps of Engineers and the rest of us involved in this project will do whatever is humanly possible to provide adequate alternatives for the white water resources which will be affected by this project.

Therefore, I would hope that this amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will recall that about 4 years ago a delegation from the Committee on Public Works of this House attended that very area of the country following disastrous floods. Several repeated floods had ensued. We had public hearings. I do not live there, but I saw the devastation that lay in the wake of those disastrous floods. I heard the local citizens testify. Not one single citizen raised a voice against this project.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, all of them were very much in favor of it. I cannot conceive of any national organization

saying it is not environmentally sound to protect its people from those floodwaters.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is correct. It is a very large river and a very large watershed. We have had numerous floods. That is why they are very much interested in seeing the project built, because the flood benefits are very large and they will control floods, because it is of sufficient size to do that.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my support to Congressman McCloskey's amendment to the Public Works Appropriation to delete funding for construction of the New Melones Dam on the Stanislaus River in California. From both economic and ecological points of view, the construction of the New Melones Dam is unwarranted.

Originally planned to store water for irrigation, as part of the Central Valley Project which is still unauthorized, the reservoir created by the dam is no longer required for agricultural purposes. In addition, the California State water resources control board has denied the Bureau of Reclamation the right to fill the reservoir because of lack of evidence that the water will ever be needed, much less needed in the near future. This means that on a cost-benefit basis, using the Army Corps of Engineers figures, there will be no economic advantage to construction of the dam.

Ecologically, the dam will destroy all 15 miles of the safe but challenging whitewater rapids of the Stanislaus River—the second most widely used whitewater river in the United States. It will also cause the loss of unusual limestone, geological formations, thousands of acres of wildlife habitat, and miles of excellent trout fishing. In return for this pointless destruction, the Corps of Engineers has not offered the State of California any mitigation or even promised to consider compensation of any kind until 1974.

These factors, I feel, cannot fail to make clear the obvious desirability of Congressman McCloskey's amendment and I heartily urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCloskey).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. McCloskey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, now that the warfare between the States of Pennsyl-

vania and Ohio, and the internal warfare in California, has subsided, I wonder if we could get something started with respect to West Virginia and the half million dollars in this bill to study strip mining. I thought that was being studied all over the place.

Why is there \$540,000 to study strip mining in Appalachia?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend that we do have Appalachian Regional Development Commission, which consists of States from New York to Mississippi, some 13 States. If you are referring to an Appalachian project, we have provided funds for highways, health care, trade centers, mine restoration, and for other authorized programs.

Mr. GROSS. That is the entire point. This bill increases by 23 percent over last year the funds for the Appalachian Commission, and yet there is \$540,000 in this bill for a study of strip mining. Why is it that the Commission does not conduct the study of strip mining?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is referring to the item on page 19 of the report?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The item I was speaking to was the Appalachian Regional Development Commission.

This item referred to on page 19 is for a Corps of Engineers study, which was included in the budget request.

The bill includes \$540,000 for a study of the effects of strip mining operations upon the navigable rivers and their tributaries. As the gentleman knows, there is sedimentation which runs into navigable rivers and their tributaries. The Corps of Engineers wants to know the effects of those strip mining discharges and the hazards of flooding conditions on coal mining areas.

Mr. GROSS. How many other funds have been established and are being used for this purpose? I thought we had a discussion of one such fund in another bill only a day or two ago.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Strip mining seems to be a large problem in many areas of several States. The corps is asking for these funds for this study, and the committee felt, based upon testimony received during the hearings, that it would be wise to approve the funds.

Mr. GROSS. I guess we are all for motherhood and against sin.

Let me ask the gentleman why there is an increase of 23 percent for the maintenance of the Appalachian Commission? Why should the Commission have more money to spend?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The increase is for the Appalachian Regional Commission and is to provide for the salaries of the Federal cochairman and his staff and the Federal share, 50 percent, of the Commission's administrative expenses.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous

consent that they may be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The portion of the bill to which the amendments relate is as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$184,360,000, of which \$115,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer: *Provided further*, That the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit shall not be determined until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform with the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 10, line 22, strike out "\$184,360,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$167,360,000".

Page 11, line 17, insert immediately after "waters" the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to continue construction of the Garrison diversion unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, except that funds may be expended with respect to the Minot extension of such unit".

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, when authorization hearings for the Garrison diversion project were held in 1965, I filed a minority report in which I said that, in my belief, the good people of North Dakota were being deceived by project claims and promises which would not be fulfilled.

I went on to state that I viewed the project as a Pandora's box which, though holding the seed of hope, would release much wrong and evil when opened. I voiced then a concern that the Garrison diversion project would prove not to be in the best interest of North Dakota, the Missouri River Basin, and the Nation.

That was 8 years ago. Garrison diversion was then only a promise on paper.

Today that "promise" is under construction—the Pandora's box has been opened—and the problems for the good people of North Dakota are just beginning.

Within the last 6 months, the largest farm organization in North Dakota—the 31,000-member North Dakota Farmers Union—and the largest conservation organization in the State—the North Dakota Wildlife Federation—have both

formally requested the President of the United States to place a moratorium on further construction and land acquisition for the Garrison diversion project. They are not the only organizations to do so—the North Dakota Audubon Council, the North Dakota chapter of the National Farmers Organization, and the North Dakota Natural Science Society have passed resolutions with a similar request.

Why then have organizations like these, which 8 years ago offered enthusiastic support for the project, now called for a moratorium?

I believe the answer lies in the simple fact that a great deal concerning the project has changed since the time of authorization.

The most immediately apparent change is found in the cost to the taxpayer—the project was authorized at a cost of \$212 million; the latest cost estimates released by the Bureau of Reclamation this year now show the project total cost at \$378 million.

That represents a projected 78 percent cost overrun, already, for a project on which construction is, as of January 1, 1973, 15 percent complete—with construction scheduled to continue at least until the early 1980's.

Further, with 80 percent of the claimed benefits allocated to irrigation, there now exists for the project area a projected Federal subsidy of \$1,208 per irrigated acre.

If cost overruns continue at the present rate, and I see little hope that they shall continue at anything less, then we are now facing a project that probably will eventually cost U.S. taxpayers over a half-billion dollars—with the irrigation subsidy then having reached an incredible \$2,000 per acre.

Further, there are now sober indications that repayment to the Treasury of project costs will be no less than impossible. During authorization hearings, plans were detailed to pay back, over a period of 50 years, the majority of project costs from hydroelectric power revenues of the Missouri River Basin.

On March 3, 1972, however, an AP release from this city quoted Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats of the General Accounting Office as saying that electric power revenues from the Missouri River Basin power project were inadequate to pay for Federal investments, totaling an estimated \$5.25 billion, within the required 50 years.

Aside from the inexcusable cost overruns now apparent, do we at least have reasonable guarantees that all benefits once claimed for the project are indeed to be realized?

Unfortunately, we do not.

When undertaking an irrigation project of any size, I would deem it desirable, as a basic consideration, to insure that the governmental agency to be charged with construction be at least able to provide ironclad guarantees that there is indeed land in the project area suitable for irrigation.

Thus it was that in 1965 I strongly criticized the Bureau of Reclamation for not having conducted adequate soil studies on all acreage on which they in-

tended to implement irrigation. At that time, detailed studies had been completed, according to the then Commissioner of Reclamation, Floyd Dominy, on 113,000 acres of the 250,000 acres under consideration for irrigation—with the findings of those 113,000 acres extrapolated over the entire area.

Although concerned then, I cannot find the words to adequately convey my disgust at having now learned—8 years later—after having spent over \$49 million on a major pumping plant and water delivery canal—the vitally necessary soil studies have still not been completed for portions of the project area.

For example, in an analysis of the project prepared last month by the North Dakota Farmers Union, it is pointed out that in the Middle Souris irrigation area, during the early part of 1972, a number of farmers who had earlier been encouraged to form the irrigation district were told, for the first time, that their land had been determined unfit for irrigation after detailed soil analysis.

In April of this year, the Bureau of Reclamation admitted that land studies were still only half complete in the Middle Souris area.

Nor is this all—at the same time the Bureau of Reclamation admitted that land classification studies for the New Rockford irrigation area will not be complete until May of 1974.

And in the Lincoln Valley area, the Bureau conceded in April of this year that “recent drainage studies have concluded that drainage problems may exist in a portion of the area and the final acreage developed may be less than the intended amount.” In this area, detailed land classification studies are not scheduled for completion until June of 1975.

Well, what is going on in North Dakota, anyway?

It would appear that we have turned loose those who like to dig canals, without first determining if the canals, when dug, will convey water to an area that can actually use it. These land classification studies, presently incomplete, should have been completed before any canal construction was initiated—the present situation is intolerable and inexcusable.

In an area of related concern, there is now reason to question the effect that irrigation will have on water quality in the rivers of North Dakota.

This concern is not to be taken lightly. There has recently been brought to the concern of Congress, and the State Department, for example, the situation of international consequence that has developed between the United States and Mexico as pertains to the harmful effect of increasing salt quantities placed in the Colorado River largely as a result of irrigation return flows.

It has been estimated that a Federal expenditure of more than \$200 million may be necessary if we are to clean up the Colorado River prior to its flow into Mexico.

The Garrison diversion project shall also involve irrigation discharged into a neighboring nation, Canada, through the Souris River and the Red River of the north.

According to figures recently released by the Bureau of Reclamation, the salt content of the Souris River will reach 2,260 mg/l during the first year of project implementation, average at 1,740 mg/l during the next 19 years, and average at 1,320 mg/l after that. The initial 19 year average, for this area of the Garrison diversion project, then, gentlemen, is approximately double that which is currently causing our problems with Mexico.

What, then, does the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation intend to do about the situation? Well, they have not decided. They have pointed out that a meeting was arranged to discuss the problem with Canadian officials—but not until February of this year. Should Canada decide, as Mexico did, that she does not want the degraded waters, then—to quote the Bureau's latest impact statement “a more detailed investigation . . . must be made.”

Well, gentlemen, how much more will we then add to the already indicated cost overruns to cover this problem?

As if this were not bad enough, the Bureau then goes on to present data—in the same impact statement—that indicates TDS in the James River will increase by 300 to 400 percent, and that detailed irrigation flow and water quality studies, essential to any preliminary determination of the project's impact upon the environment, have not been conducted for the James, Sheyenne, Wild Rice, and Red Rivers.

What these studies might show, and how much future treatment measures might cost us, is anybody's guess—and, gentlemen, it is not a matter over which we should be guessing.

Of additional concern to me is the question of whether certain benefits claimed at the time of authorization, and used as the partial justification for that authorization, can yet be claimed as benefits—in light of alternative means of accomplishing a given project objective.

Of the cities originally scheduled to receive municipal and industrial water supplies through the diversion project, the city of Minot, N. Dak., is the largest.

At the time of project authorization, 8 years ago, the need of the city of Minot for water was indeed a valid consideration.

A report published by the city of Minot in 1970, however, indicates that substantial potential sources of water have been found to exist in underground reservoirs near the city. One of these is the Sundre Aquifer which, according to the report, could supply water suitable for Minot's needs at a withdrawal rate of 6 million gallons per day, even with no recharge, for the next 50 years.

To probe deeper into this bureaucratic quagmire, in another area of pertinent concern, we find that, in time of a growing energy crisis, the Bureau of Reclamation has, inadvertently or otherwise, deleted mention of substantial energy requirements that will be needed for operation of the Garrison diversion project in their latest environmental impact statement filed in April of this year.

In the latest statement they admit there will be an annual 112.1 million

kWh hydroelectric generation loss from the Missouri River's mainstem dams—due to water diverted for the project and thus not flowing through the power turbines. They further qualify that 100 million kWh will be needed annually for on-farm pumping of project water. They do not mention, however, the 287.1 million kWh requirement to be needed annually for off-farm pumping of water through project features—that was listed earlier on page 37 of their previous preliminary final impact statement.

The total energy requirement for the Garrison Diversion project then will be 499.5 million kWh—or nearly three times the amount stated by the Bureau of Reclamation in their latest impact statement.

By way of comparison, this is 116 million kWh more than all of North Dakota industrial users required in 1971.

As such, at the time of a growing energy crisis, nearly a half-billion kWh will be used in North Dakota each year to irrigate 6/10 of 1 percent of the State's agricultural land—land that is already productive and producing fine crops through dryland agriculture.

The Bureau of Reclamation's latest impact statement also does not make mention of the fact, as admitted in an earlier statement, that:

New power sources, presumably fossil fuel or atomic, with added environmental impact, must be developed to supply customers currently dependent on power supplied by hydropower generation which will be serving the Garrison Diversion Unit.

Now this serious energy loss, it must be remembered, will be even more severe should additional water be required for any of the specific objectives of the entire project.

And, not too surprising, there are indications this may indeed be the case.

A major benefit for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes claimed at the time of project authorization was the intended freshening of the Devils Lake chain, a large series of lakes in north central North Dakota.

As reported, however, by the North Dakota chapter of the wildlife society after an intensive analysis of the project, an analysis that included contact with the U.S. Geological Survey, to actually freshen the Devils Lake area, will take 1.16 million acre feet of Missouri River water—which is one and one-third the amount presently allocated for the entire project.

Why the detailed analysis?—to point out, gentlemen, that this amount of water needed for this particular aspect of the project, 1.16 million acre feet, actually represents 11.6 times the amount of water allocated annually for all fish and wildlife benefits under the project plan . . . and, incredibly enough—1.33 times the amount of water now allocated for the entire project.

The freshening of the Devils Lake chain with project water as intended in the original authorization will then:

First. Be impossible, due to insufficient quantities of water now allocated.

Second. Be possible only through diversion of a substantially greater volume of water than originally planned, thus resulting in even less water avail-

able for Missouri River power generation and downstream navigation.

To add one final pinch of salt to an already festering wound now inflicted against the Nation's taxpayer's, it must be pointed out that a major justification for the project at the time of authorization—the projected fish and wildlife benefits—have now become the fish and wildlife costs.

At the time of authorization, indications were given that the project would result in a net gain of 16,000 acres of prairie wetlands, and much support was received then from conservation groups throughout North Dakota 'was in consideration of this promise.

As has seemingly been the mark of this project, however, the promise evaporated once Congress had granted the all-important authorization.

In the preliminary final impact statement released in January of this year, the Bureau of Reclamation admitted, in bold black and white print on the summary page, that the Garrison diversion project will result in the net decrease of 17,450 acres of prairie wetlands—and that represents the largest single unit loss of prairie wetlands of any project in North Dakota's history.

To put it bluntly, a major environmental benefit claimed at the time of authorization has become a major environmental hoax.

Nor is this all, when claiming major fishing benefits at the time of project authorization, through diverted water supplies, little consideration was apparently given to the fact, as now admitted by the Bureau of Reclamation, that carp and other rough fish will be introduced, via project water, to the presently carp-free waters of the Souris River, the Upper James and Sheyenne Rivers, the Devils Lake subbasin and eventually into Canadian waters.

In the opinion of the North Dakota wildlife society, this rough fish introduction will effectively negate fishing benefits once attributed to the project, as, through competition and predation, the rough fish will eventually replace valuable game fish presently in these waters.

Another intended benefit, another actual cost.

Now I do not believe that any man in this Chamber would wish to deny from the good people of North Dakota the claimed benefits of the Garrison diversion project—had the benefits once claimed been factual and realistic.

Conversely, I do not believe that any man in this Chamber should wish to stand aside if there is evidence—as there is now to an overwhelming degree—that ominous problems have become apparent with the Garrison diversion project.

Those from North Dakota who are aware of these problems, and who have expressed their concern via the resolutions I mentioned earlier, have asked for a construction moratorium so as to have time for additional analysis now necessary.

We have an opportunity to give them that time, to close the Pandora's box, and force the Bureau of Reclamation to answer the growing list of unanswered questions before any further appropriations might be granted at a later date.

I ask you to accept the responsibility of this House toward insuring the wise and proper use of tax moneys;

I ask you to accept the responsibility we have here today to demand greater assurances that this particular project will indeed stand in good merit for present and future North Dakotans;

I ask you to take the severe but necessary step—imperative in light of problems now encountered and yet unanswered—of deleting all funding earmarked for the Garrison diversion project for fiscal year 1974.

I respectfully ask your support of my amendment.

Thank you.

Mr. RHODES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. RHODES. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

For the purpose of refining the statement about the Colorado River, I would say to my friend that the river is quite saline but it is not all caused by man. As the gentleman well knows, even in its natural state the Colorado River has a lot of salinity. The half a billion dollar figure that the gentleman refers to is in my opinion, an optimistic figure. If we were to clean the river up as far as the natural salinity is concerned, it might take more than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SAYLOR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SAYLOR. I just want to say to my colleague from Arizona that the same is true of the Souris River. It has some natural salinity in it, too, but before there is any water run out the Bureau of Reclamation now says that the salinity will far exceed anything they expected in their original estimate when they authorized it.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the hour is late, but when the experts begin attacking projects in your own district you want to do the best you can to set the record straight.

My good friend from Pennsylvania is relying on some, shall I say, out of house experts and perhaps this fall or next fall I will get him up into North Dakota and let him take a look at the water there—I know what an avid outdoorsman he is—and get him into a duck blind, and I am sure that he will become as convinced a booster of the Garrison diversion project as anyone who lives up there.

I want to thank the committee for its support. This project is needed, because in 1944, under the Pick-Sloan plan they inundated 540,000 acres of the best land in North Dakota in order to provide flood control for downstream States. At that time North Dakota's compensation as their part of the bargain was to get this project which would irrigate 250,000 acres of land and provide a dependable water supply for the cities in the eastern two-thirds of the State and rehabilitate

the major duck-breeding grounds in the central flyway.

To the best of my knowledge there is no loss in duck breeding and, in fact, we will have an enhanced area of 54,000 acres.

Now to prove the support of the people for water there. When my colleague said he was going to introduce his amendment I made a couple of calls to the State. I have a telegram here from our former colleague, Art Link, now Governor of the State and close to the people as any good Governor is. He says:

This is to inform you of my strong and continued support of the Garrison project.

It is signed by Art Link, Governor.

I have a wire from Mr. Fahey, chief engineer of the North Dakota State Water Commission, who used to be city manager of Minot, and he emphasizes the need contrary to what my friend says the Bureau of Reclamation says.

Also I have a telegram from Mr. Meidinger, North Dakota head of Ducks Unlimited," that he urges us to support the Garrison project.

I have telegrams from the president of the Izaak Walton League Chapter in that area and from the Souris-Red-Rainey River Basin Commission.

I could go on for many minutes with these telegrams, but I will not.

Let me tell you a story about water in North Dakota. This is the Fargo Forum of 2 years ago. The Red River, the second largest river in our State, was totally dead; no flow at all. Sure there is going to be a little salinity problem, but some water is better than no water. The Public Health Service study says it is not safe to eat the fish that you catch between Grand Forks and Fargo, N. Dak. Garrison diversion will remedy our recurring low-flow stream problems and will greatly enhance an environment.

Mr. Chairman, we need this project, and I hope my colleagues will join in supporting this committee so that we can continue it, because we need it there.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have several questions that I would like to ask about this project of either the gentleman from North Dakota or members of the committee.

As I understand it, the Garrison project is intended to increase the agricultural output of the area. Can someone tell me what will be grown on these lands?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would be more than happy to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, the Garrison diversion Dam project is a replacement for 540,000 acres of farm bottomland formerly producing a dependable winter feed supply for breed cows that will produce the beef that our country needs. This is necessary if we are going to correct the beef shortage that is going on in this country. The beef cattle population in North Dakota today is less than it was 20 years

ago because we do not have the dependable feed supply.

Mr. VANIK. Do I understand as stated in the hearing record that it is going to be used for the production of feed grains, potatoes, and sugar beets?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. It is not going to be used primarily for the production of sugar beets, and it is not going to be used for the production of feed grains, because you can make more per acre by growing the forages that are necessary to keep the mother-cow herds going that produce the calves that eventually get fattened on feed grains grown under the dry-land program.

Mr. VANIK. Do I understand that there would be some feed grains produced such as alfalfa and corn?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. There would be alfalfa.

Mr. VANIK. In connection with the production of feed grains, sugar beets, and some of these other programs, am I correct in understanding that some of these are presently receiving some help under the price-support programs and the stabilization programs; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am sure the gentleman knows that we just put export controls on feed ingredients because of their shortage in this country.

But, let me say that as a farmer who has studied this project for 15 years, that barley and wheat will seldom be raised on irrigated acres. These acres will be used for the growing of forage crops for livestock.

Mr. VANIK. The gentleman from North Dakota must admit that increased production could result in higher price supports.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. It could result in fewer price support payments, because those lands now being used in the production of wheat and barley will be transposed to forage production, which is more needed.

Mr. VANIK. In the 21 counties involved in the Garrison Diversion Dam area, what is the present level of agricultural stabilization, or conservation, and price supports?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I would assume the level is about the level for any prairie State. I do not have the exact figure.

Mr. VANIK. According to the study by the Department that I received, some \$88 million was paid into these counties.

The question I want to ask is, Does it make sense to increase production through irrigation, and then have to limit production and support the price for that production?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. As I would like to point out again to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, the introduction of irrigation farming will lower the amount of payments made in these counties because they will move out of price-supported or program-supported grains and into nonfederally supported legumes, speciality crops, and forage.

Mr. VANIK. Perhaps the gentleman from North Dakota or someone else on

the committee can tell me whether and how much agricultural subsidies go into other Bureau of Reclamation areas? Is there any calculation? I think the National Water Commission made an estimate of something between \$83 million and \$179 million annually, is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I cannot speak as to that but, if my colleague will yield further, some time ago I read an estimate that the Bureau of Reclamation irrigation projects have returned to the Federal Treasury in increased income taxes by crops grown on them more than twice the money put into them by the Federal Government.

Mr. VANIK. I am glad the gentleman from North Dakota talked about income taxes, because I want to place in the RECORD right now the report that I received that in 1970 the total income taxes paid by agriculture, including lumber and fishing, and the fishery industry, was \$1.6 billion. When you take out fishing and lumbering the total comes to \$1.4 billion. This is probably the sector of our economy. Where taxpayers subsidize the greatest amount of incentive through taxpayer-supported programs, out of which we get a benefit-ratio in income taxes that I think is one of the lowest in the whole economic spectrum. I support the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused. So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. 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. ICHOR, 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. 8947) making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions 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.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GUDE

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GUDE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GUDE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8947 to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 26, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—384

Abdnor	Burleson, Tex.	Diggs
Abzug	Burlison, Mo.	Dingell
Adams	Burton	Donohue
Addabbo	Butler	Dorn
Alexander	Byron	Downing
Anderson,	Camp	Dulski
Calif.	Carney, Ohio	Duncan
Anderson, Ill.	Carter	du Pont
Andrews,	Casey, Tex.	Eckhardt
N. Dak.	Cederberg	Edwards, Ala.
Annunzio	Chamberlain	Elliott
Archer	Chappell	Erlenborn
Arends	Chisholm	Esch
Armstrong	Clancy	Eshleman
Ashley	Clausen	Evans, Colo.
Aspin	Don H.	Evans, Tenn.
Bafalis	Clawson, Del.	Fascell
Baker	Clay	Findley
Barrett	Cochran	Flood
Beard	Cohen	Flowers
Bennett	Collier	Flynt
Bergland	Collins, Ill.	Foley
Bevill	Collins, Tex.	Ford, Gerald R.
Biaggi	Conable	Ford,
Blester	Conlan	William D.
Blackburn	Corman	Forsythe
Boland	Cotter	Fountain
Bolling	Coughlin	Fraser
Bowen	Crane	Frelinghuysen
Brademas	Cronin	Frenzel
Brasco	Culver	Frey
Bray	Daniel, Dan	Fröhlich
Breckinridge	Daniel, Robert	Fulton
Brinkley	W., Jr.	Fuqua
Brooks	Daniels,	Gaydos
Broomfield	Dominick V.	Gettys
Brotzman	Davis, Ga.	Gialmo
Brown, Calif.	Davis, S.C.	Gibbons
Brown, Mich.	Davis, Wis.	Gilman
Brown, Ohio	de la Garza	Ginn
Broyhill, N.C.	Delaney	Goldwater
Broyhill, Va.	Dellenback	Gonzalez
Buchanan	Dellums	Goodling
Burgener	Denholm	Grasso
Burke, Calif.	Dennis	Gray
Burke, Fla.	Devine	Green, Oreg.
Burke, Mass.	Dickinson	Green, Pa.

Gross	Melcher	Schneebell
Grover	Metcalfe	Schroeder
Gubser	Mezvisinsky	Sebelius
Guyer	Michel	Shipley
Haley	Milford	Shoup
Hamilton	Miller	Shriver
Hammer-	Mills, Ark.	Shuster
schmidt	Minish	Sikes
Hanley	Mink	Sisk
Hanna	Minshall, Ohio	Skubitz
Hanrahan	Mitchell, Md.	Slack
Hansen, Idaho	Mitchell, N.Y.	Smith, Iowa
Harsha	Mizell	Smith, N.Y.
Harvey	Moakley	Snyder
Hastings	Mollohan	Spence
Hays	Montgomery	Staggers
Heckler, Mass.	Moorhead,	Stanton,
Helstoski	Calif.	J. William
Henderson	Moorhead, Pa.	Stanton,
Hicks	Morgan	James V.
Hillis	Mosher	Stark
Hinshaw	Moss	Steed
Hogan	Murphy, Ill.	Steele
Holifield	Murphy, N.Y.	Steelman
Holt	Myers	Steiger, Ariz.
Horton	Natcher	Stephens
Hosmer	Nedzi	Stokes
Howard	Neilsen	Stratton
Huber	Nichols	Stubblefield
Hudnut	Nix	Stuckey
Hungate	O'Brien	Studds
Hunt	O'Hara	Sullivan
Hutchinson	O'Neill	Symington
Ichord	Owens	Symms
Jarman	Parris	Talcott
Johnson, Calif.	Fassman	Taylor, Mo.
Johnson, Colo.	Patman	Taylor, N.C.
Johnson, Pa.	Patten	Teague, Calif.
Jones, Ala.	Pepper	Thomson, Wis.
Jones, N.C.	Perkins	Thone
Jones, Okla.	Pettis	Thornton
Jones, Tenn.	Peyser	Towell, Nev.
Jordan	Pickle	Treen
Karth	Pike	Udall
Kastenmeier	Poage	Ullman
Kazen	Podell	Van Deerlin
Keating	Powell, Ohio	Vander Jagt
Kemp	Preyer	Veysey
Ketchum	Price, Ill.	Vigorito
Kluczyński	Price, Tex.	Waggonner
Kuykendall	Pritchard	Waldie
Kyros	Quile	Walsh
Landgrebe	Quillen	Wampler
Landrum	Railsback	Ware
Latta	Randall	Whalen
Leggett	Rangel	White
Lehman	Rarick	Whitehurst
Lent	Rees	Whitten
Litton	Regula	Widnall
Long, La.	Reuss	Wiggins
Long, Md.	Rhodes	Williams
Lott	Rinaldo	Wilson, Bob
Lujan	Roberts	Wilson,
McClary	Robinson, Va.	Charles H.,
McCollister	Robison, N.Y.	Calif.
McCormack	Rodino	Wilson,
McDade	Roe	Charles, Tex.
McEwen	Rogers	Winn
McFall	Roncallo, Wyo.	Wolf
McKay	Roncallo, N.Y.	Wright
McKinney	Rooney, Pa.	Wyatt
McSpadden	Rose	Wylder
Macdonald	Rostenkowski	Wylie
Madden	Roush	Wyman
Madigan	Rousselot	Yatron
Mahon	Roy	Young, Alaska
Mailliard	Roybal	Young, Fla.
Mallary	Runnels	Young, Ga.
Mann	Ruppe	Young, Ill.
Martin, Nebr.	Ruth	Young, S.C.
Martin, N.C.	Ryan	Young, Tex.
Mathias, Calif.	St Germain	Zablocki
Matsunaga	Sarasin	Zion
Mayne	Sarbanes	Zwach
Mazzoli	Satterfield	
Meeds	Scherle	

NAYS—26

Bingham	Gunter	Obey
Carey, N.Y.	Harrington	Riegle
Cleveland	Heckler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Conte	Heinz	Saylor
Conyers	Holtzman	Seiberling
Drinan	Koch	Steiger, Wis.
Edwards, Calif.	McCloskey	Vanik
Fish	Maraziti	Yates
Gude	Mathis, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—23

Andrews, N.C.	Blatnik	Danielson
Ashbrook	Boggs	Dent
Badillo	Breaux	Derwinski
Bell	Clark	Fisher

OXIX—1396—Part 17

Griffiths	King	Teague, Tex.
Hansen, Wash.	Reid	Thompson, N.J.
Hawkins	Rooney, N.Y.	Tiernan
Hébert	Sandman	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Danielson.
Mr. Hébert with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Hawkins.
Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Tiernan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. 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 material, on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 8537) entitled "An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to make permanent certain provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to provide for the extension of certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7528, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. SYMINGTON (on behalf of Mr. TEAGUE of Texas) filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7528) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-353)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7528) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

(a) For "Research and development," for the following programs:

- (1) Space flight operations, \$555,500,000;
- (2) Space Shuttle, \$475,000,000;
- (3) Advanced missions, \$1,500,000;
- (4) Physics and astronomy, \$63,600,000;
- (5) Lunar and planetary exploration, \$311,000,000;
- (6) Launch vehicle procurement, \$177,400,000;

(7) Space applications, \$161,000,000;

(8) Aeronautical research and technology, \$180,000,000; of this amount \$14,000,000 is reserved for the JT-3D Refan Retrofit Research Program;

(9) Space and nuclear research and technology, \$72,000,000;

(10) Tracking and data acquisition, \$244,000,000;

(11) Technology utilization, \$4,500,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisition, as follows:

(1) Replacement of transportation facility, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$660,000;

(2) Rehabilitation of vibration laboratory, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$710,000;

(3) Modifications of and addition to 25-foot space simulator building, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, \$740,000;

(4) Modification of planetary mission support facilities, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, \$580,000;

(5) Rehabilitation and modification of 600 pounds per square inch air supply system, Langley Research Center, \$2,410,000;

(6) Construction of systems engineering building, Langley Research Center, \$1,620,000;

(7) Rehabilitation of airfield pavement, Wallops Station, \$570,000;

(8) Rehabilitation of communication system, Wallops Station, \$575,000;

(9) Modification for fire protection improvements at various tracking and data stations, \$1,885,000;

(10) Modification of space launch complex 2 West, Vandenberg Air Force Base, \$980,000;

(11) Modification of power system, Slidell Computer Complex, \$1,085,000;

(12) Space Shuttle facilities at various locations, as follows:

(A) Modifications for auxiliary propulsion and power systems test facilities, White Sands Test Facility, \$1,290,000;

(B) Modifications for shuttle avionics integration laboratory, Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, \$1,240,000;

(C) Modifications for radiant heating verification facility, Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, \$1,260,000;

(D) Modifications for the Orbiter propulsion system test facilities, Mississippi Test Facility, \$11,300,000;

(E) Modifications for external tank structural test facilities, Marshall Space Flight Center, \$4,400,000;

(F) Modification of manufacturing and subassembly facilities for the Orbiter, NASA Industrial Plant, Downey, California, \$2,650,000;

(G) Modification of and addition to final assembly and checkout facilities for the Orbiter, Air Force Plant Number 42, Palmdale, California, \$7,350,000;

(H) Modification of manufacturing and final assembly facilities for external tanks, Michoud Assembly Facility, \$9,510,000;

(I) Construction of Orbiter landing facilities, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$28,200,000;

(13) Rehabilitation and modification of facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$500,000 per project, \$14,785,000;

(14) Minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$250,000 per project, \$4,600,000;

(15) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, \$13,600,000.

(c) For "Research and program management," \$707,000,000, and such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law of which not more than \$549,020,000 and such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law, shall be available for personnel and related costs.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 1(g), appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be acquired at locations other than installations of the Administration for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used in accordance with this subsection for the construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation

Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Research and program management" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed \$35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 1(a) and 1(c), not in excess of \$10,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and not in excess of \$25,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for rehabilitation or modification of facilities: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a), not in excess of \$250,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for any of the foregoing for unforeseen programmatic needs.

(h) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may be used for grants to any nonprofit institution of higher learning unless the Administrator or his designee determines at the time of the grant that recruiting personnel of any of the Armed Forces of the United States are not being barred from the premises or property of such institution except that this subsection shall not apply if the Administrator or his designee determines that the grant is a continuation or renewal of a previous grant to such institution which is likely to make a significant contribution to the aeronautical and space activities of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Administrator or his designee within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act and each January 30 and June 30 thereafter the names of any nonprofit institutions of higher learning which the Secretary of Defense determines on the date of each such report are barring such recruiting personnel from premises or property of any such institution.

Sec. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1) through (14), inclusive, of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

Sec. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (15) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that a deferral of such action until the enactment of the next Authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation is aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, con-

vert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

Sec. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee, unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the expenditure of amounts for personnel and related costs pursuant to section 1(c) to exceed amounts authorized for such costs.

Sec. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

Sec. 6. Section 203(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2473(b)), is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (10) the following new paragraph:

"(11) to provide by concession, without regard to section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; 40 U.S.C. 303b), on such terms as the Administrator may deem to be appropriate and to be necessary to protect the concessioner against loss of his investment in property (but not anticipated profits) resulting from the Administration's discretionary acts and decisions, for the construction, maintenance, and operation of all manner of facilities and equipment for visitors to the several installations of the Administration and, in connection therewith, to provide services incident to the dissemination

tion of information concerning its activities to such visitors, without charge or with a reasonable charge therefor (with this authority being in addition to any other authority which the Administration may have to provide facilities, equipment, and services for visitors to its installations). A concession agreement under this paragraph may be negotiated with any qualified proposer following due consideration of all proposals received after reasonable public notice of the intention to contract. The concessioner shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to make a profit commensurate with the capital invested and the obligations assumed, and the consideration paid by him for the concession shall be based on the probable value of such opportunity and not on maximizing revenue to the United States. Each concession agreement shall specify the manner in which the concessioner's records are to be maintained, and shall provide for access to any such records by the Administration and the Comptroller General of the United States for a period of five years after the close of the business year to which such records relate. A concessioner may be accorded a possessory interest, consisting of all incidents of ownership except legal title (which shall vest in the United States), in any structure, fixture, or improvement he constructs or locates upon land owned by the United States; and, with the approval of the Administration, such possessory interest may be assigned, transferred, encumbered, or relinquished by him, and, unless otherwise provided by contract, shall not be extinguished by the expiration or other termination of the con-

cession and may not be taken for public use without just compensation."

SEC. 7. Title II of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"DISPOSAL OF EXCESS LAND

"SEC. 207. Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, the Administration may not report to a disposal agency as excess to the needs of the Administration any land having an estimated value in excess of \$50,000 which is owned by the United States and under the jurisdiction and control of the Administration, unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the President and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of a report by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action."

SEC. 8. Section 5316, title 5, United States Code, is amended by deleting paragraphs (15), (16), and (17) and by substituting therefor a new paragraph (15) to read as follows:

"(15) Associate Administrators, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (6)."

SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the "Na-

tional Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1974".

And the Senate agree to the same.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
KEN HECHLER,
DON FUQUA,
JAMES W. SYMINGTON,
CHARLES A. MOSHER,
ALPHONZO BELL,
JOHN W. WYDLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

FRANK E. MOSS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
BARRY GOLDWATER,
CARL CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE
COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the Senate and the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7528) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management submit the following joint statement to the Senate and House in the explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The NASA request for Fiscal Year 1974 totaled \$3,016,000,000. The House authorized \$3,073,500,000, and the Senate amendment authorized \$3,046,000,000. The committee of conference agrees to a total authorization of \$3,064,500,000, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL ADJUSTMENTS TO NASA FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET REQUEST

	Budget request	House	Senate	Committee of Conference
Research and development:				
Space flight operations.....	\$555,500,000	\$548,500,000	\$555,500,000	\$555,500,000
Space shuttle.....	475,000,000	500,000,000	475,000,000	475,000,000
Advanced missions.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Physics and astronomy.....	64,600,000	59,600,000	64,600,000	63,600,000
Lunar and planetary exploration.....	312,000,000	309,000,000	312,000,000	311,000,000
Launch vehicle procurement.....	176,400,000	177,400,000	177,400,000	177,400,000
Space applications.....	147,000,000	159,000,000	161,000,000	161,000,000
Aeronautical research and technology.....	146,000,000	180,000,000	160,000,000	180,000,000
Space and nuclear research and technology.....	65,000,000	75,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000
Tracking and data acquisition.....	250,000,000	240,000,000	248,000,000	244,000,000
Technology utilization.....	4,000,000	4,500,000	4,000,000	4,500,000
Total.....	2,197,000,000	2,254,500,000	2,231,000,000	2,245,500,000
Construction of facilities.....	112,000,000	112,000,000	110,000,000	112,000,000
Research and program management.....	707,000,000	707,000,000	705,000,000	707,000,000
Grand total.....	3,016,000,000	3,073,500,000	3,046,000,000	3,064,500,000

The points in disagreement and the conference resolution of them are as follows:

1. The House authorized \$548,500,000 for the Space Flight Operations program which is \$7 million less than the NASA request of \$555,500,000. This action would have reduced the amount for the Skylab project by \$10 million and added \$3,000,000 to the Space Life Sciences project for continued space-suit development during Fiscal Year 1974.

Acting subsequent to the initial Skylab launch the Senate amendment authorized \$555,500,000, the exact amount of the NASA request, on the basis that the difficulties experienced during the Skylab launch did not permit a judgment that a reduction could be made in the Skylab project and that there was adequate funding in the program to support continued space suit development.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate position and authorizes \$555,500,000 for the Space Flight Operations program.

2. The House authorized \$500,000,000 for the Space Shuttle program, which is \$25 million more than the NASA request of \$475,000,000. The House increased the amount to provide for more effective program implementation and increase the confidence in attaining the key program milestones of first

horizontal flight in 1976 and the first manned orbital flight in 1978.

The Senate amendment authorized \$475,000,000, which is the exact amount of the NASA request.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate position and authorizes \$475,000,000 for the Space Shuttle program.

3. NASA requested \$64,600,000 for the Physics and Astronomy program. The House authorized \$59,600,000, \$5,000,000 less than the request. The House reduced the amount requested for orbital Explorer projects by \$3,000,000 and the amount requested for Supporting Research and Technology projects by \$2,000,000, these amounts to be applied to immediately reinstate work on the ERTS-B satellite under the Space Applications program.

The Senate authorized the full amount of the NASA request, \$64,600,000 but concurred in the immediate reinstatement of the ERTS-B.

The conference substitute authorizes \$63,600,000 for the Physics and Astronomy program, a reduction of \$1,000,000 below the NASA request, but the reduction is not directed at any specific project within the program.

4. NASA requested \$312,000,000 for the Lunar and Planetary Exploration Program. The House authorized \$309,000,000, a reduction of \$3,000,000. The reduction was made in Supporting Research and Technology of the Lunar and Planetary Exploration program on the basis that these funds be applied to the Space Applications program for the ERTS project and to the Launch Vehicle Procurement program to support the ERTS-B launch next year.

The Senate approved the full amount of the NASA request.

The conference substitute authorizes \$311,000,000 for the Lunar and Planetary Exploration program, \$1,000,000 less than the NASA request, but the reduction is not directed at any specific project within the program.

5. The House authorized \$159,000,000 for the Space Applications program.

The Senate authorized \$161,000,000 for the Space Applications program in order for NASA to exploit capabilities developed in NASA and apply them to the urgent national energy need. Specifically, the Senate directed NASA to formulate a long-term energy program that would create, explore and demonstrate options for energy generation and

management from all the many technologies that NASA has developed.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision and authorizes \$161,000,000 for the Space Applications program.

The conference considers that NASA should specifically investigate the collection and conversion of solar energy in synchronous orbit and the microwave transmission of such energy to earth. The conference also expects NASA to continue to cooperate closely with the National Science Foundation on its energy programs.

6. The House authorized \$180,000,000 for the Aeronautical Research and Technology program, specifically providing \$20 million to reinstate the quiet take-off and landing research aircraft project (QUESTOL) which was terminated in January 1973.

The Senate provided \$160,000,000 for the Aeronautical Research and Technology program.

The conference substitute adopts the House provision restoring QUESTOL and authorizes \$180,000,000 for the Aeronautical Research and Technology program.

The House added \$14,000,000 to the Aeronautical Research and Technology program to reinstate the JT-3D aircraft engine Refan Retrofit Research program to achieve substantial noise reduction in that engine as soon as possible. The House bill included language reserving \$14,000,000 for the JT-3D Refan Retrofit Research Program and \$18,000,000 for the JT-8D Refan Retrofit Research Program which was part of the NASA request.

The Senate concurred with the House in adding \$14,000,000 for the JT-3D aircraft engine Refan Retrofit Research program and, in addition, agreed to the language in the bill reserving this \$14,000,000 for the JT-3D Refan Retrofit Research program. The Senate amendment did not include language reserving funds for the JT-8D program because funding for this program was part of the NASA fiscal year 1974 budget plan presented to the Congress.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate language on the Aeronautical Research and Technology program with respect to the JT-3D Refan Retrofit Research Program. Although the adopted language does not specifically reserve funding for the JT-8D program, the conference supports the NASA program plan for the JT-3D Refan Retrofit Research Program and expects NASA to proceed with this program as outlined to the Congress in its budget submission.

7. The House authorized \$75,000,000 for the Space and Nuclear Research and Technology program.

The Senate authorized \$72,000,000 for the Space and Nuclear Research and Technology program, making a \$3,000,000 reduction in the amount requested for Space Research and Technology on the basis that since the space shuttle has moved into full development, the amount of direct shuttle support required from this program has decreased markedly and therefore the Senate believes that economies can be pursued in this program. The Senate specifically directed that the \$3,000,000 cut is not to be applied against the Nuclear Research and Technology part of this program.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision and authorizes \$72,000,000 for this program.

8. The House authorized \$240,000,000 for the Tracking and Data Acquisition program, \$10,000,000 below the NASA request.

The Senate authorized \$248,000,000 for the Tracking and Data Acquisition program, \$2 million below the NASA request.

The conference substitute authorizes \$244,000,000 for the Tracking and Data Acquisition program.

9. The House authorized \$4,500,000 for the Technology Utilization program, \$500,000 more than the NASA request, to provide that the scientific, technical and management knowledge acquired with public funds spent

by NASA be made available to the public sector as quickly and efficiently as possible.

The Senate authorized \$4,000,000 for the Technology Utilization program.

The conference substitute authorizes \$4,500,000 for the Technology Utilization program.

10. Both the House and the Senate authorized \$67,200,000 for Space Shuttle Facilities, itemizing the individual construction projects. The House bill specifies the total amount authorized for Space Shuttle Facilities without identifying the amounts authorized for the 9 individual construction projects, whereas the Senate amendment authorizes the same facilities and specifies the dollar amount authorized for each individual construction project.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate language specifying the dollar amount authorized for each individual Space Shuttle construction.

11. The House authorized \$13,600,000 for Facility Planning and Design, the amount of the NASA request.

The Senate authorized \$11,600,000, \$2,000,000 less than the NASA request.

The conference substitute authorizes \$13,600,000 for Facility Planning and Design.

12. The House authorized \$707,000,000 for the Research and Program Management program, the amount of the NASA request.

The Senate authorized \$705,000,000 for this program, \$2,000,000 less than the NASA request. Additionally, the Senate included language in its amendment stipulating that not more than \$549,020,000 be used for personnel and related costs.

The conference substitute approves a total amount of \$707,000,000 for Research and Program Management and includes language stipulating that not more than \$549,020,000 can be utilized for personnel and related costs.

13. The Senate amendment modified Section 4 of the bill with the addition of subsection 4(b) which restricts the amount authorized by the bill for personnel and related costs.

The House had no similar provision in their bill.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

14. The Senate amendment modified Section 4(a) of the bill adding a provision to preclude any inconsistencies between the provisions of this Act and any other legislation which might be enacted with respect to the impoundment or selected withholding of appropriated funds.

The House bill had no comparable provision.

The conference substitute adopts the House position and deletes the language from the bill. However, the committee of conference notes that in Fiscal Year 1973 there were considerable adjustments by the Executive Branch to the amounts authorized and appropriated to NASA by the Congress. The conference strongly urges that the funds provided by the Congress for NASA for Fiscal Year 1974 be used to fully fund the programs to the levels approved by Congress.

15. In previous years the NASA authorization bill has contained a provision which denied payment by an institution of higher education of any funds provided under a NASA program to any student convicted by any court of record for involvement in disruption or other specified activities at any institution of higher education which prevented officials or students from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies.

The recommended bill sent to the Congress by the Administration included this provision and it was adopted by the House.

The Senate deleted this provision on the basis that it was no longer considered necessary in the annual authorization bill for the

National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The conference substitute agreed to the deletion of this provision.

16. The Senate amendment added a new Section to the bill amending Section 5316, Title 5, U.S.C., which deletes, in the Executive Salary Schedule, Level V, the three NASA positions of Associate Administrators for Advanced Research and Technology, for Space Science and Applications, and Manned Space Flight, and inserting in lieu thereof, "Associate Administrators, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (6)." This provision updates Section 5316 to recognize the additional levels of responsibility which have been established within NASA and simplifies any subsequent reorganization within the agency by deleting the functional designation following the title of Associate Administrator. No change in individual salaries is effected by this amendment at the present time.

The House had no comparable provision in their bill.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision. This action was taken with the concurrence of both the House and Senate Standing Committees on Post Office and Civil Service.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
KEN HECHLER,
DON FUQUA,
JAMES W. SYMINGTON,
CHARLES A. MOSHER,
ALPHONZO BELL,
JOHN W. WYDLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

FRANK E. MOSS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
BARRY GOLDWATER,
CARL CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8410, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) I ask unanimous consent that the managers be given permission to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 8410, to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-355)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8410) to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
AL ULLMAN,
JAMES A. BURKE,
MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI,
HAROLD R. COLLIER,
JOEL T. BROTHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
VANCE HARTKE,
ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
CARL T. CURTIS,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE
COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8410) to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes, report that the conferees have been unable to agree.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
AL ULLMAN,
JAMES A. BURKE,
MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI,
HAROLD R. COLLIER,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
VANCE HARTKE,
ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
CARL T. CURTIS,
PAUL J. FANNIN,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*ANNOUNCEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE
PROGRAM

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the following announcement: That the program for the remainder of the day will be Senate Joint Resolution 128, the continuing regulation Q to August 1. That will be the next item of business.

The item of business that we have scheduled for today, H.R. 8548, International Economic Policy Act, will immediately following regulation Q.

Mr. Speaker, that will be the program for the remainder of the day.

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11
O'CLOCK, FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman to withhold that request until we find out whether we will be out of here in another hour or whether it will be midnight before we get out. I ask the gentleman to withhold that request and see if we can get out at a reasonable hour. I would not object if we are not going to be forced to work late tonight; otherwise I will certainly object.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, may I say that it is certainly my opinion the House will not run late tonight.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) withhold his request?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I will withhold my request.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on rollcall No. 308. At that time I was in the Judiciary Subcommittee

rooms, and there was no bell ringing at that time. I was not aware of the voting. Mr. Speaker, if I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

EXTENSION OF LAWS RELATING TO
PAYMENT OF INTEREST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 128) to provide for an extension of certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 128

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Act of September 21, 1966 (Public Law 89-597; 80 Stat. 823), is amended by striking out "June 1, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 1, 1973".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 128 is an emergency matter. Senate Joint Resolution 128, as amended, would extend regulation Q authority, which allows the various Federal financial regulatory agencies to establish ceiling rates on time and savings deposits from June 1 of this year—when it expired—until August 1 of this year.

For the benefit of the Members of the House, the House, on May 9, passed H.R. 6370, which included in it, among other things, a prohibition against so-called NOW accounts and extension of regulation Q. This conference has met innumerable times since the House passed this legislation and as yet has not been able to resolve the NOW account question.

In order to avoid any possible chaos that might ensue within the financial community, your Banking and Currency Committee is recommending this short extension of time for regulation Q in the hopes that prior to August 1, when this extension would expire, we can resolve these differences.

I support—as I know most, if not all of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee do—the adoption of this joint resolution, as amended.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

As I understand it, this is merely an extension of existing law and does not represent any substantial change in existing practices.

Mr. PATMAN. No change at all.

Mr. BLACKBURN. This is simply to preserve the status quo of the law?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and support the extension.

Mr. REES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman on the merits of the legislation.

Mr. REES. That is the first time that has happened.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee is it not true that for the past 28 days we have not had regulation Q?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. REES. Regulation Q is the Federal regulation that governs the interest rates that can be charged to savers in savings and loans and banks?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. REES. Yes. So in the last 28 days there has been no regulation in effect, so that really the savings and loans and banks and other financial institutions could pay any interest rate they wanted to. Could they not?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, there is another side to that. All of the Federal financial regulatory agencies immediately gave notice to all of the financial institutions to let the status quo remain the same as it was because Congress was sure to pass a law. It is too important and too necessary and too much of an emergency for them to pass it over long. They were assured please do not violate the law. They could have the biggest black market in the world here if they were to start black market practices. We want to get away from that.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, if you will continue to yield, the situation is that the cost of interest to the consumer has gone up. If you are buying a house, you pay 8½ to 9 percent interest for a loan. The prime rate today is 7¼ percent. So if you are borrowing from a bank and are an ordinary consumer of money, you find that you are probably paying 9, 10, or 11 percent. But the banks and savings and loans are paying the depositor on his saving account the same amount that they were paying last year. Therefore we have had an increase in the cost of money, and the increase in that goes into the profits of the banks and savings and loans and the person who has money deposited in that bank is getting interest from that deposit is not receiving a penny more.

For the last 27 days regulation Q has not been the law of the United States, and not one savings and loan or bank throughout the United States has raised the interest rate to their consumers, they have not given the consumers a break who have deposits in those savings and loans, and banks. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not see why we have to give regulation Q 3 more months, because the banks and the savings and loans have not done anything in the last 27 days to increase the money they pay to their consumers.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I correct the statement made by the gentleman from California (Mr. REES)? We are not asking for 3 months, we are asking for only 1 month. Time is of the essence here. This is a danger sign. It would be terrible if we did not pass this.

Mr. REES. If the gentleman will yield further, if they have gone 28 days, why do they need another month?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe

that I have already answered that question.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) who is the chairman of the subcommittee which is in charge of this bill.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) has said, this is an extension to merely August 1, because of the reason that we have been deadlocked in the conference attempting to maintain the position of the House on the legislation previously adopted.

On the last point that was raised, if, by removing regulation Q a higher interest rate would in effect be paid to the consumers, that is one thing, if the rate to the borrower would remain the same, but I think we all realize that were regulation Q to be removed interest rates paid on time and savings deposits would be increased, then the amount the borrower would pay would have to be increased.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN). We endorse the proposal, and we ask the House to approve the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (Senate Joint Resolution 128), as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend and revise my remarks prior to the passage of the Senate joint resolution.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY ACT OF 1972

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 468 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 468

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8548) to amend the International Economic

Policy Act of 1972 to change the membership of the Council on International Economic Policy, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 8548, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1636 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 8548 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. McSPADDEN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 468 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 8548, a bill to amend the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 to change the membership of the Council on International Economic Policy.

The rule provides that after the passage of H.R. 8548 it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1636 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1636 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 8548 as passed by the House.

H.R. 8548 extends the International Economic Policy Act until June 30, 1977. It also removes the President from membership on the Council on International Economic Policy and omits the requirement that he be the chairman of the Council, and substitutes the requirement that he designate the chairman from the members of the Council.

H.R. 8548 authorizes \$1.4 million for the expenses of the Council for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. This is the only cost for the bill for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 468 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 8548.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 468, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 8548, amending the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, is an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. This rule also makes it in order to insert the House-passed language in the Senate bill, S. 1636.

The primary purpose of H.R. 8548 is to extend the International Economic Policy Act from June 30, 1973, to June 30, 1977.

The present act provides for a Council on International Economic Policy within the Executive Office of the President, in

order to coordinate international monetary, investment, trade, and financial policies. The administration requested open-ended authorizations and called for permanent statutory authority for the organization. The administration proposal also deleted the provision requiring the President to serve as chairman of the Council.

This bill, H.R. 8548, removes the President from membership on the Council, and substitutes the requirement that he designate the chairman from the statutory members of the Council. It extends the act to June 30, 1977, and provides fiscal year 1974 authorization in the amount of \$1,400,000. This bill also broadens the content requirements of the annual report of the President on the international economic position of the United States.

The cost of this bill is \$1,400,000 for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 468 in order that the House may begin debate on H.R. 8548.

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say this is an open rule?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. A completely open rule with no points of order waived?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. If I were not tone deaf, I would lead the House in singing "Happy Days Are Here Again."

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. 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. 8548) to amend the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 to change the membership of the Council on International Economic Policy, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

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. 8548, with Mr. GIBBONS 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 rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, first I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the entire subcommittee for the fine work they have done on this bill.

The distinguished subcommittee chairman, the Honorable LUD ASHLEY, of Ohio, will in a moment explain the bill in detail and give the reasoning why this bill should be supported.

I would like to remind my colleagues that the Council on International Economic Policy was established to coordinate international monetary, investment, trade and financial policy. The Presidential Commission on International Trade and Investment Policy recommended that the Council on International Economic Policy be given statutory authorization. I believe that the events of recent months with respect to further devaluation of the dollar, the continuing deficit in our balance of payments and, most dramatically in recent days, the worsening of the situation at home with respect to the price and supply of vital components of the national diet in the face of uncontrolled exports of agricultural commodities, only further demonstrates the need for better coordination of international economic policy and the achievement of a consistency between domestic and foreign economic policies as required under the International Economic Policy Act of 1972.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. ASHLEY).

Mr. ASHLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the measure before us is without controversy and can be disposed of in very short order. The International Economic Policy Act, as the Members may recall, was adopted by the Congress last year. Its purpose was to coordinate economic international monetary, investment, trade, and financial policies.

Our subcommittee has conducted oversight hearings of some duration and has been quite well satisfied with the operation of the council today. The council existed prior to last year, but it did not have statutory authority. The statutory authority that was granted last year does expire on June 30, and therefore it is necessary for us to renew that authority. Hence the purpose of the measure before us.

Mr. Chairman, there are four sections to the bill, which I think can be explained very briefly as follows.

Section 1 removes the President from membership on the Council on International Economic Policy and deletes the requirement that he be the chairman and substitutes the requirement that he designate the chairman from among the statutory members of the council.

Section 2 provides the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 will be extended to June 30, 1977. There was discussion about this that may be of some interest. It was my view that the administration should have the flexibility to shape the kind of mechanism that it thinks is necessary for the kind of coordination that is contemplated in the Council on International Economic Policy. There have been some changes in the last year which we reviewed in our most recent hearings. We are satisfied

that the administration should be able to count upon continued authority through the remainder of this administration, hence the June 30, 1977 date.

Having said that, I want to make it clear that the subcommittee has insisted upon accountability to the Congress and has done so by providing that there be only a 1-year authorization with respect to funding, so that while we do continue funding at the \$1.4 million level, no more and no less than last year.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the measure before us directs attention to the substance of the report that is required on an annual basis from the Council on International Economic Policy and it makes provisions, that will be commented upon by the other members of the subcommittee, which better define the scope of the international economic report and the substance of the report that is to be furnished on an annual basis.

This would conclude the presentation of the substance of the measure before us. It was reported without dissent by the Subcommittee on Trade and reported also without dissent in the full Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reassure the members of the committee that this matter has been thoroughly discussed before the International Trade Subcommittee. We have had extensive hearings. Those Members who were here last year when we established this Council were aware that I frankly opposed establishment of the Council. I have changed my position. I feel the Council is in a position to do eminently well qualified work to promote the cause of international trade and particularly promote the cause of trade by this, our own Nation in international markets. So I would urge the committee to adopt the bill as it now exists. I would urge Members of the House and Members of Congress also to join in adopting this bill as it now exists.

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I too opposed this bill the last time with the gentleman from Georgia and some other Members because of our major concern that it was merely a split-off of additional bureaucracy that some of us felt was already adequately handled under the Council of Economic Advisers and other groups within the White House staff.

I notice there is a slight increase in the dollars authorized in this. I think the gentleman from Ohio has properly explained the appropriation which will have to be made each year.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this is not just the beginning of the growth of another large bureaucracy about which there was great complaint here about the tremendous growth of the executive branch, especially the office of the President?

Is this not just another trend in the same direction?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's concern, but I

think there is an overriding consideration at the present time. That is, the problem of our international balance of trade and international balance of payments. This council, because of its make-up, because of the focus of its attention, because of its whole purpose, I think that consideration is overriding at the present time. That is what persuades me to continue the extension of the council.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not disagree at all with the gentleman's objective as he stated it. I would like to refocus on the question I raised.

Could not this have been adequately handled within the office of the President and Council of Economic Advisers, and is it not really true the Council of Economic Advisers, which has the basic responsibility of deciding on policy or recommending the policy for domestic affairs, should also very closely coordinate those policies that relate to international policy because they so directly affect each other?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, certainly the inseparability of domestic economic policy and international economic policy is recognized, I think, by everyone in this chamber; by everyone in this body.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, that was the very argument the gentleman from Georgia raised the last time, and I wonder, is he really saying that this group is not going to grow just like all other bureaucracies and that it could not be adequately handled by the Council of Economic Advisers?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, of course the gentleman realizes that this body is going to review each year this appropriation for the operation of this organization. The President himself is controlling the operation of this Council the same as he is supervising the operation of the Council of Economic Advisers.

I frankly do not anticipate that the President is going to have a lack of coordination in both the purposes and recommendations of these two groups, so I am not pessimistic. There will be a proper degree of cooperation between both this Council and the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that my friend from Georgia has been so easily convinced on the basis of past experience, but I wish to state that I still have great reservations. I intend to offer several amendments. We will go ahead and get on with the debate and the amendments.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. REES).

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, we have two groups here within the White House. One is the Council for Economic Policy, which is the organization we are extending with this bill. The other is the Office of Special Trade Representative. The Office of Special Trade Representative was created by the Ways and Means Committee in the trade bill we had up several years ago.

CFIP is the Council for International Policy created by the Committee on

Banking and Currency, so that we have this problem of jurisdiction. The President, I understand, is planning to merge the two offices within the White House. This was opposed by many of us who are familiar with the operation of both the organizations. In the meeting of the subcommittee, I was prepared to offer an amendment which would hold off this merger because I felt that the purposes of one organization certainly were not the purposes of the other organization. There would be a great deal of confusion if they were prematurely merged.

In discussing this, however, with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and the White House, there was a tacit understanding that there would be no merger of CIEP and the Special Trade Representative until the trade bill was approved by Congress and signed by the President.

This was my understanding. The reason this understanding was made was that the Ways and Means Committee, in dealing with trade policy of this country, might wish to structure the special trade representative in a different pattern within the White House, and it would be best to hold off to see what the Ways and Means Committee would be doing.

The reason why I bring this up is I do want to make it clear, I hope, to all here and downtown, that the two offices are not to be merged until a trade bill is signed by the President.

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one or two questions.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the main difference between the Senate bill and the bill we have before us is that the Senate bill calls for a confirmation of the Chairman for International Economic Policy. There is also another section in the Senate bill which retains civil service protection for the members of the Special Trade Representative's Office. The members of the Council on International Economic Policy are considered more in political positions and are not covered by civil service.

Since I am very interested in both these matters, I was wondering if an amendment dealing with civil service would not be germane at this time on the floor. I am not sure if there will be an amendment on confirmation.

Is it the plan of the chairman of the subcommittee to insist on a conference with the Senate?

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes, it is.

Mr. REES. So we will have an opportunity to work these things out with the Senate?

Mr. ASHLEY. We will indeed.

Mr. REES. What my worry is, is that the Senate might agree to the House bill and then we would not have an opportunity to work out these problems.

Mr. ASHLEY. That is not the understanding I have gotten from the other body. There is insistence on the part of various Members of the other body that we do go to conference, and that would be my expectation.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman very much.

Again I urge the Members of the House to vote for this legislation. I believe it is definitely needed.

One part of the legislation calls for a look down the future in terms of international economic policy, and I believe this is what we have needed for a great many years.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER).

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, we are on the eve of a major round of international trade negotiations which are intended to undertake a reshaping of the international trading system. This undertaking is going to require, on the part of the United States, an effective organization in the executive branch to coordinate and implement U.S. foreign economic policy, as well as an open and constructive partnership between the Executive and the Congress.

As brought out in hearings held last year by the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, and the hearings held this year by the Banking Currency Subcommittee on International Trade, many questions remain as to what is the best structure for coordinating U.S. foreign economic policy. Should it be CEP, CIEP, STR or the NSC?

The Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy for its part, will continue to exercise an oversight function on the foreign economic policy apparatus of the executive branch; paying particular attention to the difficult problem of coordination.

With the passage today of an extension of the International Economic Policy Act, it is clear that for the next several years CIEP will be the major organization in charge of coordinating U.S. international economic policy. I hope with this mandate the Executive and the Congress will work effectively together to develop a balanced policy for the United States; and most important, in the context of the upcoming trade negotiations, that Executive will eliminate current ambiguity and clearly designate who in the executive branch the private sector, Congress, and our trading partners can look to as the chief trade spokesman and office for our Government.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, apparently, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) would rather switch than fight. After listening to his remarks today and comparing them with his comments of last August concerning this International Economic Council, he has indeed changed. At that time the gentleman from Georgia suggested that this Council was an unnecessary duplication of authority. I agreed with him and got up here on this floor in his support and associated myself with his remarks.

I asked the question at that time why cannot the Council on Economic Policy handle these duties, or why cannot the Council of Economic Advisers handle these duties, or perhaps the Office of Foreign Investments could work on these problems to avoid the necessity of creating this new agency with a \$1.4 appropriation.

I also suggested that, once created, the Commission would go on ad infinitum, and that is apparently what is going to happen, because we are now going to authorize the Commission until 1977.

I notice from the report that I was not the only one who had some thought along these lines. In the report, it says, on page 2:

While there was strong support in the hearings for the principle of policy coordination, questions were raised as to whether coordination could not be effected through other mechanisms such as the Council on Economic Policy (CEP). These questions remain unresolved in large measure because both CIEP and CEP are too new to have established clear patterns of inter-relationship and records of failure and success.

I still do not sense the urgency for this Council.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the time for general debate having been exhausted, I ask that the Clerk read.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205 of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 647) is amended by—

(1) striking out "(1) The President,";
(2) striking out "be the Chairman of the Council and shall preside over the meetings of the Council; in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in his place" and inserting in lieu thereof "designate the Chairman of the Council from among the members listed in paragraphs (1) through (9)"; and

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:
(3) redesignating paragraphs (2) through (10) as paragraphs (1) through (9), respectively.

SEC. 2. Section 209 of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 649) is amended by striking out "1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1977".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROUSSELOT
Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:
Amendment offered by Mr. ROUSSELOT: Page 2, line 9, strike out "1977" and insert "1975."

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It incorporates what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) has said is needed: close congressional supervision. The gentleman said that we should come back to the House each year for appropriations.

Since we are still relatively unsure of this legislation—even the committee report shows these uncertain aspects—and because many of us have a great concern that this may grow into a huge bureaucracy, we are trying as a Congress to regain our control over the things that go on in the executive branch of Govern-

ment. I have merely asked that we reduce the term of this legislation from 1977 to 1975. This is proposed so that those of us in Congress who have jurisdiction and responsibility over this administrative activity will have an opportunity to check the Council again to see if they are really producing all the great things that the Congress has been told they are going to produce. It will give the Council a full 2 years to prove that they can do the job.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make it clear that I doubt that this Council can do anything that cannot be done in other agencies already existing, especially the Council of Economic Advisers. But I certainly think at the minimum that we should reduce the term on this legislation so that we have an opportunity to take a hard look in 1975.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

The "huge bureaucracy" that appears to be frightening our friend, the gentleman from California, now numbers 29 professionals. Obviously during the past year this number has not grown. The fears of the gentleman have no basis in fact whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, as far as congressional accountability is concerned, let me say that we have insisted in the subcommittee and in the full committee on 1 year of funding.

Mr. Chairman, in order to assure congressional accountability, we most certainly do not need both annual authorization for funding and authorization every 2 years as far as the life of the program is concerned. It does seem to me that the administration is entitled, this administration as would be a different administration, to the flexibility that is essential and that is provided for in this legislation through a period of time between now and 1977 for the duration of the Council. That establishes, I think, the confidence of the Congress in the administration to use the Council for the purposes that have been provided.

So I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment will be defeated and that this body will have confidence in the fact that accountability is established in this measure.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's comment. I do not think the Council poses a great threat of massive growth today, but as an example there were 10 people on the staff a year ago and now there are 29. I am sure it will grow even more. My concern is most bureaucracies always start very small. Also, I think we have every right to ask that they come back in 1975 and justify what they have done or what they have not done.

Mr. ASHLEY. I think that is a good point, but it is satisfied by the fact that the Council will appear before a subcommittee on an annual basis.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio, what this budding bureaucracy has accomplished for the money

that has been spent on it to date, and how much money has been expended?

Mr. ASHLEY. The amount of money spent to date is something under \$1 million.

Mr. GROSS. For the past 2 years?

Mr. ASHLEY. No. We authorized the council last year.

Mr. GROSS. I thought it was authorized in 1972. Was it not?

Mr. ASHLEY. That was last year, if I may remind the gentleman. It was last year.

Mr. GROSS. Was it in the fiscal 1972 budget or the fiscal 1973 budget?

Mr. ASHLEY. In the present fiscal budget.

Mr. GROSS. What has it accomplished? I look around and see no accomplishment worthy of note by most of these bureaucracies—these advisory boards, councils, and commissions.

Mr. ASHLEY. Let me try to point out to the gentleman—

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. ASHLEY. The international economic policy prior to the formation of the council had no focus. As a matter of fact, it has been estimated the international economic policy was the domain of between 35 and 40 different departments and agencies within the Federal Establishment. The purpose of the council is to bring together responsibilities previously exercised by this disparate group of agencies and concentrate it within one council. This is the only rational kind of policymaking and decisionmaking.

Mr. GROSS. But what is the tangible result of what has been spent thus far? When the gentleman speaks of flexibility—and I support the amendment to limit it to 1975—all we have gotten out of flexibility with respect to most of these councils is more bureaucracy and more and better paid bureaucrats in the Government.

Mr. ASHLEY. If I may respond to the gentleman, I will say that the council and its staff were intimately engaged in negotiations for the sale of wheat from Iowa and other States to the Soviet Union.

Mr. GROSS. I would not point to that as any great achievement. That was a nice "sweetheart" deal in all too many respects.

Tell me what has it done to rectify the trouble we are in with 100 billion American dollars floating around the world that all too few countries want? What has this international council done to show any tangible results?

Mr. ASHLEY. We still have difficulties and we have them aplenty. There is no question about that. I would suggest to the gentleman that he read the report that was issued in March of this year, the economic report of the President.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. And I will bet that was printed on beautiful, nice, slick paper, too.

Mr. ASHLEY. The gentleman can review it and decide for himself whether it was or was not.

Mr. GROSS. Replete with photographs

of the members of the council and all that sort of thing.

Mr. ASHLEY. I think if the gentleman is seriously interested in the purpose of the council and the accomplishments of the council to date, he will find that in this report, and I commend it to him.

Mr. GROSS. Before my time runs out let me tell the gentleman what I am not interested in, and that is as one Member suggested—some more toys in the sandbox in the White House.

That is what I think the House will accomplish by extending the life of this bureaucracy.

Mr. ASHLEY. All I can say to the gentleman from Iowa, frankly, is that the committee decided to the contrary to what the gentleman has just bespoken last year, and I think it will do so this year on the basis of the record of the council, it is a good, solid record.

Mr. GROSS. I would say, that if the wheat deal with the Russians was what they accomplished, then we do not need them at all.

Mr. ASHLEY. The gentleman did not permit me to go through the full recitation of what the council has done. I would commend the report to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I think that just about anyone could have engineered a better wheat deal than we got with the Russians last year, complete with a \$100 million windfall due to the devaluation of the dollar. And the reason the dollar has been devaluated is because we have embarked upon the establishment of too many councils, too many advisory boards, and too many other agencies in this Government, all helping feed the flames of inflation.

I support the amendment and oppose the bill and continuation of this council as being unnecessary.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment simply causes the act to expire 2 years earlier than the committee intended it to do. As the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, and I would point out, the authorization expires next year, so that this committee and others who will be interested, and there are other jurisdictions interested in the work of the CIEP, will have plenty of time to review annually all of the actions of this council, and the actions of this committee on what is authorized and what is appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to some of the questions that have been raised, I believe it is also important to point out that the authorization this year is at the same level as the authorization was last year. So far as I know, Mr. Chairman, the number of personnel was 29 last year when we handled this authorization, and it is still 29 this year.

With respect to the accomplishments of CIEP, this is the group that has coordinated the building of our American trade policy which has tried to coordinate the ideas of each of the disparate groups, as they are called, so that they can be coordinated. They are interested in our trade policy. They have coordi-

nated this trade policy in the bill that is now being heard in another committee of this Congress. When this Congress produces the trade bill, then CIEP will have the authority to manage this policy, to take us through the next GATT round, and to carry out the trade policy which we give them.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the council has done a good job. I think it can do a better job. I think we have plenty of capability to manage it in our year-to-year authorizations.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the committee defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I still do not understand why the gentleman would oppose the amendment. All we have asked to do is to have the Congress review this in 2 years instead of extending it for 4 years, so that we will have a chance to check it.

Mr. FRENZEL. The reason is that it is not necessary to review it annually anyway.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this report, prepared by the council, is a very fine, very thorough and very complete report. I personally suspect that it is so thorough and so complete for the precise reason that the existence of the council was very much in the balance when this report was new. And so long as we do keep the council under observation by the Congress, the better it will be.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, I advised the chairman of the council when the gentleman appeared before our subcommittee I would expect that council to speak out and speak loudly on the question of inconsistent domestic economic policies where they were in violent conflict with good international economic policies, and I would expect him to be an advocate in the White House for good economic national policies, and that he would speak against what would otherwise appear to be good domestic economic policies but which would be false economic international policies.

I think if we are going to hold the chairman of the council and his group to their promises to accede to my request, we should insist upon a more regular review of the assistance of the council. Therefore, I urge the Members to support the amendment of the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROUSSELOT) there were—ayes 53, noes 52.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Section 210 of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 649) is

amended by striking out "1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1974".

SEC. 4. Section 207(a) of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 648) is amended by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3), and by inserting immediately after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) a comparative description and analysis of the following subject matter, with respect to the United States, the European Community and principal countries within the European Community, Japan, and whenever applicable, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—

"(A) research and development expenditures, and productivity and technological trends in major industrial and agricultural sectors;

"(B) investment patterns in new plant and equipment;

"(C) industrial manpower and training practices;

"(D) tax incentives and other governmental financial assistance;

"(E) export promotion practices;

"(F) share of the export market, by area and industrial and agricultural sectors;

"(G) antitrust practices; and

"(H) long-range governmental economic planning programs, targets, and objectives; and"

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PICKLE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PICKLE: After line 14, page 3, add a new section 5:

"Section 205 of Public Law 92-412 is amended by adding 'The Secretary of Transportation,'"

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, when this law was put in the books, section 205 provided that the Council shall be composed of the following members, and such additional members as the President may designate. He lists them, about 10 of them. The Secretary of Transportation is not listed. I merely want to add the Secretary of Transportation as one of these members. The reason is that we are dealing in all of these big international trades such as our grain deal, and we at least ought to have a Secretary of Transportation sitting in on the Council and perhaps preventing the fiasco we had last year.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, we have had an opportunity to review the amendment. We find on our side no objection to it and we will accept it.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield, we accept it.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. CULVER

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think it would be nice to know what the amendments are.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CULVER: Page 3, immediately after line 11, insert "(G) environmental practices;" and on line 12, strike out "(G)" and insert in lieu thereof "(H)" and on line 13, strike out "(H)" and insert in lieu thereof "(I)".

Page 3, immediately after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. Section 207(a) of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 is amended by redesignating paragraph (5), as redesignated by section 4 of this Act, as paragraph (6), and by inserting immediately after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) a review of the relationship between the United States Government and American private business with respect to the categories of subject matter listed in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of paragraph (4) and any other appropriate areas of information, together with recommendations for appropriate policies and programs in order to insure that American business is competitive in international commerce; and"

Page 3, line 14, strike out "and" the second time it appears therein.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa that his two amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, both of these amendments I believe are non-controversial in nature. They have been discussed thoroughly with the chairman of the full committee and the subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. I believe they strengthen the intent of this particular section of the legislation by adding one additional area of study which I believe would be useful; and by requesting recommendations I think will strengthen, hopefully, the competitiveness of American business in international trade.

Mr. Chairman, the first amendment would add "environmental practices" to section 4 of the International Economic Policy Act.

There is justifiable mounting concern in every nation for preserving the quality of the world's environment. However, it is clear that environmental laws, designed to improve the quality of our environment, can have a substantial impact on international trade and investment relations.

Environmental controls influence the international competitiveness of many industries and can in a real sense be considered part of the larger and long standing set of problems associated with nontariff carriers.

The competitive effect of environmental control programs may lead to national policies to offset their trade competitiveness effect—much as export subsidies and import surcharges and other compensatory policies.

Therefore, there is an urgent need—satisfied by this amendment—to understand and analyze the international impact of environmental practices.

My second amendment would require CIEP to review the relationship of the U.S. Government and the American private business sector, and then make recommendations to insure that American business remains competitive in international commerce.

Historically, although perhaps not always in real practice, the private sector and the Government have preferred to operate at arms length. All too often where we have seen Government respond to business interests it has been with regard to situations where special narrow private interests rather than broader public purposes have been served. We can surely give constructive thought to ways in which a more progressive and enlightened relationship of mutual benefit can be forged.

Today, there is much discussion in both U.S. business and U.S. Government circles about the unique and close relationship between the private business sector in Japan and Europe. There are some who feel that the U.S. should learn from, and adopt some of the programs and policies utilized by "Japan Inc"; for example, so as to move in concert toward desired, rational objectives as opposed to merely marshalling Government resources to protect noncompetitive obsolescence at public expense.

Obviously, models suitable for one society rarely fit another, but undoubtedly much of value and possible application can be learned from careful study of various systems.

The international economic realities of today require a review of the traditional relationship between the U.S. Government and the American private business sector in order to assure our competitiveness. The yearly report published by CIEP is, I submit, the proper forum for such a review since CIEP is charged with coordinating U.S. domestic and international economic policy in order to formulate a balanced U.S. policy.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Iowa has discussed his amendments with the Executive Director of the Council on International Economic Policy and has won favor in that discussion. Is that correct?

Mr. CULVER. Yes. I have been advised by the Director that he has no objection to these amendments.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendments and urge their adoption.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have reviewed the amendments on this side and will in fact accept the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHALEN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHALEN: Add new section 6 on page 3 as follows:

"Sec. 6. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 208 (a) of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, any future Executive Director of the Council on International Economic Policy appointed after the date of the enactment of this bill shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does one thing. It requires that the Executive Director of the CIEP, who may be appointed hereafter, will be subject to Senate confirmation. This is somewhat similar to the amendment to this bill which was adopted unanimously by the House last year, the single difference being that this has prospective effect, whereas the amendment adopted last year had current effect.

Let me cite a couple of reasons why I feel this amendment should be adopted. First of all, the Constitution directs that the Congress shall have control over foreign trade, foreign commerce. It seems to me, therefore, that any organization established within the executive branch of Government should come under the direct scrutiny and supervision of the U.S. Congress.

This Executive Director is a statutory position created by the Congress. Therefore, since it is a creature of Congress, I think that the occupant of that position should be confirmed by the Senate.

The second reason is that this is a super agency, in effect. It is designed not only to create international economic policy, but also to coordinate. In view of the power which is being vested in this organization, in this council, I think it is very important that the chief operator, or the person given responsibility for administering the affairs of the council should, since he is appointed by the President, be subject to Senate confirmation.

For this reason, therefore, I hope that the House will adopt this amendment. Let me say that whereas last year the House incorporated in this bill the provision for Senate confirmation, the Senate did not ask for it. However, the Senate bill this year does have this provision in it, so I think that that question has been resolved.

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

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman now say that the creature of this assembly should be—

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I said this is a creature of Congress.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, the Executive Director is a creature of Congress. Does the gentleman think this organization did a good job last year, since it was created?

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not discussing last year.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I want the

gentleman to discuss it. Since he wants to make the director a creature of the Senate, I want him to discuss whether or not he thinks it did or did not do a good job.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I think that remains to be seen. I think the gentleman's question is not relevant to the situation.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, it is relevant to many of us. The question has been asked before.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON).

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record as supporting the amendment. I understand it is only prospective, for the director who will be appointed.

Mr. WHALEN. That is correct.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very good amendment.

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

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY).

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think a word of explanation is in order as to why the legislation before us is silent on the matter of confirmation.

It should be remembered, as my good friend from Ohio has pointed out, that last year the House did act on this when it adopted an amendment as suggested, I believe, by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER). That amendment calling for confirmation was resoundingly adopted in the House. However, the Senate, which of course has the responsibility for confirmation, insisted to the contrary, that confirmation in their view at that time was not necessary.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that we have learned some things about the Council on International Economic Policy since that time. It is also a fact that the Senate has acted with respect to legislation similar to that which is being considered by us at this time.

The legislation has been adopted in the other body, and it does make provision for Senate confirmation. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, the view of the subcommittee on international trade, quite frankly, has changed.

I have no objection whatever to Senate confirmation of the Executive Director. I am most certainly mindful of the action taken by the House last year in this respect. Inasmuch as the other body now is of a different view from what it was last year, and has asserted itself with respect to this prerogative, I believe the gentleman's amendment is a prudent one and a good one, and I would recommend it be adopted.

Mr. WHALEN. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Frankly, this amendment was not discussed before our committee this year.

It has never been discussed before any of the Members of the committee I know of until this hour.

I know that the practice of drafting legislation from the Banking Committee on the floor of the House is a very frequent thing, and I have learned to adjust myself to that. To propose amendments of this sort, without any legislative history, without any hearings, without any discussion, I believe is unwise. It is not that we are going to limit banking legislation to wise legislation; I have adjusted myself to the realities of that as well.

I would like to urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment as being unwise, unwarranted, and completely unnecessary.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have had quite a bit to say recently about the need for the Congress to be aware of its proper role in our Government.

The gentleman from Ohio is precisely right. The Constitution gives to the Congress the responsibility for the regulation of commerce.

I have served for some 18 years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In the regulation we normally utilize independent regulatory commissions. Here there is no independent regulatory commission. At the very least the Executive Director should be subject to confirmation by the Senate.

I believe it is an excellent amendment. I believe it reinforces and underscores the importance of the role of the Congress, and I strongly urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASHLEY) there were—ayes 88, noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GIBBONS, 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. 8548) to amend the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 to change the membership of the Council on International Economic Policy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 468, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 322, noes 62, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

AYES—322

Abdnor	Edwards, Ala.	McCormack
Abzug	Edwards, Calif.	McDade
Adams	Erlenborn	McEwen
Alexander	Eshleman	McFall
Anderson, Ill.	Fascell	McKinney
Andrews, N.C.	Findley	McSpadden
Andrews, N. Dak.	Flood	Macdonald
Annunzio	Flowers	Madden
Archer	Flynt	Madigan
Arends	Foley	Mahon
Armstrong	Ford, Gerald R.	Mailliard
Ashley	Forsythe	Mallary
Aspin	Fountain	Mann
Bennett	Fraser	Martin, Nebr.
Bergland	Frelinghuysen	Martin, N.C.
Bevill	Frenzel	Mathias, Calif.
Blester	Fröhlich	Matsunaga
Bingham	Fulton	Mayne
Blackburn	Fuqua	Mazzoli
Boggs	Gaydos	Meeds
Boland	Gettys	Metcalfe
Bolling	Gialmo	Mezvisinsky
Bowen	Gibbons	Milner
Brasco	Gilman	Minish
Brademas	Ginn	Mink
Brasco	Goldwater	Mitchell, Md.
Bray	Gonzalez	Mitchell, N.Y.
Breckinridge	Grasso	Moakley
Brinkley	Gray	Mollohan
Brooks	Green, Oreg.	Montgomery
Broomfield	Green, Pa.	Moorhead,
Brotzman	Grover	Calif.
Brown, Calif.	Gude	Moorhead, Pa.
Brown, Mich.	Guyer	Morgan
Brown, Ohio	Haley	Murphy, Ill.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.
Broyhill, Va.	Hammer-	Natcher
Buchanan	schmidt	Nedzi
Burgener	Hanley	Nelsen
Burke, Calif.	Hanna	Nichols
Burke, Mass.	Hansen, Idaho	Nix
Burlison, Mo.	Harrington	Obey
Burton	Harsha	O'Brien
Butler	Harvey	O'Hara
Carey, N.Y.	Hastings	O'Neill
Carey, Ohio	Hawkins	Passman
Carter	Hays	Patman
Casey, Tex.	Hechler, W. Va.	Patten
Cederberg	Heckler, Mass.	Pepper
Chamberlain	Heinz	Perkins
Chappell	Helstoski	Pettis
Chisholm	Henderson	Peyser
Clausen,	Hicks	Pickle
Don H.	Hillis	Pike
Clawson, Del	Hinshaw	Podell
Clay	Hogan	Preyer
Cleveland	Holtzman	Price, Ill.
Cochran	Horton	Price, Tex.
Cohen	Hosmer	Pritchard
Collier	Howard	Quie
Collins, Ill.	Huber	Rallsback
Conable	Hungate	Randall
Conlan	Hutchinson	Rangel
Conte	Jarman	Rees
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Regula
Cotter	Johnson, Colo.	Reuss
Coughlin	Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes
Cronin	Jones, Okla.	Riegle
Culver	Jordan	Rinaldo
Daniel, Robert	Karth	Roberts
W., Jr.	Kastenmeier	Robinson, Va.
Daniels,	Kazen	Robison, N.Y.
Dominick V.	Keating	Rodino
Davis, Ga.	Kemp	Roe
Davis, S.C.	Kluczynski	Rogers
de la Garza	Koch	Roncalio, Wyo.
Delaney	Kyros	Rooney, Pa.
Dellenback	Landrum	Rose
Dellums	Latta	Rosenthal
Denholm	Leggett	Rostenkowski
Dennis	Lehman	Roush
Dickinson	Lent	Roy
Donohue	Litton	Roybal
Downing	Long, La.	Ruppe
Drinan	Lott	Ryan
Dulski	McClory	St Germain
du Pont	McCloskey	Sarasin
Eckhardt	McCollister	

Sarbanes	Stratton	Whalen
Saylor	Stuckey	White
Schneebell	Studds	Whitehurst
Sebelius	Sullivan	Wildnall
Seiberling	Symington	Williams
Shoup	Talcott	Wilson, Bob
Shriver	Taylor, N.C.	Wilson,
Skubitz	Teague, Calif.	Charles H.,
Slack	Thomson, Wis.	Calif.
Smith, Iowa	Thone	Winn
Smith, N.Y.	Thornton	Wolff
Staggers	Udall	Wydler
Stanton,	Ullman	Wyman
J. William	Van Deerlin	Yates
Stanton,	Vander Jagt	Yatron
James V.	Vanik	Young, Alaska
Stark	Veysey	Young, Ga.
Steed	Vigorito	Young, Ill.
Steele	Waggonner	Young, Tex.
Steelman	Waldie	Zablocki
Steiger, Wis.	Walsh	Zion
Stephens	Wampler	Zwack
Stokes	Ware	

NOES—62

Anderson,	Holt	Quillen
Calif.	Hudnut	Rarick
Bafalis	Hunt	Roncalio, N.Y.
Baker	Ichord	Rousslot
Beard	Jones, N.C.	Runnels
Burke, Fla.	Jones, Tenn.	Ruth
Burleson, Tex.	Ketchum	Satterfield
Byron	Kuykendall	Scherle
Camp	Landgrebe	Schroeder
Clancy	Long, Md.	Shuster
Collins, Tex.	Lujan	Snyder
Crane	McKay	Spence
Daniel, Dan	Maraziti	Steiger, Ariz.
Davis, Wis.	Mathis, Ga.	Symms
Devine	Michel	Taylor, Mo.
Dorn	Mizell	Towell, Nev.
Duncan	Moss	Treen
Goodling	Myers	Wyatt
Gross	Owens	Wylie
Gunter	Parris	Young, Fla.
Hanrahan	Powell, Ohio	Young, S.C.

NOT VOTING—49

Addabbo	Evans, Colo.	Mosher
Ashbrook	Evins, Tenn.	Poage
Badillo	Fish	Reld
Barrett	Fisher	Rooney, N.Y.
Bell	Ford,	Sandman
Biaggi	William D.	Shipley
Blatnik	Frey	Sikes
Breaux	Griffiths	Sisk
Clark	Gubser	Stubblefield
Conyers	Hansen, Wash.	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	Hébert	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Hollifield	Tiernan
Derwinski	Jones, Ala.	Whitten
Diggs	King	Wiggins
Dingell	Melcher	Wilson,
Eilberg	Mills, Ark.	Charles, Tex.
Esch	Minshall, Ohio	Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Biaggi.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Dingell.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. King.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Badillo.
 Mr. Breaux with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Danielson with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Tiernan.
 Mr. Reid with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Eilberg.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Mosher.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Melcher with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Sisk.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Whitten.
 Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Wright.
 Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Jones of Alabama.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 468, I call up for immediate consideration the bill (S. 1636) to amend the International Economic Policy Act of 1972.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PATMAN moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1636 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 8548, as passed, as follows:

That section 205 of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 647) is amended by—

(1) striking out "(1) The President";
(2) striking out "be the Chairman of the Council and shall preside over the meetings of the Council; in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in his place" and inserting in lieu thereof "designate the Chairman of the Council from among the members listed in paragraphs (1) through (9)"; and
(3) redesignating paragraphs (2) through (10) as paragraphs (1) through (9) respectively.

Sec. 2. Section 209 of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 649) is amended by striking out "1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975".

Sec. 3. Section 210 of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 649) is amended by striking out "1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1974".

Sec. 4. Section 207(a) of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 648) is amended by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3), and by inserting immediately after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) a comparative description and analysis of the following subject matter, with respect to the United States, the European Community and principal countries within the European Community, Japan, and whenever applicable, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—

"(A) research and development expenditures, and productivity and technological trends in major industrial and agricultural sectors;

"(B) investment patterns in new plant and equipment;

"(C) industrial manpower and training practices;

"(D) tax incentives and other governmental financial assistance;

"(E) export promotion practices;

"(F) share of the export market, by area and industrial and agricultural sectors;

"(G) environmental practices;

"(H) antitrust practices; and

"(I) long-range governmental economic planning programs, targets, and objectives".

Sec. 5. Section 205 of Public Law 92-412 is amended by adding "The Secretary of Transportation."

Sec. 6. Section 207(a) of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 is amended by redesignating paragraph (5), as redesignated by section 4 of this Act, as paragraph (6), and by inserting immediately after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) a review of the relationship between the United States Government and American private business with respect to the categories of subject matter listed in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of paragraph (4) and any other appropriate areas of information, together with recommendations for appropriate policies and programs in order to insure that

American business is competitive in international commerce; and".

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 208(a) of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, any future Executive Director of the Council on International Economic Policy appointed after the date of the enactment of this bill shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 to change the membership of the Council on International Economic Policy, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 8548, was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendments to the bill S. 1636 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to that request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO CORRECT SECTION NUMBERS AND PUNCTUATION IN S. 1636

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the House amendments to S. 1636 the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers and punctuation to reflect the action taken by the House.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. 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 gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT: WHY IS THERE THE CONTINUING NECESSITY FOR AMERICAN AIR POWER TO BE UTILIZED IN CAM- BODIA?

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing a letter to the President which was mailed yesterday, which I will insert in the RECORD today for the benefit of my colleagues. The purpose of the subject matter of my letter is the vote to terminate Cambodian bombing last Monday, on which I cast my vote to terminate the bombing.

Mr. Speaker, I have posed some questions to the President as to why it is necessary to continue to act in Cambodia and Laos when we have a very powerful army in the form of the South Vietnamese, a very powerful military force that we have built up with our training and with our military supplies and hardware.

I am asking the question, Mr. Speaker, of the President why it is necessary that American forces be used in Southeast Asia when the South Vietnamese have a great deal more to lose there than we have.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1973.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: As you are aware, I have been one of your more steadfast supporters regarding your policies in Southeast Asia since your assumption of the Office of the Presidency. In like manner, I supported President Johnson when I first arrived in the Congress. I felt that the President was the only person constitutionally authorized to negotiate agreements on behalf of the United States and, as a practical manner, the Congress as an institution is not equipped to handle negotiations.

I congratulate you on the success which you have achieved on the return of our American prisoners, and your success in developing in South Vietnam one of the strongest and best equipped military forces in the world.

The question which I present to you today by this letter arises because you are finding it to be a continuing necessity that American air power be utilized in Cambodia and, I assume, in Laos.

Inasmuch as we have assisted the South Vietnamese in developing a military capability, I want to know why the South Vietnamese cannot be of assistance to Cambodia? Certainly, the South Vietnamese have a great deal more to lose than we if the friendly government of Lon Nol collapses. They will find themselves once again facing North Vietnamese troops who enjoy the advantage of logistics, bases, as well as regrouping and recuperating areas across their borders in Cambodia.

I further cannot understand why the South Vietnamese are not using their ground forces in a more meaningful manner against the North Vietnamese forces in Cambodia, in South Vietnam, and even more realistically against the territory of North Vietnam itself. So long as South Vietnam is maintained in a defensive posture, always granting the enemy the tactical advantage of choosing the time and place of doing battle, the ultimate collapse of South Vietnam appears to me to be inevitable.

I voted against the continuation of American bombing in Cambodia this week because I have had enough of a permanent no-win policy in Southeast Asia. I think the South Vietnamese are capable of fighting, and fighting well, so long as they can see an ultimate

hope of victory in ridding their land of North Vietnamese forces, including the destruction of North Vietnam as a military and political threat. So long as the territory of North Vietnam remains inviolate to South Vietnamese attack, her willingness and capability to continue her mischief and barbaric actions will be demonstrated.

I do think as a congressman who must speak for, and answer to, 450,000 Americans, I am entitled to answers to these questions before I can be asked to support "secret" negotiations leading to secret deals which by every objective standard appears to point to ultimate disaster for our cause.

Respectfully,

BEN B. BLACKBURN,
Member of Congress.

"Z" REVISITED

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the public has been riveted this week on the testimony of former White House Counsel John Dean. The revelations Mr. Dean and prior witnesses have disclosed before the committee have stunned and dismayed the country. But perhaps the most alarming information is that the Internal Revenue Service, the CIA, the FBI, and the Secret Service have been used to further the political interests of the administration by intimidating and harassing opponents.

Testimony implicates the former Acting Director of the FBI as having illegally destroyed documents, the CIA as having assisted in a criminal burglary in connection with the Ellsberg case, and the Secret Service as having fed the White House information on Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN's activities during the Presidential campaign. Furthermore, it has been suggested that the Justice Department, through its then Assistant Attorney General, Henry Petersen, aided the Watergate coverup and provided secret grand jury testimony to White House aids.

We now have testimony that a special service group was established in the Internal Revenue Service "to receive and analyze all available information on organizations and individuals promoting extremist views and philosophies." And, there is evidence that the administration placed pressure on IRS to conduct audits on certain of its political adversaries.

While the Senate committee continues its investigation of the Watergate affair, I think the House has an obligation through its committees, and particularly the Government Operations Committee, to exercise its oversight responsibilities over these Federal agencies and immediately investigate the allegations that their authority was abused on behalf of the political interests of the White House. Furthermore, we must take steps to make certain that such illegal and immoral activities do not occur again.

Presently, a House Armed Services Subcommittee is reviewing the alleged involvement of the CIA in the Ellsberg case. And, Chairman WILBUR MILLS has ordered the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to investi-

gate Mr. Dean's allegations that the Internal Revenue Service investigated the tax returns of political activists at the request of the White House. But, this is not enough. In addition to these inquiries, it is imperative that the House Government Operations Committee investigate all allegations of improper activities by the Federal agencies and maintain a continuous vigilance in the future to prevent the recurrence of these and other abuses.

The closest analogy to what we see unfolding before us was that depicted in the movie "Z." Fortunately, this assault on our Republic was uncovered before we were permanently stripped of our democratic liberties.

THE FREEZE MUST END FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have appealed to the President of the United States and to the Cost of Living Council, for an immediate end to the freeze on prices within the agricultural marketing structure. In California, as in agricultural areas throughout the Nation, farmers and businessmen who depend on agriculture are facing bankruptcy en masse.

Prices throughout the system are frozen below cost. For many, the control period of June 1 to 8 was a transitional period when prices had not yet adjusted to new increases in costs of production.

Agricultural prices are almost always undergoing a similar transition, and any freeze is extremely dangerous. The food and feed marketing system must maintain a high degree of flexibility in order to maintain a normal flow of goods to the consumer.

As of now, the freeze threatens to create severe poultry shortages by July 31, severe pork shortages by September 1, severe milk and dairy product shortages by Christmas, and severe beef shortages by Easter of 1974. These shortages will virtually be assured if the freeze is allowed to continue through July.

Already, growers, farmers, and ranchers in California and nationwide are sharply curtailing production. Breeding stock is going to market. Trucks are lined up at sale barns loaded with the parent stock which was to have supplied next year's red meat. Feed prices are simply too high to afford.

Peaches, pears, oranges, carrots, watermelons, grapefruit, tomatoes, potatoes, and other commodities are also under severe stress. Buyers are refusing delivery on the new crop in many cases, because their price is frozen below profit level.

Feed producers are also facing bankruptcy. Their prices are frozen at \$5 to \$15 per ton below their cost, and some have already shut down. This further complicates the severity of livestock producers, as their feed supplies dwindle.

Let us look at individual situations.

Pear producers and peach producers

are today unable to get from the canners the price they need to break even. They are hamstrung in their negotiations for price on the new crop because the canners are, at best, limited in their ability to predict what price they can pass on to the consumer. Hence, the entire 1973 crop will likely be contracted at prices far below profit levels.

The same situation perils producers of virtually every kind of fruit in California. Some prices were especially low last year—and in fact, below profit levels in many cases. And those producers desperately needed a good price this year to recover.

Growers of fresh tomatoes, grapefruit, and carrots were caught in the vice of seasonal marketing patterns. The end of the harvest of a crop in one part of the country, with the usual cutrate, cleanup prices, actually set the freeze price for California's production.

Tomato growers in Arizona, the Imperial Valley of California, and Mexico were wrapping up their harvest and selling out the tail end of the crop. Prices were winding down at \$4 per box on June 1.

At that time, shipping had not begun in the Central Valley of California, where the break-even price is about \$7 per box.

Today, the tomato grower in central California is frozen at \$4 because the chainstore buyers were selling \$4 tomatoes to the consumer during the first week in June. The quality factor is nonexistent in this freeze.

Grapefruit prices were frozen at levels far below profit. The week of June 1-8 saw the market cleaning up tail end fruit from the Florida crop, and preparing for the new crop in California. That bargain-basement price is now the freeze price for grapefruit. Although there is now some promise that that price will be adjusted, this is one more example of how the complicated agricultural market system is strangled by a freeze such as this.

Carrot producers in the Salinas Valley provide another example. With the breakeven price at over \$5 a box, the freeze was set at around \$3.50. This happened simply because the tail end of the crop from my district—the Imperial Valley was on the market in early June.

In California today, the price received by farmers for eggs is effectively frozen at 5 cents per dozen below his cost of production. This has happened at just the time when our egg ranchers were getting back on their feet after an extended period of low prices and high losses. The industry cannot stand another blow, and already many small and several larger producers have begun to fold.

The feed industry, which supplies the livestock industry, finds itself in an impossible situation. During the past several months, the price of feed ingredients, especially soybean meal and other protein sources has been moving sharply higher. Feed manufacturers have been slowly raising their prices accordingly, but in trying to protect their customers—the livestock and the poultry producers—the feed manufacturer has struggled to hold the increase in feed

prices to a minimum. In many cases, he has taken a loss for the short term rather than increase his price too sharply to the farmer.

That very necessary practice, which is common in agricultural marketing—that of protecting one's customer by sharing in the ups and downs in costs and prices—has now placed the feed producer in an untenable position. Soybean and other protein feed supplements continue to move sharply higher, and the producer is frozen at prices which he set purposely below his cost in early June.

The major suppliers of livestock feed to southern California's important beef, dairy, and poultry industries are each losing money today at the rate of \$100,000 per month. Smaller feed companies are losing over \$1,000 per day. I submit that we will have crippled livestock, poultry, and dairy industries in short order, with feed producers losing that kind of money.

It is only commonsense that the freezing of meat prices is a bit irrelevant if there is no meat to buy.

Mr. Speaker, if the freeze continues much longer, our food supply and food marketing system will be entrenched in the gutters of black marketeering.

I appeal to my colleagues today to join me in this effort. It is not just the farmer, not just the institution of American agriculture, but the entire economy and the welfare of every consumer in this country that is at stake.

The specter of a severe food shortage, with families going hungry across the Nation, looms very real today.

While the imposition of a freeze may hold consumer prices down by a few cents per pound for a few weeks, the end result will surely be utter chaos at the marketplace and economy-wrecking prices.

The freeze must be lifted and an orderly phase IV, perhaps with price controls tied to profit margins, must be implemented immediately. And that phase also must be geared toward reinstating free market conditions as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, California's agriculture supplies one-fourth of the Nation's table food, and 40 percent of our fresh fruits and vegetables.

Agriculture supplies half of our State's water borne exports, and one-half of the trucking business. It also supplies one-third of our rail shipments, and one-third of all of the jobs for 21 million residents.

Agriculture in California is a \$5.7 billion industry annually—and a major share of that industry goes into exports each year—one of the few plus factors in this country's balance of payments.

Agriculture nationwide, in fact, is the only industry we can count on year after year, to improve our balance-of-payment situation. And I do not have to remind any of my colleagues how crucial that situation is. Without a healthy agriculture, and a healthy agriculture price and marketing structure, our economic problems will be compounded many times over.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Congress take serious note of this problem today.

It is not a philosophical question, nor is it a rural-urban question. It is courting economic disaster for all Americans to continue the price freeze on food and the food production-marketing system.

THE SUPREME COURT AND PORNOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's recent decision on pornography has supplied our States and local communities with some much-needed ammunition to rid bookstores and movies of obscene matter.

I applaud the Court's decision which abandoned the idea that all parts of the country must follow a national standard on what is obscene.

The Court reversed its previous trend toward permissiveness and laid down tougher new guidelines that can be used by the States and local governments in determining what books, films, or pictures may be banned as pornographic.

No longer must it be proved that a work is "utterly without redeeming social value" before it can be prohibited.

That rule, adopted in 1966, has been held largely responsible for the wave of dirty books and pictures that has swept the country in recent years.

Local community standards will now be used in determining whether material is obscene. As Chief Justice Warren Burger put it in the Court's majority opinion:

To require a state to structure obscenity proceedings around evidence of a national community standard would be an exercise in futility.

The Chief Justice explained that it was not realistic nor constitutionally sound to read the first amendment as requiring that the people of a city like Mobile, Ala., have to accept public depiction of conduct found tolerable in cities such as Las Vegas or New York.

Defining what actually is obscene has been the most difficult part of obscenity cases in the past. The High Court, in its new decision, prescribed a new test to determine what State laws may prohibit.

The opinion said:

Works may be banned, if, taken as a whole, they appeal to prurient interests; if they portray sexual conduct in a patently offensive way; and if they, taken as a whole, do not have serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value.

In holding that a jury may judge a work's obscenity by the standards that prevail in its community, the Supreme Court also listed a number of guidelines for State and local courts to follow.

The decision was by a 5-to-4 vote. All four of the Justices appointed by President Nixon voted with the majority: They are Chief Justice Burger, Associate Justices Harry Blackmun, Lewis Powell and William H. Rehnquist. They were joined by Associate Justice Byron White.

This "conservative" swing is a trend that has been developing in the Supreme Court over a period of time.

I have shared the concern of the peo-

ple of Alabama and the first district over the smut and pornography that have plagued our Nation and I have introduced legislation to control the mailing or selling of indecent matter and to let the local community determine its own standards.

So it is welcome news to me to see that the Supreme Court has reversed its earlier permissive rulings, and I am sure it is good news, too, to the many citizens who have voiced concern and who have tried in vain to rid our communities of smut.

THE BIG THICKET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STEELMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Big Thicket region in southeast Texas is one of America's last natural wilderness areas. It is an area unique to the United States, for nowhere else does there exist such a mixture of zoological and botanical life: temperate and tropical, western and eastern. "The Biological Crossroads of North America" is not an exaggerated description of this beautiful area.

The Big Thicket is being threatened with extinction however. Only a century ago it contained over 3 million acres. As late as 1938 over a million acres existed untouched. Today there are hardly 300,000 acres of the thicket remaining.

In order to protect the Big Thicket from completely disappearing, today I am introducing a bill to create a 100,000 acre Big Thicket National Biological Reserve.

Almost everyone agrees that there should be a portion of the Big Thicket set aside in order to be preserved in its natural state. The disagreement arises over how much land will be saved. Various groups have supported many proposals of from 35,000 acres up to 200,000 acres. I have had extensive consultations with my colleagues of the National Parks Subcommittee of the Interior Committee, the administration, and environmentalists throughout Texas. In February of this year I took a personal inspection tour of the Big Thicket area. For these reasons I believe the 100,000 acres included in my bill are reasonable and equitable to all parties concerned. The boundaries I have suggested exclude as many year-round residences as is possible. Just and adequate compensation is provided for the acquisition of private property.

This bill also contains a section which I consider vital toward the protection of the thicket. The "redwoods" provision allows the Federal Government to physically acquire the land provided for in the bill on the actual date of enactment. The biological reserve will thus be saved from further destruction as soon as the bill is enacted. No other bill has been proposed which includes this provision, which is especially important for the Big Thicket. The normal time lag between the dates of enactment and acquisition will not occur; an interim which otherwise would allow the decay of the thicket to continue at its present pace, or possibly faster.

We cannot delay any longer to preserve the Big Thicket. Now is the time for positive action to be taken by the House and all concerned parties. This beautiful and unique area in Texas must be saved.

CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN ADDRESSES THE 11TH PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. Don H. Clausen) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Congress a statement I made to the 11th Pan American Highway Conference in Quito, Ecuador.

I believe my remarks at that time retain their contemporary interest in view of the need to reassert our commitment among the nations of the Americas to treat each other with a mutual respect in a true spirit of brotherly love.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall insert my statement at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE DON H. CLAUSEN

On December 9, 1967, you accorded me the high privilege of addressing your plenary session in Montevideo, Uruguay.

At that time, I referred to the Pan American Highway program as "the most important single undertaking of our time"—"a coordinated and integrated road and highway system for the Americas."

"As we work toward this desired multinational and inter-continental integrated system of highways, one cannot help but visualize the ultimate formation of a Common Market of all the Americas."

Today, it is with pleasure that we are able to report positive progress in the development of the Darien Gap Highway as the key segment remaining to be completed in the Pan American Highway.

Culminating 6 years of Darien Surveys, a formal report was prepared by the Darien Subcommittee entitled "Final Conclusions and Recommendations Regarding the Location, Design and Construction of the Pan American Highway Through the Darien Gap of Colombia and Panama." This report was formally presented to the Permanent Executive Committee President, Eduardo Dibos D., during the meeting of the Permanent Executive Committee of the Pan American Highway Congresses in Lima, Peru, in February 1969.

March 19, 1969, in the Council Chamber of the Pan American Union in Washington, D.C., and attended by members of the Permanent Executive Committee, Darien Subcommittee, Officials of National and International Highway organizations, the Final Report of the Darien Subcommittee was presented to the Secretary General of the OAS, Dr. Galo Plaza, by Don Romulo O'Farrill, our beloved Honorary Life Chairman of the Permanent Executive Committee—the "champion of the Pan American Highway System."

On June 10, 1969, in the House of Representatives of the United States Bill H.R. 12014 was introduced by myself along with colleagues Congressman John C. Kluczynski of Illinois and Jim Wright of Texas. The Bill would authorize the United States to cooperate with the Governments of Panama and Colombia in the construction of the Darien Gap Highway in these two countries to thus connect the Inter-American Highway with the Pan American Highway and authorize \$100 million to pay two-thirds of the cost of construction of the highway.

Passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970, on December 31, 1970, was signed by President Nixon; thus the construction of the Darien Gap Highway was assured. This was a memorable occasion for all those who had worked for many years to make the closing of the missing link of the Pan American Highway System a reality.

In a historic ceremony May 6, 1971, at the Pan American Union in Washington, D.C., the Governments of Colombia, Panama and the United States executed the final agreements for the construction of the Darien Gap Highway.

In signing the agreements for the United States, Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe said, "The international project now agreed to will benefit all the Americas. It will bring both social and economic gains to all the countries of the Hemisphere."

Before the end of the fiscal year June 1, 1971, President Nixon requested supplemental appropriation by the United States Congress in the amount of \$5 million for the Darien Gap Highway. These funds were immediately obligated and an announcement made to call for bids August 31, 1971, on the section of the Darien Gap Highway in Panama between Canitas and the Bayano River including the Bayano River Bridge.

In the 1972 budget, President Nixon and the Congress appropriated \$15 million to continue to fulfill contract and construction commitments.

The continuing and intense interest of the United States Congress was next demonstrated when Mr. Wright, myself, and our House Roads Subcommittee, visited Colombia, Panama and the Darien Region to observe "on-the-spot" the construction problems to be encountered, the effect on the environment, the concerns of the native population of the area and, most importantly, to gain a greater understanding of the unique terrain, swamp and meteorological problems associated with this "impossible" construction project.

A helicopter flight over the proposed routing, an overnight stay in a Choco Indian village and meetings with native leaders—deep in the Darien Jungle—made a profound impression on all of us, as we sought to develop a fuller appreciation for the problems ahead.

All planning is aimed at "holing through" the Darien Gap with 5 years. If weather and construction conditions permit, it is our hope to accelerate the construction timetable. We are determined to complete the project and "close the Gap" at the earliest practicable date.

This presents a tremendous challenge to everyone connected with the program—from the political, administrative and financial people of our governments to the scientific, engineering and builder personnel that must accomplish the work.

The Darien Gap—long famous and challenging as the "Impossible Road Construction Project of our Hemisphere" will continue to intrigue the imagination until it is finally completed and the Pan American Highway—from Alaska to Argentina—linking the Americas—truly becomes Inter-Continental, thereby setting the stage for the unlimited economic, social, educational and cultural benefits that will become available to the people of North, Central and South America.

Where do we go from here?

In many ways, highways are comparable to the blood circulation system of our own body. The Pan American Highway is the main artery of the highway system for the Americas. Feeder roads form the main network which carries blood into the main artery. When there is active circulation of blood through the veins and arteries, the surrounding body tissues are kept healthy. Likewise, when feeder and lateral roads stimulate the production, trade and travel that

flows into the main highways of our lands, our economies prosper and the lives and living conditions of our peoples benefit.

This analogy has proven useful to me. It has helped me to understand and relate the role of highways, coordinated with other land, sea and air transportation, and how these, in turn, serve the ultimate goal of national and inter-continental development.

I have often talked about the need for integrated national transport systems as a vital ingredient of national progress. By that I refer to the rational, planned, coordinated and integrated system of different transport modes that function together efficiently and economically in serving the transport needs of our societies.

But just as the human brain directs and coordinates our bodily functions, so likewise national development planning through the Pan American Highway Congress and OAS must serve to integrate our transport systems into the total development process of the Americas.

We in the United States have long ago learned the lesson that a well-developed transport system operating alongside an inadequately developed agricultural or industrial structure has very limited benefits.

In this sense, highways and transport systems are instruments by which national development and individual mobility are served. They are not ends in themselves. For example, a farm-to-market road program which is not integrally linked to a well-conceived agricultural development plan, providing research, extension, farm credit, and marketing services, is unlikely to bring progress to the rural community or a better life for its inhabitants.

From this analogy, I arrive at the conclusion that the basic goal of all of us who are interested in highways is national development. Our job does not end when we plan and finish construction of a highway. We must not be satisfied when the main arteries and veins of a transport system are in place. We must all actively involve ourselves in ensuring that a vigorous flow of blood is pumped through these arteries and veins. That means we must concern ourselves increasingly with national development strategies, with sectoral plans for agricultural and industrial development, with plans for balanced regional economic growth and urban decentralization. Only by involving the technical and management capabilities of the transport sector in the broad tasks of a national development planning will we realize our common goal—highway systems which will serve as the vital lifelines of growth and individual betterment.

MY VIEWS ON A NEW LATIN AMERICAN POLICY

In discussing United States policy toward Latin America, I have often said, "We do not wish to be looked upon as your fathers; we prefer to be your brothers." Behind this phrase, there is a long history of continuing debate as to what the proper relationship should be between the United States and our neighbors to the South. That debate spans long periods of our history from the Monroe Doctrine, through the Good Neighbor Policy, and the Alliance for Progress, up to the present. Each phase of our evolving policy toward Latin America responded both to an assessment of United States interests and of the realities of our relationships in the Hemisphere.

The change in our desired role from being "fathers" to "brothers" goes to the very core of President Nixon's concept of the "mature partnership" we wish to have with our Latin American friends. As I have observed our working relationship during the sessions of our Pan American Highway Congresses, I have come to the firm conclusion that we are all proud of our national heritage, yet we are also willing to share ideas that will be helpful to all.

Why have we moved to this new policy and new diplomatic style?

We have realized that our Latin American neighbors have made great strides in recent years in the complicated tasks of nation building and economic and social change. These nations are increasingly flexing their "muscles of maturity" as they develop their self-confidence, as they thrust ahead in their efforts to modernize, and to bring the benefits of growth to more of their people.

We, too, have assessed our national interests and the realities of contemporary Latin America.

We have come to the conclusion that the special relationship we seek with our Latin American friends must be such as to assist the processed of change in an atmosphere of mutual respect, confidence and cooperation.

That special relationship must recognize the need of our neighbors to reconcile their interests in close ties with us with their determination to mold their own destinies.

It must be based on an understanding that our neighbors must determine their own national structures, their own solutions to their national problems, and setting their own priorities. Above all, it implies that our friends in Latin America must also live with the results of their own decisions and actions.

This is the essence of the mature partnership we seek.

On our side, a strong commitment to assist and cooperate, as requested, in dealing with the problems of change and growth in the Americas.

On the side of the Latin Americans, a growing sense of constructive nationalism and maturity in making a better life for their own people.

As this partnership develops and mellow with time, we not only help each other, but strengthen the quality of our political, social and economic institutions that bind us together in the Inter-American system.

In presenting my personal assessment of our relationship of the past, I am of the firm opinion that we must all accept a proportionate share of the blame for the problems that have not been resolved in an orderly manner.

Why has this occurred?

In my view, we have all wavered from one extreme to another—all the way from "benign neglect" on the one hand to the "bear hug" on the other.

When we needed each other desperately, we would join together to meet a common threat to our respective interests.

After the threat had passed, we would fail to communicate adequately, to "keep in touch", thereby neglecting to recognize or deal with promptly the increasing problems associated with the challenges of change in this jet-space-nuclear-technological age.

The result has been smothering paternalism wrapped in a blanket of immaturity, misunderstanding, unfulfilled promises and mounting uncertainty.

The time has come for all Americans, North, Central and South, to stand up and be counted on a man to man basis—treat each other with mutual respect in a true spirit of brotherly love, as intended, originally, by our Creator.

We are all constructive, creative, dedicated and determined individuals and nations.

We must all realize, however, that by maximizing our organizational inter-dependence, we can enhance the cherished goal of independence.

We, the delegates of this Eleventh Pan American Congress, can and must show the way.

Just as the late President John F. Kennedy and the United States Congress said in the early 1960's, "We will put a man on the moon during this decade," I know it is the desire of President Richard Nixon and the United States Congress to cooperate in unit-

ing the Americas during this decade of the 70's.

The closing of the Darien Gap, when completed, will serve as THE SYMBOL of Hemispheric cooperation and solidarity and as a living monument to you, the delegates of these Eleventh Pan American Highway Congresses.

THE HIDDEN DANGER IN THE WHALEN-BUCHANAN AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the House takes up the war powers resolution, House Joint Resolution 542, in July, our colleague from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) has announced his intention to offer the following amendment:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 542, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. WHALEN

Page 3, strike out line 24 and all that follows down through line 5 on page 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) Within one hundred and twenty calendar days after a report is submitted or is required to be submitted (whichever is earlier) pursuant to section 3, the Congress, by a declaration of war or by the passage of a resolution appropriate to the purpose, shall either approve, ratify, confirm, and authorize the continuation of the action taken by the President and reported to the Congress, or shall disapprove such action in which case the President shall terminate any commitment and remove any enlargement of United States Armed Forces with respect to which such report was submitted.

I believe this is a dangerous amendment.

The purpose of war powers legislation is to reduce the likelihood of Presidential wars—especially long ones—and to enhance the role of Congress in the war powers field.

This amendment has to be considered in the light of that purpose.

By any reasonable test, it is a serious mistake and should be rejected. It works just backward.

First, it inevitably will have the effect of enhancing the President's war powers.

It will reduce the likelihood that a future President will ask the Congress for a declaration of war, because any President will quickly conclude that the Congress is less likely to halt his action through the operation of the Whalen-Buchanan amendment.

Under it, Congress can cause the President to terminate the engagement in hostilities only if both Houses agree. Under the traditional war declaration, one House—just one—can cause the declaration to fail and, therefore war policy to fail.

A war declaration must pass both the House and Senate to be effective. Thus one House can effectively veto a war by failing to approve the declaration.

With the Whalen-Buchanan language, a President will be less likely to use the war declaration approach in dealing with Congress.

Also, the Whalen-Buchanan amendment does not say whether the resolution by which Congress may disapprove a war will be concurrent or joint.

By leaving the ambiguous language

"appropriate to the occasion" in describing the type resolution to be used by Congress, the bill yields control to the President.

In signing or vetoing this bill, President Nixon—or any President may announce that the appropriate resolution must be a joint resolution. Can we expect anything else? He will be protective of Presidential power, as every other President in history has been, and do his best to protect full Presidential flexibility in war-making. He will say that a concurrent resolution, or a simple resolution, is inappropriate to any such occasion.

This interpretation would not, of course, be binding on future events, but inevitably it would be cited by a future President if the section became operative in a crisis.

This would mean that a President could seek to nullify by veto a resolution by the Congress to disapprove.

In this case the power of the President would be immensely enhanced, because only by two-thirds vote of both Houses could the Congress effectively stop a Presidential war.

The Whalen-Buchanan language would reverse exactly the roles of the Congress and President. Instead of just one House being able to veto a war, the President would be able to veto a resolution agreed to by both Houses to stop a war.

The vote Wednesday on the supplemental appropriations override illustrates perfectly the position in which the Congress will find itself if the Whalen-Buchanan amendment is adopted. The President wants to continue acts of war in Cambodia. By majority vote the Congress has voted to halt these acts of war. Because of the Presidential veto and the failure of bombing critics to muster a two-thirds vote in both Houses, the bombing goes on.

Under the Whalen amendment, Presidents in the future will be able to continue indefinitely Presidential wars simply by retaining the support of one-third of either House.

THE ENERGY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to review some of the facts of what has become one of America's most serious domestic concerns—the energy crisis, particularly as it affects the users of petroleum products. The adverse effects of this situation hinders both rural and urban life of the Nation. The energy shortage is of utmost importance to Kansas' Fourth Congressional District, which produces, stores, and transports much of the feed grain for the rest of the Nation.

CAUSES

With respect to refined petroleum products, demand now outstrips supply. This situation will become more serious, as the growth rate of demand is expected to rise 5.7 percent per year from now to 1975, 2.7 percent per year from 1976 to 1980, and 3 percent per year from 1981

to 1985. Simply, demand for petroleum products will increase from approximately 17 million barrels per day to over 26 million barrels per day in 1985.

To further aggravate the problem, domestic refining capacity is projected to be 25.7 percent short of total capacity required to meet 1975 demand. This means that production of crude oil products will be an estimated 4.8 million barrels per day short of required output.

The decline in exploration for and production of domestic crude oil has resulted in greater difficulties in obtaining assured crude supplies. This has an inhibiting effect of the expansion of domestic refining capacity. Furthermore, imported crude oil has a high sulfur content as opposed to the low-sulfur content of crude oil produced domestically. Since many U.S. refineries are designed for low-sulfur crude oil, they are rendered useless with respect to imported crude, unless necessary installation of extensive new equipment is undertaken to prevent damage and meet product specifications.

Second, environmental concerns have created a conflict between energy requirements and environmental goals. This has been the case in two ways: First, environmental issues have delayed—and in some cases—prevented new refinery construction; second, the development of deepwater port facilities—for that crude oil which is imported—has been inhibited because of environmental concerns.

Third, economic factors have inhibited exploration for, production and refinement of domestic crude oil supplies. Independent oil producers no longer find it economically feasible to explore for crude oil. This is caused, at least in part, by the reduced oil depletion allowance. The independent oil producers have been hardest hit by this reduction. Additionally, economic factors have deterred refiners from expanding to meet projected demand for petroleum products. Investment dollars are "tight," forcing refiners to compete for funds in capital markets, while offering a lower rate of return. Furthermore, this situation is seriously aggravated due to the uncertain nature of the market in the supply of oil. If the supply of crude oil is inadequate to meet current refining capacity, investors have little reason to build more refineries in a market where capital funds are already tight. This serves to multiply the adverse effect of the energy crisis in the long run.

EFFECTS

Thinking in short-term effects, rather than long-term potential problems, the energy shortage is an enigma to all walks of American life.

People traveling through the country may find it difficult to buy gasoline for their automobiles, as limitations of purchases may be—and have been—imposed; municipalities and county governments will continue to find it difficult to locate adequate supplies of fuel oil for their buildings and gasoline for their automobiles; farmers, the source of the Nation's food supply, are already experiencing serious shortages in both fuel oil, used for grain dryers, and gasoline required to operate necessary farm equipment.

The deficiencies currently suffered by farmers are twofold, and perhaps more serious to the Nation as a whole. First, this summer's harvest is endangered by fuel shortages. This is serious enough, but when added to the prospect of a continued shortage of fuel into the planting season, preventing the planting and cultivation of crops, the production of food for the Nation may be seriously threatened.

In attempting to survey my constituency about the fuel shortage, I have found some examples of how the "energy crisis" is affecting citizens engaged in the production of food and related activities. Outside of the city of Wichita, as many as 5 to 10 gasoline stations are closed; 10 to 15 are limiting the quantity of sales, many are projecting a shortage of supply, and nearly all rural suppliers are serving regular customers only. Many suppliers are considering closing—or have already closed—their public stations in order to supply farmers for the wheat harvest, which is now in full swing. This indicates a serious deficiency which must be alleviated as quickly as possible.

SOME ALTERNATIVES

Perhaps the most immediate possible solution is to encourage exploration for and production of crude oil through a "loosening up" of the oil depletion allowance, and other incentives, particularly for independent producers, which serve many areas of what I consider to be first priority, the Nation's farmers. In this way, the providers of the Nation's food supply will have adequate resources to do their job.

Second, if the American people do their best to reduce demand, more petroleum products will be available for other priority items on the Nation's energy agenda, such as fuel for the protective services of fire and police departments, and ambulance services. Demand can be reduced by cutting down on unnecessary travel, encouraging mass transportation, reducing speed on highways, keeping automobile engines in top shape, using car air conditioners sparingly, and by driving sensibly. With respect to fuel oil, a change by 2 degrees on the thermostat in the home can save significant volumes of fuels.

In the long run, it is readily apparent that either a trans-Alaska or a trans-Canada pipeline will have to be built to provide for future energy needs. Additionally, we should encourage research in other energy fields such as the uses of atomic energy, geothermal energy, and the potential uses of solar energy.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my belief that Congress should consider the entire energy crisis as expeditiously as we can, and in the most thorough way possible. I have joined my colleagues from Kansas in expressing our concern to the President, urging immediate action. The nature of the crisis, and its severity, will necessitate the combined efforts of the legislative and executive branches of Government in finding a solution, as well as the expertise of those in the industry; and the cooperation and understanding of the public.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the testimony

which was given in behalf of the Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association before the Oil Policy Hearing Committee in Washington. The testimony submitted by Tom L. Schwinn, executive vice president, follows:

STATEMENT BY TOM L. SCHWINN

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I am Tom L. Schwinn, Executive Vice President of the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association (KIOGA), an independent explorer-producer group of some 1400 members who produce or are interested in the production of crude oil and natural gas in the State of Kansas. As such, we are vitally interested in these hearings inasmuch as they have been broadened to include not only allocation of refined petroleum products, but crude oil as well.

We would like to clarify the record by making a distinction between major and independent producer companies. The former are vertically integrated from the well head to the gasoline pump. The independent only sells a commodity. The major generates vast amounts of capital throughout its sprawling and complex operations. Moreover, the major company exerts an invidious influence over independent operations for the reason that they buy much of his production and historically have posted prices at which the independent has sold his crude oil—indeed, independent refiners have followed major company postings in their own purchases.

Nevertheless, this spring as the shortage of energy became well recognized, a fact that had been forecast and well documented for more than a decade, independent refiners, first in Kansas and then elsewhere, advanced their prices to secure additional supplies of crude. In many cases, this has improved their position. In others, no improvement has been noted because major companies have met the increases in order to protect their own well head connections.

Let there be no doubt in the committee's mind. The shortage of crude is genuine, hence there is a shortage of refined products. The decline in crude production has followed closely the decline in exploratory drilling—especially in the mid-continent. Thus, to reach the root cause of the problem, we must make a start at once to turn around the level of exploratory drilling. All the suggestions in the world about how to allocate products will not alleviate a total shortage. Only more discovered reserves and more productive capacity can present a real short or long term solution.

We sympathize with the plight of the independent refiner. As the value of their import tickets has declined, their ability to secure crude supplies has been impaired. In Kansas, independent producers sell a great deal of their crude to independent refiners. Their survival is thus important to independent producers. But for more than 15 years, there has been a gradual demise of independent producers. Yet, I cannot recall in all of those years any significant appeal at any level by others about his deepening crisis.

We assert that an allocation program will succeed if properly staffed and reasonably administered. Adequate discretion must be provided. There must be an end to the diffusion of policy over the production of crude oil by government. What the nation needs is an administration of an allocation program that exhibits an interest in practical solutions—not abject hand-wringing over shortages, real or imagined.

Any base period will impose some inequities. This is so because the selection of a base period is per force arbitrary.

Shortages expressed in terms of gallons of product versus barrels of crude oil are misleading. Remember that a 100 barrel oil well will provide more than 4,200 gallons of product.

Establishment of priorities also contains danger. In any list of priorities, someone is at the top and someone is at the bottom. I can document the fact that the independent producer-explorer segment is now experiencing shortages and threatened shortages of some magnitude.

We strongly urge the committee to free the independent producer of the harassment of being included in the allocation of his crude oil sales. FPC control of well head prices for natural gas is the single most important reason for the natural gas shortage. To force him to continue sales to a major company purchaser will only compound the ominous trend toward monopoly in the industry. Since the major companies are net purchasers of domestic crude, it is to their economic advantage to keep the price of crude oil low. In essence, we need a small producer exemption. There are a myriad of good business reasons aside from price why an operator may wish to switch a connection.

I thank the committee for the opportunity to present this statement. We commend the committee for its quick decision to come to grips with this serious problem about which there is much said with so little understanding.

I shall be happy to answer any questions.

BEWARE OF THE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there are a lot of people in this country who believe that any problem can be solved by legislation. They believe that if a problem arises, the first thing to do is run to Washington for a solution.

Obviously there are many problems which require attention at the Federal level. But there are other problems where Federal intervention merely compounds the problem—it does not solve or even mitigate the problem, it compounds it and may make solution improbable or even impossible.

One of the favorite areas for suggested Federal intervention in recent months has been in the area of food. Food prices have been rising, so self-styled consumer advocates turned to the Federal Government with demands for price ceilings, controls, and Federal decisionmaking.

This approach ignores a basic fact of life. That is that farmers are in business to make a living. They must have some profit or they would not produce. A farmer does not get up at 2 o'clock in the morning and go out to play midwife to a sow giving birth to a litter of pigs simply because he is fond of the sow. He leaves that nice warm bed and goes out to care for the sow because that is where his profit is.

If there is no profit in raising those pigs, then he sells the sow, she goes to market, we eat that pork—but there are no little pigs for the next year's pork supply.

We now are seeing this expected result from the imposition of price ceilings. Farmers' profit potential has been cut as retail prices are frozen. The ceiling effect backs up all the way to the farm gate, even though the farm price of raw, unprocessed commodities is exempt from the price freeze now in effect. Therefore, farmers are sending to market many of

the female hogs which we had earlier thought would be producing a more abundant pork supply next year.

For the same reasons, the number of beef cattle going into feedlots is being reduced below the level expected earlier. And the Nation's canners are warning us that they cannot produce and distribute the quantity of fruits and vegetables and other canned products that we will need in the coming year, because the profit incentive is no longer there.

Broiler producers are cutting back on the number of broilers because, under the price ceiling so fervently demanded by many Members of the Congress, they are losing 4 cents a pound on their broiler production.

Now, perhaps we should pass a law which says farmers and canners and broiler producers should go ahead and produce at a loss. But even the most control-oriented people are not that stupid.

So one result of our monkeying around with the smooth functioning of our agricultural production and marketing systems is that we may be having shortages of food next year—when we are all up for reelection. If that occurs, we will be called upon by our constituents—and properly so—to explain just where we stood when consumer pressures were forcing the administration into supply-diminishing price ceilings on food products.

H.R. 8860 is another current example of an attempt to control prices by substituting unwise Government action for signals from the market to producers as to whether consumers want more or less of which products. You will be given an opportunity to vote on this bill in a few days. I ask you to reflect on the wisdom of moving Government more deeply into agriculture via this bill.

The unfortunate fact is that we do not seem to be able to learn from experience. Through 40 years of Government interference in agriculture—accompanied by the expenditure of billions of tax dollars—we have not grasped the simple truth that the commodities which get into price difficulties are nearly always those which have the so-called benefit of Government regulations. Now, I am not speaking of the problem of high prices; I am speaking of the more common problem—and the problem which H.R. 8860 purports to mitigate—the problem of low prices for farmers. However, the same result—dislocations, production not related to the needs of people, and so on—are much the same.

Some results which we could logically expect and reliably predict if we were to enact this legislation are as follows:

With target prices at incentive levels, farmers would produce for that Government target price, not for the demands of people for food production. We could confidently expect a return to escalating tax costs, surplus production which would have to be taken over by the Government, and the return to high storage costs and other inefficiencies which would soak up taxpayers' dollars without providing any meaningful public benefits.

The administrators of the program would be forced to choose between limiting tax costs of the program by shrinking allotments and production to force

prices up, or of turning production loose, and trying to live with the attendant high production, and the accompanying burden of payments and storage costs out of the Federal Treasury. Under H.R. 8860 we would either sock it to consumers or sock it to taxpayers. And since taxpayers are also consumers—and most consumers also pay taxes—the choice is not pleasant either way.

And farmers, whom we intend to help by this legislation, are not really helped. In the first place, farmers do not like getting their income from the Federal Treasury. They have told us this in every conceivable way. Nor do they like having consumers and other taxpayers mad at them, making statements that they are living off a Federal dole and so on. Farmers prefer to get their incomes and prices out of the marketplace. There is no reason we should refuse them this privilege.

Further, under this proposed legislation the value of allotments and the target price goodies will be swiftly translated into land values, increasing the cost of production for farmers so they do not end up with any more net income—while the taxpayer and consumer is being hit. And land speculators, plus other big money interests, will increase their competition for land, making it more difficult for the family farmer to continue to compete for that land.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the reasons why we need to consider carefully our votes on this bill. We can vote for this bill and move agriculture and consumers and taxpayers and the country backward. Or we can move to positive legislation which will move farmers in the direction of greater freedom and less dependence on Government, less dependence on outmoded allotments and quotas and production patterns based on decades-ago planting needs. We have a responsibility to move ahead, to let farmers take advantage of the opportunity for increasing production and profits which now are so obvious. We have a responsibility to let farmers produce for expanding markets at lower unit costs and increased profits—which will be good for consumers, for taxpayers, for farmers, and for people around the world.

FUND CUTOFF FOR CAMBODIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, recent votes in the U.S. House and Senate to cut off all funds for bombing in Cambodia, although slightly different in their provisions, forecast an ominous future for the United States. This unwise action by a majority of the Congress endangers the tremendous strides we have made toward lasting peace during the last few years.

The very people who are offering and actively supporting the cutting off of all funds for Cambodia are the same people who passed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. They then rallied behind and encouraged an administration which sent over 540,000 American troops to Southeast Asia. During this time, U.S.

casualties ran as high as 200 to 300 young American men each week.

Now that we have achieved at least 95 percent of our goal for a lasting peace, all of our troops are out of Southeast Asia, all known POW's and almost all MIA's have been returned, summarily cutting off all expenditures in Cambodia and Southeast Asia can only make this country's representatives ineffectual in striving for a complete and lasting peace.

We are presently making progress in our talks with Russia and China. A total halt of further expenditures to Southeast Asia would remove the Communist incentive to negotiate. Also, a Communist victory in Cambodia would threaten the fragile balance of negotiated agreements and alignments on which the overall peace in Southeast Asia depends.

I am voting against all attempts to cut off expenditures for Cambodia and Southeast Asia as it is my considered opinion that to do otherwise would result in serious danger to our country.

PROMISES UNKEPT FROM PRIOR TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is being asked to write a trade bill to give new and broad negotiating authority to the President. It might be interesting for the Members to read the following article from the New York Times on June 24, 1973—an article which provides insight on what we can expect in the trade negotiations that would take place under the bill's authority.

The Common Market, it seems, does not even want to negotiate or to pay us what is due us from the last negotiations. How are we going to get them to pay us under new rules? That is the question before the House when the President's trade bill—however amended—comes before it. Who wants to negotiate with us?

The New York Times is not protectionist. The writer of the article, Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., is not a protectionist. But even these people are beginning to see that the trade game is rigged, and the other nations know it is rigged. If the United States even suggests applying its many present laws to promote its own interests, or to pass new laws to right old wrongs, the rest of the world—and often the New York Times—screams about a trade war. But what do the other countries do? They refuse to budge. And what does the United States say? "We will be under very strong pressure to retaliate." But we refuse to use the arms and the rights we negotiated.

It is time for a rethinking of where the United States stands at this point in history. The President has authority to act right now on the exclusion of U.S. goods from the enlargement of the Common Market. But what is happening is exactly nothing, because the rest of the world is interested in promoting its own self-interest, and understandably so. Only they, it seems, can act in their own self-

interest. The United States is always wrong.

The full article follows:

EEC TRADE TALKS—A DIALOG OF THE DEAF (By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—An obscure negotiation in Geneva, seemingly so technical that even its existence is not widely known, may have a major influence on the whole future of the world's trading relations, particularly on the global trade bargaining due to begin next fall.

The talks, which essentially pit the United States against the European Common Market, are nearing their climax. So far they are deadlocked, though pessimism is regarded here as still premature. If they fail, the consequences are viewed by high Government officials here with major concern.

In the jargon of trade negotiators, the Geneva talks are known as the "24-6" negotiations, named for an article of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. At issue is whether, and by how much, the Common Market will "compensate" the United States and other outsiders, through tariff cuts or other trade concessions, for exports that may be lost as a result of the recent enlargement of the Common Market to include Britain, Denmark and Ireland.

The outsiders' exports that may be lost are those now going to the three new members. The loss could come in two ways: through the adoption by the new members of the import-restrictive common agricultural policy of the Common Market and through increases in tariffs on some 600 nonfarm products as a result of adaptation of the individual tariff schedules of the new members to the common tariff of the Common Market.

The GATT says there should be compensation in cases such as this. But the Common Market and the United States have wholly different theories of how much the United States will lose. It has been, so far, a "dialogue of the deaf."

The Common Market argues that many more tariffs of the new members will be lowered than increased and that it owes the United States nothing. The United States has examined this argument, product by product, and rejects the Europeans' conclusion that no compensation is owed.

As an example, a British tariff on a certain chemical might drop from 10 per cent to 8 per cent, the latter being the common tariff of the community. Theoretically, the United States and other outsiders would benefit.

But suppose the principal supplier of the item to Britain is, say, West Germany. For the import into Britain from Germany (another Common Market member) the tariff will soon drop to zero. The United States cannot object to that, because it is part of the whole concept of a "customs union." But the United States can and does argue that it will get little benefit from the decline in the British tariff against outsiders from 10 per cent to 8 per cent.

The agricultural problem is even more serious. Again, the Common Market argues that it does not owe anything, over-all even if the United States might lose some sales of grain to the new members. The United States, it is understood, is not trying as part of this negotiation to have the European community modify its common agricultural policy, which affects mainly American grain exports. But the United States would like concessions on such products as tobacco, lard and citrus fruits, which do not come under the complex common agricultural policy.

The crucial issue is whether the Common Market will change its basic stand that no concessions are due. The matter will be debated in the next few days at the council of ministers in Brussels, with the deadline for completion of the negotiations already agreed by both sides as July 31.

And what if the Common Market refuses to budge?

"We will be under very strong pressure to retaliate," says a high United States official. This would take the form of "withdrawing" past tariff cuts—meaning raising tariffs on some goods from Europe. This is the stuff of which trade wars are made.

In addition, a refusal of the Common Market to offer some compensation could have a significant effect on the outcome of the major trade legislation now nearing its active phase in Congress.

Busy United States emissaries have in the last few weeks been quietly seeking to impress these facts upon the nine Common Market governments. They think they have made some headway in getting across the point that the United States is serious and simply cannot take "no" for an answer. The ball is now in the Common Market's court.

IMPACT AID FUNDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, when I offered an amendment to delete portions of category B impact aid, I was unable to speak to my amendment and to outline my reasons for it due to the point of order which was raised against the amendment, and sustained.

As I intend to introduce legislation in the near future to eliminate the authorization for this kind of aid, I place in the RECORD the statement I would have made yesterday on my amendment which would have accomplished the same purpose:

Mr. Chairman, frankly I had anticipated my first trip to the well of the House would be to speak for more education funds, not less. My feeling that we do need additional appropriations for much of the authorized education legislation does not preclude my opposition to an education appropriation if the basis or the premise for the allocation of these funds is not justifiable.

In regards to impact aid funds, I have no quarrel with Category A children where the parents both live and work on a Federal installation.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are two kinds of Category B impact aid. The first, called "B-in" is for the child whose parent works in a Federal installation located within the school district which the child attends. I do not challenge the justification of impact aid for this group.

However, the second, called "B-out" is for the child whose parents work at a Federal installation which is NOT located within the same school district which the child attends and what my amendment would do is eliminate impact aid funding for the so-called B-out student.

A good example of B-out funding is the student in Montgomery County, Maryland, whose parents work at the Pentagon in Virginia. In this case, Montgomery County would receive impact aid for that child, although the Pentagon in no way diminishes the taxable property of Montgomery County by virtue of the fact that it is not located in the same State, much less the same school district.

Of the total Category B impact aid, approximately 24.5% amounting to over \$79 million would go for the B-out child. This is general aid to education—to a privileged few. If this \$79 million was pro-rated equally throughout the country, my own district would receive a quarter of a million dollars more for education.

While I understand the impact of a Federal installation located within the school district which the child attends, I cannot understand the logic of paying for the impact of Federal property which is not even located in the same school district.

As a former public school teacher, as a six-year member of the board of the 6th largest school district in the nation, and as a businessman for over 30 years, I feel this amendment is reasonable, sensible, justifiable, and fiscally responsible.

I hope my colleagues will feel the same way and support this amendment.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF KOSOVO—JUNE 28

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo, an event of tremendous historical significance to those of Serbian descent in America and indeed all over the world.

While the Battle of Kosovo was fought on June 15, 1389, its anniversary is June 28, under the Gregorian calendar. On this day in 1389, the kingdom of Serbia collapsed as Turkish attacks proved to be too strong for the Serbian empire to handle. The battle, which took the life of the Serbian Tzar Lazar I, forced the Serbs to live under Turkish domination until 1459 when Serbia became part of the Ottoman Empire.

For the next 400 years, the Serbs were harshly treated by the Ottoman rulers who subjected the peasantry to cruel and inhumane treatment. Throughout these years, however, the Serbian people, through the leadership of their church were able to maintain a sense of national pride. The weakening of the Ottoman rulers in the late 18th and early 19th century led to a series of events that enabled Serbia to regain its independence and become a kingdom in 1882.

Since the end of World War I, Serbia became part of what is now known as Yugoslavia. However, it was not until 1929 that the complete unification took place with such diverse ethnic groups as Croats, Slovans, and others joining together to form a single nation. After 1945, the monarchy was abolished and Communist domination of Yugoslavia was established. Unfortunately, the official observance of the anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo has been banned by the Yugoslav Government. Nevertheless, this historic date remains alive in the hearts of Serbs everywhere.

Serbsians now make up the largest single ethnic group living in Yugoslavia. And those who are now living in America, I know, are committed to the preservation of their national heritage. I have been fortunate enough to witness the community spirit of Serbian-Americans in Chicago and I must say that their patriotism and self-determination is heartwarming indeed.

Mr. Speaker it is time that all Americans take note of this historic anniversary commemorated by the Serbian people. Although the quest for freedom has not yet been realized by the Serbian

people, we do have a deep admiration for their pride and dedication, for they are waging a heroic struggle to achieve the full realization of the ideals embodied in the spirit of Kosovo.

I extend my greetings to the Serbian-Americans on this anniversary and my best wishes for the preservation of their culture and their sense of community, and for the achievement of their national aspirations.

ABORTION CONTROVERSY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, with admirable skill, Harriet Van Horne demolishes the arguments of the so-called right-to-life groups, in her column in the New York Post, June 25.

She notes:

Leaders in the movement, while mouthing platitudes about the "killing" of a cluster of blood cells, invariably speak out in favor of capital punishment. One may also note in their ranks the leading hawks of the Vietnam war. Behind their thinking, one gathers, is the feeling that it's wrong to kill the unborn but right to kill the fully formed male once he has reached manhood.

She also lists some benefits of the legalization of abortion: lives saved by sanitary conditions for abortions, fewer unwanted and miserable children.

I insert the entire column in the RECORD at this point:

ABORTION CONTROVERSY (By Harriet Van Horne)

It took the lives of half a million young women—dying in anguish at the rate of 10,000 a year—to make abortion finally legal.

Before American women won the right to end unwanted pregnancies, one million of us crept off to back-street butchers, sidled into sleazy motels under false names, or brought a purse full of begged, borrowed or extortion bills to a "midwife" whose surgical skill put her a bare notch above podiatrists and chicken-pluckers.

Behind the Supreme Court decision legalizing abortion lie the maimed bodies of young girls who "got into trouble," the women rendered sterile by instruments that perforated and ripped the walls of the womb. We have passed into an age of enlightenment now, and the moral fiber of our society is stronger in consequence. Some of the best people in this land—doctors, clergymen, legislators and bitter, damaged women—fought a 20-year battle for abortion reform. Their victory, in the eyes of most women, represents the triumph of decency over cruelty, honesty over hypocrisy.

But now the Pharisees—chanting their hollow pieties about "the right to life"—are massing for a new onslaught on womanhood. Yesterday they staged a protest outside the Americana Hotel, where the American Medical Assn. is holding its annual meeting. They hope to persuade—or frighten—physicians into supporting Sen. James Buckley's proposed amendment to the Constitution outlawing abortion.

The irrationality of these Right to Life zealots is matched only by their hypocrisy. Leaders in the movement, while mouthing their platitudes about the "killing" of a cluster of blood cells, invariably speak out in favor of capital punishment. One may also note in their ranks the leading hawks of the Vietnam war. Behind their thinking, one gathers, is the feeling that it's wrong to kill

the unborn but right to kill the fully formed male once he has reached manhood.

It is extremely doubtful that Sen. Buckley's amendment has a chance in more than two or three state legislatures (Louisiana and Rhode Island come to mind). And if, by some freakish shift in public opinion, a law were to be passed restoring the ban on abortion, it would be no more enforceable than the 18th Amendment banning liquor. Why, one wonders, do these busybodies continue their obscene crusade to send women back to the Dark Ages?

The legalization of abortion has had, if one regards the results objectively, an altogether tonic effect on society. First, welfare cases have decreased. There are fewer unwanted children, born to be public charges most, if not all, of their lives. Second, pregnancies can now be terminated under decent, sanitary conditions. The phrase "criminal abortion" is gone from the language, and with it much of the guilt properly reared young women used to feel.

The Right to Lifers should be relieved to hear that the crime syndicate, which used to take in at least a part of the \$350 million spent each year on illegal abortions, is now taking a loss.

I shall no doubt hear from readers who will state unequivocally that anyone who supports legal abortion is anti-Catholic. Not so. There are non-Catholic physicians in the Right to Life movement. And there are Catholic physicians who dispense birth control advice and perform abortions. That leaves us with the pickets outside the AMA meeting, and Winston Churchill's remark that "a fanatic is one who can't change his mind and won't change the subject."

There are many sound reasons—some of them urgent—for maintaining freedom of abortion for women who do not wish to bear a child. We live in a world moving from abundance to scarcity, a world threatened by famine, plague and the breakdown of cities. Dr. Desmond Morris, who wrote "The Human Zoo," says that overcrowding can easily lead, in the next 20 years, to chaos and the collapse of the social structure.

If our rate of growth is not curbed, we cannot expect both the human race and democracy to survive. Overpopulation must inevitably lead to a harsh, authoritarian government, desperately rationing the food and trying to maintain order. In a crowded lifeboat, do not expect tranquility and honor.

Nowhere is it written that the Lord hath commanded woman to carry each fetus full term. The most offensive aspect of the Right to Life crusade is that it insists all women, of whatever creed or class, bear unwanted children.

European countries—except certain Latin ones—have shown considerably more wisdom than the U.S. in regulating birth as well as abortion.

Year after year, the polls show Catholic couples—as many as two thirds—admitting to the use of birth control devices. Clearly, the Right to Lifers are not acting entirely from religious beliefs. There's a Freudian paradox in their extremism, a rigid authoritarian drive that transcends Catholic dogma. Like the Birchers and other right-wing groups, they alone perceive the "sin" and they alone, they believe, can save us.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES NATHAN ESTES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to recognize James Nathan Estes, of Livermore, Calif., who

will be 100 years old on July 20, 1973. His long life has been an eventful one. Born in Indianapolis, Indiana a century ago, he moved westward, becoming a homesteader in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. He held a variety of jobs, including carrying mail on skis over Teton Pass, being a plasterer, and holding the position of assistant deputy sheriff. Married in 1907, he later moved his family of three children to Montana, and then to California, where he has lived ever since.

I am proud to have this man in my district, and I congratulate him on 100 years of life.

RUNAWAY YOUTH ACT OF 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with a number of my colleagues in introducing an improved version of the Runaway Youth Act of 1973. This bill is similar to other bills I introduced in March of 1972 and January of 1973. It provides for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of temporary housing and counseling services for runaway youth to facilitate their return to their families. It also provides for the strengthening of interstate reporting, for services for parents of runaway children and for the development of research on the size of the runaway youth population.

I am revising my bill in response to improvements made in similar legislation introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH). In this version of the bill, I have deleted the section requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to report annually on "effectiveness in reducing drug abuse and undesirable conditions existing in areas which runaway youth frequent."

I have also omitted the section in the bill which provided that the Secretary would pay 90 percent of the application costs of those whose applications for funds have been accepted.

Another change reflected in my new legislation is designed to protect the confidentiality of the individual records of youth receiving services from the facilities assisted under this act, except where the records are needed for law enforcement purposes. Where records are needed for statistical studies, the identity of individual runaways may not be disclosed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues in the House will give this proposal prompt and favorable consideration, remembering that a similar bill (S. 654) has already passed the Senate. At this point, I insert the text of the Runaway Youth Act into the RECORD:

H.R. 9042

A bill to amend the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 to meet the needs of runaway youths and facilitate their return to their families without resort to the law enforcement structure.

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

Act may be cited as the "Runaway Youth Act".

Sec. 2. The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 is amended by redesignating title IV (and cross references thereto) as title V, by redesignating sections 401 through 411 (and cross references thereto) as sections 501 through 511, respectively, and by inserting after title III the following new title:

"TITLE IV FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"Sec. 401. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the number of juveniles who leave and remain away from home without parental permission has increased to alarming proportions, creating a substantial law enforcement problem for the communities inundated, and significantly endangering the young people who are without resources and live on the street;

(2) the exact nature of the problem is not well defined because national statistics on the size and profile of the runaway youth population are not tabulated;

(3) many of these young people, because of their age and situation, are urgently in need of temporary shelter and counseling services;

(4) the problem of locating, detaining, and returning runaway children should not be the responsibility of already overburdened police departments and juvenile justice authorities; and

(5) in view of the interstate nature of the problem, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to develop accurate reporting of the problem nationally and to develop an effective system of temporary care outside the law enforcement structure.

"Sec. 402. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants and to provide technical assistance to localities and nonprofit private agencies in accordance with the provisions of this title. Grants under this title should be made for the purpose of developing local facilities to deal primarily with the immediate needs of runaways in a manner which is outside the law enforcement structure and juvenile justice system. The size of such grants should be determined by the number of runaway children in the community and the existing availability of services. Among applicants priority should be given to private organizations or institutions who have had past experience in dealing with runaways.

(b) The Secretary may promulgate and enforce any rules, regulations, standards, and procedures which he may deem necessary and appropriate to fulfill the purposes of this Act.

"Sec. 403. (a) To be eligible for assistance under this title, an applicant must propose to establish, strengthen, or fund an existing or proposed runaway house, a locally controlled facility providing temporary shelter, and counseling services to juveniles who have left home without the permission of their parents or guardians.

(b) In order to qualify, an applicant must submit a plan to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare meeting the following requirements and including the following information. Each house—

(1) shall be located in an area which is demonstrably frequented by or easily reachable by runaway children;

(2) shall have a maximum capacity of no more than twenty children, with a ratio of staff to children of sufficient proportion to insure adequate supervision and treatment;

(3) shall develop an adequate plan for contacting the child's parents or relatives in accordance with the law of the State in which the runaway house is established and insuring his safe return according to the best interests of the child;

(4) shall develop an adequate plan for insuring proper relations with law enforce-

ment personnel, and the return of runaways from correctional institutions;

(5) shall develop an adequate plan for aftercare counseling involving runaway children and their parents within the State in which the runaway house is located and assuring, as possible, that aftercare services will be provided to those children who are returned beyond the State in which the runaway house is located;

(6) shall keep adequate statistical records profiling the children and parents which it serves: *Provided, however,* That records maintained on individual runaways shall not be disclosed without parental consent to anyone other than another agency compiling statistical records or a government agency involved in the disposition of criminal charges against an individual runaway: *Provided further,* That reports or other documents based on such statistical records shall not disclose the identity of individual runaways;

(7) shall submit annual reports to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare detailing how the house has been able to meet the goals of its plans and reporting the statistical summaries required in section 102 (b) (6);

(8) shall demonstrate its ability to operate under accounting procedures and fiscal control devices as required by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(9) shall supply such other information as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare reasonably deems necessary.

"Sec. 404. An application by a State, locality, or nonprofit private agency for a grant under this title may be approved by the Secretary only if it is consistent with the applicable provisions of this title and meets the requirements set forth in section 403. Priority shall be given to grants smaller than \$50,000.

"Sec. 405. Nothing in this title shall be construed to deny grants to nonprofit private agencies which are fully controlled by private boards or persons but which in other ways meet the requirements of this title and agree to be legally responsible for the operation of the runaway house. Nothing in this title shall give the Federal Government and its agencies control over the staffing and personnel decisions of facilities receiving Federal funds, except as the staffs of such facilities must meet the standards under this title.

"Sec. 406. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall annually report to Congress on the status and accomplishments of the runaway houses which were funded with particular attention to—

(1) their effectiveness in alleviating the problems of runaway youth;

(2) their ability to reunite children with their families and to encourage the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and other services; and

(3) their effectiveness in strengthening family relationships and encouraging stable living conditions for children.

"Sec. 407. As used in this title, the term 'State' shall include Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

"Sec. 408. (a) The Federal share for the construction of new facilities under this title shall be no more than 50 per centum. The Federal share for the acquisition and renovation of existing structures, the provision of counseling services, staff training, and the general costs of operations of such facility's budget for any fiscal year shall be 90 per centum. The non-Federal share may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

(b) Payments under this section may be made in installments, in advance, or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out this title there is authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1974, 1975, and 1976 the sum of \$10,000,000.

"Sec. 409. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall gather information and carry out a comprehensive statistical survey defining the major characteristics of the runaway youth population and determining the areas of the country most affected. Such survey shall include, but not be limited to, the age, sex, socioeconomic background of runaway children, the places from which and to which children run, and the relationship between running away and other illegal behavior. The Secretary shall report to Congress not later than June 30, 1974.

"Sec. 410. Records containing the identity of individual runaways gathered for statistical purposes pursuant to section 409 may under no circumstances be disclosed or transferred to any individual or other agency, public or private.

"Sec. 411. For the purpose of carrying out this title there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$500,000."

PRAISE TO HON. WILBUR MILLS FOR INVESTIGATING WATERGATE IMPLICATIONS OF IRS

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, I rise today to commend the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) for his initiative in ordering the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to investigate the alleged improprieties in using, or proposing to use, the facilities of the Internal Revenue Service to harass and intimidate citizens who disagreed with the policies of this administration.

Evidence admitted yesterday before the Senate Select Committee investigating the Watergate scandal reveals that it was probably John Caulfield, a former officer of the Department of the Treasury, who recommended that the IRS machinery be used for "discreet political actions" calling for "an IRS audit of a group of specific individuals having the same occupation." (Senate Select Committee record June 1973.)

On several previous occasions I have expressed concern to my colleagues that Executive Order No. 11697, as modified by Executive Order No. 11709 permitting a department of this Government for the first time to make tax returns available for inspection of an entire class of people. I reiterate that this precedent is fraught with danger of abuse and is in my judgment a clear invasion of the right of privacy of every member of that class, the nation's farmers. After reviewing the Watergate testimony, can there be any question that every precaution should be exercised to protect the privacy of American citizens from government abuse?

Frightening is the admission of Assistant Attorney General, Robert J. Dixon, Jr. that the original Executive order was, in his words:

Prepared by the Department of the Treasury in language designed to serve as a prototype for future tax return inspection orders. This Department (of Justice) approved the order as to form and legality. It (the Department of Justice) was not requested to, nor did it, express any policy judgment.

Which group is next? Was this an attempt to reach the businessmen of the Nation through a similar Executive order for the Department of Commerce? Was this procedure designed to authorize the Department of Labor to provide oversight of wage earners? A technique for HEW to look into the private affairs of doctors, or teachers? How about HUD desiring information for "statistical purposes" of our Nation's homeowners having insured loans under FHA?

In spite of these warnings, the Department of Agriculture remains insensitive, both to the potential invasion of privacy of our Nation's farmers and of the implications revealed by the evidence admitted before the Senate Select Committee investigating the Watergate scandal.

Today I received a letter from Secretary Butz denying a request of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information to suspend its authority to examine tax returns of farmers until our committee has completed its investigations. Mr. Butz states in his letter that:

Because of the importance and urgency attached to the arrangements under consideration, as well as the lead time involved in developing a computer program for the work, we feel that we must proceed with the negotiations (with IRS) that have been started in order to meet our obligations in fulfilling projected statistical programs.

The information requested by the Department of Agriculture may be needed. That Department may be innocent of any involvement to willfully invade the right of privacy of our Nation's farmers. But is the USDA a stalking horse for another purpose? Has that Department been used as a "prototype" for other orders of other agencies? I implore the Secretary to open his eyes to reality, read the front page of his favorite newspaper and suspend his authority under the Executive orders until Congress can complete its investigations of this and related matters.

REV. THEODORE M. HESBURGH AND REV. DR. EUGENE CARSON BLAKE ARE INTERVIEWED BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS ON "WASHINGTON INSIGHT"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMÁS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, every month I have the privilege of moderating a television program "Washington Insight," on which outstanding figures in the Nation's life appear. The program is broadcast on station WSJV-TV, the ABC affiliate in South Bend-Elkhart, Ind.

The two distinguished Americans with whom I shall tonight discuss the role of religion in American life on "Washington Insight" are the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame, and the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, the retired general secretary of the World Council of Churches.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the transcript of our discussion at this point in the RECORD:

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Welcome to another edition of "Washington Insight." Tonight I am pleased to have with me as guests two distinguished American leaders recognized throughout the world for their leadership in the field of religion.

Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., has distinguished himself for the last 20 years as President of the University of Notre Dame. He has served on the United States Commission on Civil Rights for 16 years and as Chairman of that Commission for four years. Among the extraordinary variety of other responsibilities Father Hesburgh has undertaken is that he is now the Chairman of the Overseas Development Council, a task about which I shall shortly question him. For his achievements, Father Hesburgh received from President Johnson the Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civilian honor.

The Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake is a graduate of Princeton University, where he played guard on the football team, and Father, if Notre Dame had fostered the ecumenical spirit by recruiting Presbyterians, perhaps Dr. Blake might have played for the Fighting Irish. After receiving a Doctor of Divinity degree from Princeton University, Dr. Blake began a long and distinguished career as teacher, pastor, and theologian, and as chief executive officer of the United Presbyterian Church of the United States for 15 years. He was one of the most outspoken leaders of the civil rights movement in the early 1960's and for the last six years, Dr. Blake has served as the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches.

Gentlemen, welcome to "Washington Insight." Dr. Blake, you made a speech last year in New York which I had the privilege of hearing in which you discussed what you described as the continuing task of the ecumenical movement in the United States. Your speech contained several themes we might use for discussion today, but first of all, what do you mean by the ecumenical movement and what is the role of the World Council of Churches in it?

WORLD COUNCIL LEADS ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

Dr. BLAKE. Well, the ecumenical movement is a movement rather than an organization. It is a movement toward unity and is used to describe Christian reunion. But it has always been broader than the membership of the World Council of Churches. For example, in these last six years nothing than the World Council has done was done without some kind of Roman Catholic participation; sometimes as full members of a commission; sometimes as observers. But this movement is something really new in our time. A great many Americans don't realize the utter change in the relationship of the churches: Protestant, Orthodox, and Roman Catholic, all over the world, since Vatican Council II.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. I want to come back to ask you another question or two about the role of the World Council, Dr. Blake, but first, Father let me ask you as a Roman Catholic, how you perceive the relationships developing between the Roman Catholic Church and the other Christian traditions in the world?

Fr. HESBURGH. Well, I think there's been a great openness and a searching and yearning since Vatican II, as Dr. Blake just said. There's no question in my mind but that we are coming together in a wide variety of ways, through action and through prayer together. All kinds of discussion are taking place on a variety of real problems. I would like to believe that before the turn of the century we may have one great Christian

church. And I think there will be enormous variety in it, an enormous variety of liturgical practices, prayer, but a common belief in the message of Christ our Lord. I think it is moving quicker perhaps than people think; it's moving, I think, by the power of the spirit and perhaps over and above and beyond the efforts of human beings. It is to me one of the most promising motions and movements of our day.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I recall that on the Notre Dame campus some months ago there was a very large meeting of Roman Catholics who are in the pentecostal tradition and then, Dr. Blake, I recall that at the last meeting of the General Assembly of the World Council in Sweden, I believe a Brazilian pentecostal church was admitted to the World Council.

SORTING OUT THE ECCLESIASTICAL BAGGAGE

Dr. BLAKE. That came just afterward, but we have now several pentecostal churches that have become a part. They are very important, especially in Latin America where you have, some people say, more pentecostals in church on a Sunday morning than Roman Catholics. I am delighted that there has been a taking seriously of this kind of movement. But it is basically the fellow who is the head of that second largest pentecostal church in Brazil. He said he didn't have much use for the ecclesiastical baggage that most of us were carrying but that he was interested in the Gospel and the common people, whom he served, and, he said, and he smiled, "After we come in, you'll never be the same again."

And that, of course, is the theory of the World Council, that each of us must bring his own tradition. It isn't a question of turning against your tradition; it is a faith that we really need each other rightly to hear and do the word of God.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Father, I've noticed at Notre Dame that a number of non-Catholic theologians are being studied and, I think, you've had a number of persons visit and teach who are not in the Christian tradition.

Father HESBURGH. That's right. Ecumenism has become a very great reality. We have a number of non-Catholic theologians on our faculty. Somehow in the old days we thought we were practicing virtue by saying that Catholics had to study theology but that people who weren't Catholic didn't. Today we say everyone should take a couple of courses in theology, but you can take whatever theology you like.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Following from that, I recall again, Dr. Blake's address at the Riverside Church in New York last year in which he said that the ecumenical movement was committed to dialogue with persons of other faiths and other ideologies. I wonder if each of you could comment from your own experience on how you see Christians developing in their relationships with non-Christians, especially elsewhere in the world. Dr. Blake?

Dr. BLAKE. Yes, well, it's quite obvious that if you are interested in the service of humanity or the question of overseas development, you have to, if its going to be religiously motivated, you've got to understand the Buddhists or the Muslims, whether in Thailand or Indonesia. It is partly a theological discussion of what it means to believe in God and the whole idea of a transcendent meaning of human life. I was preaching in Jakarta a year ago or so and I was saying a good deal about God in the sermon; some people don't think I talk enough about God. Every time I said, "God," the interpreter in Indonesia said "Allah" and that makes you stop and think. And my own feeling is that you don't have to weaken on your own central Christian conviction but really you ought to be sure you are speaking as if you belong to God rather than God belongs to you. I think that is the heart of the problem.

WHAT OF ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN CHRISTIANS AND MARXISTS?

Mr. BRADEMAs. Father, I know you've traveled in the Soviet Union, for example, and in Eastern Europe. What kinds of comments can you give us on the encounters between Christians and Marxists?

Fr. HESBURGH. There's a good deal of growth there you know, John. Some people in the early days took Marxism as being completely antithetical to anything that was religious or any belief in God. I think the conversations that have been growing and other things that have come up since have opened up that whole area too, but I'm persuaded through moving around the world that if you take the Christians in the world, you're talking about a third of humanity. If you take other religions, it is partly more than a third of the remainder of the other two-thirds of humanity. And when you see their common belief in a Supreme Being or a common belief in immortality, a yearning to not just have life what it seems to be in our temporal days, if you see a sense of some universal moral code that unites all men everywhere and that is perceivable by our minds and by our conscience and ultimately, I think that the meaning of life, the transcendent meaning that Dr. Blake talked about, comes more through spiritual values than material values. In each of these four important concepts, which are fundamentally religious concepts we do have in common with other religions, and it gives you an important base to somehow bring mankind together, which I think is the first step toward world peace.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Dr. Blake, I recall the last meeting of the General Assembly of the World Council of Churches, where, as you know, I was one of the delegates from my own church, The Methodist Church.

Dr. BLAKE. You are one of my bosses, as a matter of fact, because you are a member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. That is, you were my boss until November 1st.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Yes, I should make clear that Dr. Blake has retired and has been replaced as General Secretary of the World Council by Dr. Phillip Potter of Jamaica.

But what struck me very much there at the General Assembly—perhaps because my father is Greek Orthodox, I'm out of the Methodist tradition, my mother is of the Disciples of Christ tradition, and I spent a lot of time at the University of Notre Dame—was the different emphases brought by differing Christian traditions to that meeting. The Orthodox were very heavily concentrated on the spiritual dimension while some of the mainline Protestant churches were heavily committed to social action, for example.

Father HESBURGH. I want to ask you to make a comment deriving from what Dr. Blake said in his talk at the last World Council meeting and also from what he said in New York, namely that the ecumenical movement is committed to the establishment of the world community. You're now Chairman of the Overseas Development Council, and maybe you could tell us what that does and what impact you think the United States ought to be making in terms of the wider world community of which you spoke?

ECUMENICISM COMPATIBLE WITH SPACESHIP EARTH

Fr. HESBURGH. Well, John, the word that comes to mind immediately of course is world justice or social justice. And the concept that comes to mind if you walk in the offices of the Overseas Development Council in Washington, D.C., when you see that picture of the world from outer space, that beautiful globe, small but beautiful, in a void of black—and when you see this, I think you begin to realize, at least I do

for the first time, that it is one world and we have to start to talk about the community of humanity, if you will.

We have to start talking about a little better distribution. It just isn't right that one-fifth of humanity has four-fifths of the resources available to humanity in this world, while the other four-fifths have to make do on 20% of the resources. It just isn't right; it's not just; and I think if religion does anything to mankind in our day or if Christianity does anything, it will make us conscious of that imbalance and make us want to do something to get a much better balance for the rest of the world and to try to move across these things that separate mankind, East and West and North and South, black and white, and Christian and non-Christian. We might begin to build these bridges that bring men together and aid their total development as human beings.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Dr. Blake, what about the role of the World Council of Churches in economic development, especially in the poor countries of the world?

Dr. BLAKE. Well, we have been attempting very clearly to hear the best Christian voices from these churches from Asia, Africa, Latin America, and I think that the main thing that bothers me as I come back is that the American people seem to take for granted this privilege that we have of living better than anybody else. Somewhere I read that we make twice as much garbage per head in New York than they do in London even.

Well, this means that we are that much more wasteful of what we understand now are our limited resources. The World Council has been working to try to see how the churches could serve humanity not merely by charity, though our biggest operation is still a charitable operation. But we hear loud and clear from the best representatives from the Christian churches all over the world, "Look, if you don't worry about the structures that make us poor, we're not particularly impressed with your generosity and charity."

And today, I think, we are making progress, but it's slow and hard and the United Nations in many ways has got material that we ought to be listening to, but it becomes really a political thing in all the countries. There is a tendency now, as I come back, for people to say that any criticism of the United States is unpatriotic. I am at the point now where I am ready to criticize all the countries of the world and say, "Look, boys, you are on this spaceship earth that Barbara Ward has popularized so much, and we are going to survive together or not survive, and we had better begin."

Here again is an anti-secular kind of—you've got to have moral values in your world view—and I think we sort of gave up on that and we said that really morality is not a part of government; government is supposed to protect the people.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Some people say, Dr. Blake and Father HESBURGH, that there is, as a result of the impact of the Vietnam war, a declining capacity for moral outrage on the part of the people of the United States and some observers say that we don't seem as outraged by corruption in high places, even in government in the United States, as a result of the War. Father HESBURGH, I wonder if you would address yourself to that question? What do you think about that?

VIETNAM LED TO DECLINE IN MORAL OUTRAGE

Fr. HESBURGH. I think that it's absolutely true, John. We seem to be beyond being shocked by things that would really have turned everybody off 20 years ago. Today, much larger irregularities happen, and people just pooh-pooh it. I think we've lost our sense of the dignity of life. For example, we saw so much violence—they talk about body counts—and I think that whole thing eroded

the sense of dignity of life and the horror of violence and killing. There's been so much violence in all of the media that again, people have gotten used to it and don't see anything wrong in shooting people or beating up people. There is a kind of total disrespect, to sum up, for the dignity of the human person whatever their race or personality.

I do believe that in getting ourselves through Vietnam and other realities that were unhappy in the past decades, we're really in a kind of unshockable position. I think that's true of sex today. I think it's true of human violence, I think it's true of disrespect for human life, and I think it's true of the many terrible aberrations that are visited upon children today.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Dr. Blake, you've been gone from the country on a permanent basis for the last six years, and just following what Father Hesburgh has said, what are the major changes in the United States that you sense? Are we more materialistic as a people? Do we have less regard for the role of religion in our lives than once we did?

Dr. BLAKE. I think the opposite side of the vision of the Kingdom of God, if you want to put it, on earth, which all of us pray for everytime we go to a service. This seems to have been lost somewhere as a really Christian commitment. We want God's will done on earth as it is in heaven. This is so central to anything in any of our traditions and it is not anti-Jewish or anti-Muslim or anti-Buddhist either.

But I find materialism is accepted. You fellows in Congress, nobody wants to vote for higher taxes. That's part of your problem right now. We don't have enough money to go around. Now sure, you can say priorities come in. I find really a danger in terms of taking it for granted that somehow God has favored us either by our virtue or by our good fortune to live better than everybody else, and that's not going to last forever. That's the reason so many of our people are uptight with fear of any change.

Now, on the other hand, I haven't been preaching a discouraging sermon for sometime because I think that the major thing that Americans need is some hope. I mean real hope, the kind of thing that people are willing to live for and die for, and that is the thing that I think we must find somewhere in our churches and synagogues.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I recall, Father Hesburgh, reading a very powerful article of yours in the *New York Times* a while ago entitled, "Even Good People Are Losing Heart," and I thought, in view of what Dr. Blake has just said, about the passage—I think it's in Chapter I of Isaiah—where the prophet said, "Away with your new moons and your appointed feasts; what I want to know, is are you bringing justice to the people? I'm not so much interested in ceremonies as in justice."

And I wonder if, against the background of your extraordinary experience with the United States Civil Rights Commission, you could comment on whether we have a prospect of gaining heart in the search for justice for the minorities and the oppressed in our society?

QUEST FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE WEAKENED

Fr. HESBURGH. John, what bothers me most at this moment is that we made enormous progress during the '60's because people really decided it was high time we practiced justice as regards our minorities, mainly blacks, and we got the vote assured after a century passed. We opened up a chance for running for political office. More than a thousand blacks were elected in the last general election. We broke up a dual school system so that we would have common school systems throughout the country for blacks and whites. We opened up many areas of employment; we opened up many of our state universities, and private universities to blacks. We opened up all our public ac-

commodations that were just an open affront to black people every day of their lives. I mean they couldn't drink here, they couldn't eat here, they couldn't sleep there, they couldn't swim here, they couldn't even be buried here.

So we made that progress, but then you get to a point in progress, and I think Americans like a quick payoff, where you've really got to practice and not just talk about it. Everybody is in favor of open housing until it affects the people next door and then they get a little less favorable. Everybody gets interested in practicing virtue as long as it's done in the South, but up North it's a little more difficult. Everybody's in favor of open employment unless it threatens your job and then all of a sudden everybody turns a little less favorable and justice becomes not quite that reality.

And what I'm concerned about is that we made that upward progress helped by a lot of national disgraces, assassinations and all the rest. Then, suddenly, it begins to level off and I fear at times start down hill a little bit because people just don't have the solid commitment to justice in our times. And without this there is no hope for us as a people.

I can't imagine peace without justice. When I look at the Christian world, even in America that makes up 6% of the world's population, using 40% of the world's resources, that just isn't justice and there aren't limitless resources. We're going to have to do a little more sharing. People will talk about justice, but I'm not sure they want to share what is theirs in order to achieve justice.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Dr. Blake, I know that you were present just 10 years ago in August at the great Civil Rights March on Washington led by Martin Luther King. I know because I was there and I think, Father, you were there and I think that was an extraordinary day. And the churches were strongly represented in that march. But I sense that the churches have to some extent retreated from the search for justice in the field of civil rights. I don't know if that's an unfair charge and would you comment on it?

CHURCHES SHOULD STAY INVOLVED

Dr. BLAKE. Well, I think the churches are still involved and I think that's part of our problem still because some of our constituency isn't sure, because they think we get too much involved, and that is the difficulty. Basically I think the thing has gotten more complicated. In the early '60's we were able easily to use the word integration. And the greatest thing this country has done is to educate some of the greatest black leadership that there is in the world. And I have great confidence, through contacts with American blacks and other people of other colors all over the world, in such leadership. On the Central Committee, of which you are a member, of the World Council, all the smart people aren't white by any manner of means. The Chairman is an Indian as dark as an American black.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Your successor's black.

Dr. BLAKE. My successor, Dr. Phillip A. Potter, is black. I think Jean Bokeleale is one of the most eloquent Christians I've ever heard. He is from the African Republic of Zaire. These people are looking at things from a very different point of view than you did and in one sense than I did. We have different backgrounds; I'm a WASP basically. All of these things have changed now and people are trying to fight it, but it is perfectly clear that the American dream earlier did leave out the blacks. But we wanted them, even as we were opening up the doors, to behave the way we set the standard.

Black men are now saying, "no," and what's more, they are saying, "You white people are a minority in the world and you are going to have to adjust to our standards

whether it be music, aesthetic, or anything else."

Now, I think that this shows advancement, but it doesn't make it as easy as we thought it was going to be. But I moved rather early in '64 from civil rights, when we won the battle, I thought, on the law, at least, to the poverty program, the Office of Economic Opportunity, which now seems to be being wiped out and basically this is because we weren't going to get any progress in our cities unless we have sufficient jobs and other necessities. That still is the number one thing as far as I'm concerned, the cities, and the minorities in the big cities, but this is also a world problem. We find that a lot of people who didn't think they had a race problem, do have it, all over the world.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I wonder if you could say just a quick word on what Dr. Blake alluded to, namely, the role of the churches in meeting social and political issues.

Fr. HESBURGH. John, I think the churches today are the great fire. I read an article by an Englishman recently who said the churches are so involved in social justice, human rights and human development around the world, they forgot to preach the message of Christ. Or they've forgotten to perform that great mediating service between God and men and to bring God to men and men to God.

Yet I've always thought, John, and maybe it's my own simple construction, that the reason that the cross is a great symbol in Christianity, apart from the meaning of Calvary, is that Christianity has to be a message of love fundamentally, and the love has to be vertical towards God and it's got to be horizontal towards your fellow man. So you have the vertical and horizontal nature of Christianity. And to the extent that we just try to love our fellow man and forget about God, it's wrong. We have to serve God and our fellow men. Insofar as we try to love God and forget the poverty and the misery and the injustice around us, we're not really loving God because He says, you know, "You're my followers, you should love one another."

And so I think the church is always going to have that kind of tension within it between those who would like it to stay in the sacristy and those who would like to see it fighting all the battles in the slums and in the difficult areas of human endeavor. But I think it's got to be in both places. It's the old prayer and work and work and prayer and faith and action and action and faith. We've got to somehow make it real by the total lives we live. I like what you said, Dr. Blake, about God not belonging to us.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Dr. Blake, I wonder if you would like to make a concluding comment on this point?

Dr. BLAKE. Father Hesburgh and I, I think, represent within the varying Christian traditions, the things we cannot separate. Both of them are ultimately important.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Well, gentlemen, you have spoken, I think, with great impact and power to the subjects of the development of the ecumenical movement in the United States and the search for justice on the part of Christians.

We've been joined for this edition of "Washington Insight" by the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, who has just retired as General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, and by the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of the University of Notre Dame. Thank you for being with us on this edition of "Washington Insight."

PRESIDENT COMPOUNDS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS WITH APPROPRIATION VETO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly troubled by the President's action yesterday in vetoing H.R. 7447, the second supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1973. He has told us that he vetoed this bill not because he disagreed with the substance of our appropriations, but because he disagreed with this body's attempt to bring a war, which we never authorized and which is therefore in violation of the Constitution, to an end.

I seriously question the validity of such an action by the President. The Constitution in article I, section 8, squarely places the power to declare war, and conversely the power to stop a war, in the hands of Congress. The President never asked us to approve his Cambodia adventure. Is he now telling us that not only do we not have the power to declare war, but that when this esteemed body wishes to stop unilateral military actions on his part, we can only do so by a two-thirds vote? I do not think this is a valid interpretation of the Constitution and I think the President has compounded his unconstitutional action by vetoing this bill.

I would like to introduce into the Record for the benefit of my colleagues an article by the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, Anthony Lewis, who expands upon this argument and offers several suggestions to the Congress for alleviating this deadlock with the President:

MOMENT OF TRUTH
(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, June 27.—The United States has had many Presidents who took a broad view of their power under the Constitution but never before has any President sought to amend the Constitution by himself—brazenly, defiantly, by fiat.

That is what President Nixon has just done in vetoing the appropriations bill that banned any further money for the bombing of Cambodia. Even after all that we have learned in these last months, after the Watergate and its associated crimes, the import of that veto is breathtaking.

What it amounts to is this. If Mr. Nixon has his way, the Constitution will effectively contain a new clause that says:

"The President shall have power to wage war unless the Congress, by a two-thirds vote of both houses, shall order him to desist."

It is crucial that as many Americans as possible understand what is involved. Our country has had so many crises of conscience and law in recent years that a certain weariness is understandable. But this one is of a different character—a genuine constitutional crisis, in the words of that moderate and gentle man, Senator Mike Mansfield.

An explanation in ABC terms is therefore required. It must begin with the original language of the Constitution, which vested in Congress alone the power "to declare war."

Over the years, Presidents have taken military action of various kinds without a previous formal declaration of war. That is part of modern history, a gloss on the Constitution.

But until now these Presidential military adventures have been of limited character or duration, or else have depended for their legal support on the effective consent of Congress. The recent example was the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, which the Johnson Administration used as the legal equivalent of a Congressional declaration in the Vietnam war.

The bombing of Cambodia since the Paris agreements on Vietnam has been something quite different. For here Congress had not implied its consent in any way, not by resolution and not by ratifying any treaty that covered Cambodia. Nor could the President cite his responsibility for the safety of any American troops.

Now President Nixon has gone one long step further. He claims independent authority to wage war, in the name of the United States, not only in the absence of Congressional approval but in the face of clear disapproval.

In short, he is attempting to reverse the constitutional assumption. Instead of the old idea that the United States should be at peace unless Congress declared otherwise, the new rule would be that a President may take his country into war—and keep it there indefinitely—unless Congress stops him.

And more than that, much more. For of course the veto provision of the Constitution requires two-third majorities to override. And by this veto Mr. Nixon would impose that same requirement on Congress—and on the American people who it represents—to stop a war.

The consequences of this veto, and of the House sustaining it, are therefore grave. The first is political, the crisis to which Senator Mansfield referred.

Unless events somehow dissipate the clash between the President and the Congressional majority, the talk of impeachment must now take a new and more immediate ground. For in the ultimate, if there is no other resolution, Congress is faced with an attempt at a Presidential coup d'etat. It must consider its own ultimate weapon.

A second consequence is legal. The courts of the United States have been understandably wary of entertaining lawsuits that challenge the lawfulness of war-making. But that reluctance is likely to diminish when a President wages war in flagrant violation of law and the Constitution. On the legal merits, his attempt to impose a two-thirds rule on Congress' war power would certainly not protect any official sued by citizens seeking to enjoin unlawful military spending.

Finally, there is the consequence of conscience. Those of us who have opposed the war cannot be regarded as detached on this new question. And so it is fundamentally a problem for conservatives.

Will Barry Goldwater sit still for a unilateral Presidential amendment of the Constitution? Will Melvin Laird, who joined the White House staff as an avowed Congressional man? Will Elliot Richardson, who has begun to stake out his claim of independence as Attorney General? I hope and believe that the answer will be no.

PRESERVING THE COUNTRY'S HERITAGE

(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 am introducing today a bill the Commission would be charged with developing a program for preserving and making accessible documentary resources throughout the Nation. This bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator Brooke of Massachusetts and I feel it deserves serious consideration by the House.

A proper appreciation and understanding of our Nation's history is founded on the primary documents which are available. Each generation of scholars must have the opportunity to examine historical documents with the methods and in-

sights of their own time. If we are concerned with maintaining a strong sense of continuity with our heritage we must assure that accurate information of the country's past is not lost.

Modern technology provides us with the means for preservation and dissemination of the country's great fund of source material, but effort and organization are needed as well. While the major burdens have been borne by private agencies and institutions the Federal Government must now accept a larger share in documentary preservation programs and activities.

The National Commission envisioned would aid and encourage agencies undertaking preservation by private means, would encourage training and instruction in the documentary preservation field, and would assist State and local governments in the expansion of their own programs.

Passage of the National Historic Records Act at this time, as we approach the bicentennial anniversary of the American Revolution, would signal our deep commitment to the traditions of this Nation's past.

WASHINGTON POST QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a form letter which I assumed was sent to all of our colleagues from the distinguished assistant managing editor of the Washington Post, Haynes Johnson. His letter attaches a questionnaire seeking to learn, anonymously, our conclusions on many of the key unanswered, unresolved questions surrounding the current Watergate prosecution and Senate investigation which concern alleged Presidential involvement. The text of the questionnaire follows:

WASHINGTON POST QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you believe that President Nixon knew in advance of plans for the Watergate break-in? Yes. No.
 2. Do you believe President Nixon knew of espionage-sabotage plans to be used on his behalf during the 1972 campaign? Yes. No.
 3. Do you believe that President Nixon was personally involved in the Watergate cover-up? Yes. No.
 4. If you have answered yes to any of the foregoing questions, do you believe that President Nixon should remain in office? Yes. No.
 5. If you believe he should remain in office, do you believe he should be censured by the Congress? Yes. No.
 6. If you believe the President should no longer remain in office, do you feel that he should resign? Yes. No.
 7. Do you feel that impeachment proceedings should be brought against him? Yes. No.
 8. Are you a member of the: Senate. House.
 9. Are you a: Democrat. Republican.
- Please put any additional comments you wish to in this space or on separate paper. (But do not sign your name anywhere on this questionnaire.)

I recognize the strong interest of the public and the media and particularly that of the Washington Post, which has contributed so much to uncovering of

this sordid affair, in resolving unanswered questions, the answers to which could have a broad impact on our Government and society. I also recognize that it would be proper and legitimate for Members of Congress and Senators who have reached firm conclusions on questions of Presidential involvement to state their conclusions publicly. However, I think it is highly irresponsible for the Washington Post newspaper to invite anonymous comments and conclusions on these very critical questions from the very Members of Congress and Senators who may, depending upon the ultimate answers to these questions, be called upon to act as grand jury and trial jury in the ultimate disposition of these matters.

I am among those who has been deeply shocked by the extent and impact of the allegations made thus far—not only those seeking to implicate the President personally in the Watergate cover up, but also those which paint a picture of the workings of an arrogant White House staff, which in many matters is said to have considered itself to be above the laws of this land which we in Congress have enacted. Not despite but because of the severity of these charges and because of their importance for our political and governmental system, I hardly think that firm conclusions should be drawn prior to hearing from those who have been accused of serious wrongdoing, but who have had neither the opportunity to respond in open testimony nor the opportunity to have these charges weighed in judicial proceedings where the rules of evidence apply.

It is apparent that what the Washington Post seeks to do in distributing this questionnaire is to enable itself to publish an article containing a numerical survey of anonymous opinions gathered by this vehicle. Any headlines or news articles published in the current atmosphere which would read something like—"No Congressmen or Senators Feel Impeachment Is Justified," or "Half of Congress Feels the President Should Resign," would serve no useful purpose whatsoever and in fact would severely damage and distort the difficult and painstaking process of sorting fact from opinion in this entire sordid chapter of American history.

Worse yet, these anonymous opinions are sought from the very same men and women who could conceivably be called upon to act as grand jury and jury if certain of the allegations that have been made are found to be true. I for one am very deeply concerned about statements that have been made thus far but I am nowhere near drawing conclusions about the guilt or innocence of the parties said to be involved. I am not one who will draw public conclusions until more facts are in.

Mr. Johnson in his letter seeks to relieve Members of Congress and Senators of taking any responsibility for their current notions on Presidential involvement in Watergate by saying in his letter:

We realize that some members may be reluctant to state their views publicly. For that reason, we are keeping the survey strictly anonymous. In that way, we hope

you will be able to state your own private, personal views without regard to constituent wishes or party positions. . . . Please do not sign your name, or in any other way identify yourself, on the attached questionnaire.

At this relatively early stage of the development of these investigations, I see this questionnaire and the potential uses to which the results could be put as a heinous overstepping of the bounds of responsible journalism. Because of the seriousness of Watergate and the cover up for the Nation, and because of the high-level involvement which is being charged, it is probably proper for the raw testimony, unrestricted by rules of evidence to appear and be discussed in the public media, despite the potential impact of this publicity on securing fair trials for the accused later on. But there is clearly no justification for any attempt to conduct an anonymous, dry run, impeachment in the press. The serious question surrounding impeachment matters are questions for Congress and for Congress alone to decide. I feel that our responses to such an anonymous questionnaire could seriously impair our objectivity, should the occasion arise for us to decide these questions in the House and Senate.

I am not seeking to instruct or urge my colleagues to ignore this questionnaire. I do, however, Mr. Speaker, want to call to their attention the very serious implications which I feel this questionnaire and its effects may hold for our country. Every person, under our system of laws has a right to face and answer his accusers. The Washington Post has tried to provide us with an easy way to veil the identity of congressional accusers without relinquishing the public impact, and the impact on the Presidency, of the accusations they seek to survey. I for one cannot and will not participate in this process.

SMALL BUSINESS TAX REFORM BILL

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce H.R. 9036, the Small Business Tax Reform Act of 1973. This bill has been introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, Mr. ALAN BIBLE, the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, and I wish to commend my distinguished friend and colleague from Tennessee, Mr. JOE EVINS, the chairman of the House Small Business Committee, for his hard work in developing this legislation.

Nationwide, there are more than 8 million small businesses which provide about 35 million jobs and which play a vital role in providing the American consumer with an enormous variety of goods and services. Last year, these small businesses contributed over \$420 billion to the gross national product—GNP. The continued health and existence of American small business is a solid guarantee that the consumer will benefit from competition, from entre-

preneurial initiative which provides new products and services and from managerial flexibility.

New York City has a long tradition as a commercial hub for productive, hard-working small businesses, and those enterprises are of vital importance to the continued economic viability of the city. While there are few industrial manufacturing enterprises in my congressional district, there are many small- and medium-sized retail establishments, and these have a considerable impact on the daily lives of my district's residents.

Unfortunately, as is all too frequently the case with our inequitable tax laws which benefit the powerful at the expense of the working person, small businesses find themselves unfairly burdened with a business tax structure which taxes them at an effective rate of about 50 percent, while big businesses only pay about 35 percent.

One study presented to the House Ways and Means Committee revealed that the largest 4,348 U.S. corporations pay tax at an effective rate of merely 26.9 percent. As a result, big business gets richer all the time, while small and medium-sized businesses struggle to maintain their payrolls, provide quality goods and services to the consumer, and cope with ever-increasing business costs.

The last time when Congress enacted major special tax relief and reform legislation to meet the problems and needs of small business was back in 1958, and I feel that the time has come for all Members of Congress to join this growing present legislative effort to help small businesses retain a competitive posture.

Among the key objectives of this legislation are the following:

First, tax rates for small businesses—those earning less than \$300,000 in net pre-tax profits annually—would be decreased. In addition, tax deferrals would be granted to small business enterprises in their formative years. No tax would be assessed to a small business during the first 3 years of its existence on the initial \$25,000 profit annually providing that those profits were reinvested in the business.

Second, a permanent Intragovernmental Committee on Tax Simplification for Small Business would be created. This body would have the responsibility of simplifying the regulations, the laws, and the instructions relating to business taxation.

Third, an Office of Small Business Tax Analysis would be created in the Department of the Treasury, and it would have the obligation to examine tax problems and questions from the viewpoint of small business rather than from the position of the Government's interest in raising revenue.

Fourth, the continued independence of family firms would be encouraged by making it easier for heirs to pay estate taxes on inherited small business interests over a 10-year period.

This tax reform proposal would not result in a net loss of tax revenue to the Federal Government, for it would slightly increase the rate of taxation on corporate profits which exceed \$300,000 an-

nually while decreasing the tax burden of enterprises earning less than that yearly figure.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this legislation would be a positive step forward in guarding against the total domination of our economy by monolithic corporations which often ignore the needs of the individual consumer. It would help preserve the spirit of entrepreneurial independence which has characterized our Nation since colonial times, and I urge my congressional colleagues to take positive action on this bill at the earliest possible opportunity.

RETIREMENT OF COL. GEORGE L. J. DALFERES

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, Col. George L. J. Dalferes—U.S. Air Force, distinguished military officer, fellow Louisianian, and for many years a close personal friend of mine—has retired after 25 years of service to his country. George is from Shreveport, La., in my congressional district.

Colonel Dalferes rose to the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs in April of this year after an outstanding career in the Army and the Air Force. In this capacity, it was essential for him to understand the workings and decision processes of both Defense and the Congress. Understand them he did, and well.

Success in a job such as this demands an extraordinary personal touch, and George supplied it admirably. Many others have written or spoken of his abilities. I need only add that I do not envy his successor, as he certainly has a hard act to follow.

George has been a tremendous influence for good Defense-Hill relations. His departure causes me mixed feelings, as such outstanding men as Colonel Dalferes are in need today. He will be sorely missed not only by me personally, but by many others who have counted on his advice and counsel.

I congratulate George on a fine career, thank him for the limitless assistance he has given to my colleagues and me, and wish a great friend nothing but the very best in his future endeavors. I know that he will be successful.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF VENICE, ILL.

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was 100 years ago today that the village of Venice, Ill., was established along the eastern bank of the Mississippi River near St. Louis. Venice, which has since been incorporated as a city, has played an important role in the history and development of the Metro-East area.

The site which eventually became Venice was first settled by one John Atkins, who arrived from Kentucky in 1812. During the 19th century Venice

became a terminus of the old wagon route, "The National Way," or "The Old Rock Road." In 1815 John Anthony began renting flat-bottomed skiffs to persons wishing to cross the Mississippi. Later, the ferry boat *Brooklyn* operated on the river from the Venice site. Today Venice, which owns the William McKinley Bridge, is still involved in getting people and products across the river.

In 1842 a young Army engineer, Lt. Robert E. Lee, directed the building of a dike extending from Venice to Kerr Island in the Mississippi. However, an 1844 flood destroyed it, and a rebuilt dike was similarly carried away in 1851. These early floods caused Dr. Cornelius Campbell to suggest the name "Venice" when the village was organized in 1873. Fortunately, the floods were ended in the early 1900's and this American Venice no longer shares with its Italian namesake the characteristics of watery roadways.

Almost immediately after it began operating officially, Venice experienced a period of prosperity, with commerce in grain predominating. Railroad lines converged in the city, giving rise to rail yards and railroad rights-of-way. Today railroading remains a significant factor in the economic life of Venice and together with powerplants and retail business makes Venice an important community in the area.

There have been 10 mayors of the city of Venice, including Dr. John E. Lee, who has served as mayor since 1957. Dr. Lee's father, Dr. John E. Lee, Sr., saw long service at city hall as mayor from 1911 to 1915 and again from 1917 to 1944. Citizens of Venice can be proud of and grateful for this fine tradition of municipal leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as Venice celebrates her centennial, let us congratulate its citizens, saluting not only the city's past role in the development of early river commerce, but also its present participation in the great industrial and commercial activity of the metropolitan area.

NO AID FOR IDLED WORKERS IN PRESIDENT'S TRADE BILL

(Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the late Tallulah Bankhead, daughter of a former Speaker of this body, is credited with coining the comment, in judgment of a new Broadway play, that "there is less here than meets the eye."

This phrase accurately describes the so-called reform of the adjustment assistance program for workers displaced by imports proposed in the administration's trade bill now before the House Ways and Means Committee.

The present adjustment assistance program has been small comfort and little help to those workers thrown out of jobs by foreign imports. In its 10 years of existence since 1962, the program was all but inoperative up to 1969. Of all the petitions for adjustment assistance by workers, companies, and industries presented to the Tariff Commission, every one was denied—because, it was said, the

language of the law was considered an "insurmountable barrier."

Since 1969, the barrier seems to have been overcome. But of the 189 worker adjustment assistance cases processed since then, only 44—as of May—received a positive finding by the Tariff Commission; 33 more were determined by the President. Of the 77 groups approved for assistance, about 34,000 persons should have received help; about 22,000 of these were estimated by the Secretary to have received it.

That is not much of a record.

The benefits of this program are not great; the cash readjustment allowance for certified workers is equal to 65 percent of the worker's former weekly average weekly wage, not to exceed 65 percent of the national average weekly wage in manufacturing. The maximum weekly benefit for this year is \$101. Duration of payments usually is limited to 52 weeks.

When the President sent his proposed trade legislation to Congress in April, there were high-sounding words in his message about the need to meet the needs of the worker thrown out of jobs by imports.

He proposed that the old adjustment assistance be thrown out because it was "ineffective," and that a new one be put in its place.

And some new program it is. What it amounts to, in effect, is that those workers which are determined to have been displaced by imports would be drawing less in benefits than they are now. Instead of drawing 65 percent of their former earnings, these workers would now get only 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of program is a cruel hoax on the American worker which is not worthy of the Congress' serious consideration. This is not any answer to the plight of those hundreds of thousands of workers who continue to be thrown out of jobs by the deluge of imports coming into this country; it is an insult.

OPPOSITION TO AUTHORITY FOR THE PRESIDENT TO IMPOSE EXPORT CONTROLS ON AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

(Mr. SMITH of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Rules Committee held hearings on a bill to enlarge upon the existing authority to impose export controls. The Rules Committee heard the proponents and me and then decided to delay the hearing until a later date. I think this is a very important matter upon which the Members should become fully informed. My remarks before the Rules Committee explain the reasons for this opinion. It is as follows:

STATEMENT BY NEAL SMITH, DEMOCRAT OF IOWA, BEFORE THE RULES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN OPPOSITION TO AUTHORITY FOR THE PRESIDENT TO IMPOSE EXPORT CONTROLS ON AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, JUNE 28, 1973.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appeal to you to prevent the Banking and Currency Committee from taking

another bill to the House floor which would result in further shortages of food in the grocery stores. By bringing a bill before you to authorize the imposition of export controls, the Committee is living up to its perfect record of the past several months of proposing exactly the wrong medicine for the problems which exist. Shortages of some kinds of food are almost certain to occur in the next several weeks. The meat boycott in April, the attempt by the Banking and Currency Committee to pass a bill to roll back prices of food products and the ceiling which has been imposed at the retail level, have all contributed heavily toward these shortages. Obviously, the need was for a greater supply but all of these actions had the opposite effect. Many producers were so puzzled by the combination of events that they decided it was not worth the risk to increase production and many of them have taken steps to reduce their risk and also the production involved. Now instead of learning a lesson from those activities and taking steps to encourage more production, some people are proposing to impose export controls and thereby further discourage production.

Seventeen percent less beef was marketed in April than in the same month a year ago. Twelve percent less was marketed in May than a year ago. Beef marketed in April was at lighter weights than a year ago. Many producers puzzled by this whole thing decided to feed their animals a lower nutrient ration and stretch out the period of time required to finish the product hoping that after a few months the situation would be more stable and they could better predict what to do. Less pigs are being produced and this will have an effect next winter. The effect of price ceilings on beef not only reduces total supply but it also prohibits seasonal adjustments from one kind of meat to another.

The whole broiler chicken industry has been thrown into a situation where they cannot recover costs on normal production, let alone having any incentive to produce more. The cost of transportation, gas, labor and almost everything that goes into poultry production has increased but the price freeze prohibits normal adjustments. In addition to destroying eggs that were in incubators and not setting as many eggs, producers have been selling broilers at lighter weights. One producer I know of found that by selling his broilers which he had in the pens at the time at 2½ pounds instead of the normal 3½ pounds, he would reduce his losses to \$30,000 instead of \$50,000 so naturally he sold them at a lighter weight. This means that not only a lesser number of broilers will be available but also a far lesser tonnage of poultry meat will be available.

In the case of vegetables, the cost of harvesting and transporting has increased so much that under price freezes, some of them have simply chosen to leave them in the field or fail to plant any more. In some cases, using one week the first of June as the period for determining prices ignores the importance of normal adjustments in price from week to week and month to month and also ignores the fact that sometimes vegetables of a different quality come to market during one week compared to another. Those who were selling lower quality vegetables the first week of June at a lower price have now been eliminated from the market.

When there are less vegetables, retailers who can pay the most will get them and the retailers who can pay the most will be the ones who raised prices the most. Thus, the penalty is upon the wrong merchants. It is the kind of government action that convinces more merchants that they should raise prices as soon as it is legally possible so as to be ready if there is another freeze. Talk of boycotts, roll backs and ceiling prices has already resulted in substantial price increases and the new ceiling based on one week in June rewards those who raised their prices.

As if they had not already made enough mistakes, the same people who promoted the price ceilings and causes of the food shortage are now promoting this bill for export controls on food products. They may say it will be on a selective basis but the provisions of the bill are somewhat unimportant because the psychological damage will be tremendous regardless of how the bill is written. It convinces producers that if they do increase supplies, the government may prevent recovering increased costs for chemicals, fuel, taxes and other inputs. This is just another wrong move and the sooner it is abandoned, the better for those who want to see the food supply situation improved.

As far as beef is concerned, export controls would be of no benefit to consumers in the United States even on a short-term basis. We import 30 times as much beef as we export and any reduction in exports would obviously mean that those countries receiving those exports from the United States would simply buy some of the supply which we would normally be importing. So as far as beef is concerned, it not only has an adverse psychological impact which results in less increase in production in the United States on a long-term basis, but it also provides no supply advantage on a short-term basis.

Export controls are not only stupid economically but they are also downright un-American. It seems strange that as we are preparing for the Bicentennial of the American Revolution, people in high places in this country would actually be advocating the same kind of action which the mother country took against the colonies in order to force them to sell their products at less than their world market value. To force some Americans who produce food to sell their product at less than it is worth in other countries would be a form of economic slavery. American processors already have a tremendous advantage because the product is here and they do not have to pay transportation costs for overseas shipments. If a product is selling so cheaply that foreign purchasers can buy it in the United States and also pay the extra transportation costs cheaper than they can produce it, then that is the very product which we should be selling and the producers of that product are the very ones who must be the least responsible for inflation. To try to hold producers of these kinds of products to prices lower than their world market value, while most other things in the United States are protected by tariffs and selling at more than world market value, is bound to create the same feeling of desperation in the American farmers of the 1970's that it created in the colonial farmers in the 1770's. It is exactly the wrong thing to do and not only penalizes the wrong people but also will not obtain the results which its proponents desire.

It is time to realize that price ceilings, talk of price rollbacks, export control proposals and boycotts and other activities which discourage greater production are exactly the opposite to what is needed and those who promote these very things are the ones who must take most of the blame for the shortages which will occur in the near future. Although the situation is already so far out of kilter, it will be difficult to get it back to where some food supplies are available in sufficient quantities, any further delay will make it worse. It is time to start thinking of terms of encouraging adequate supplies instead of paying so much attention to those who propose easy solutions such as price freezes and threats of export controls which have the opposite effect on production and distribution of food products.

In the name of common sense, I ask Members of this Committee to put the brakes on the Export Control bill.

TRIBUTE TO HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago I spoke on this floor of my high regard for the fine work done by Chairman DANIEL J. FLOOD and his Appropriations Subcommittee on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

That brief mention scarcely did justice to the enormous dedication and the legislative skill of DAN FLOOD.

When I speak of education in this country, I am talking about more than institutions and establishments. I am talking about people—specifically youngsters. And it is youngsters I mean when I say that education in the United States owes an enormous debt to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

DAN FLOOD asks the hard questions about educational finance, and he demands hard answers. This House knows that, and that is why it relies so much on his judgment and on the legislation he brings to this floor.

The appropriation for education contained in the Labor-HEW bill is a very complicated thing. Few Members of this House have time to familiarize themselves with it in its entirety. DAN FLOOD is not satisfied with superficial knowledge, and has made himself the master of this complicated subject.

I take to the floor today merely to expand the compliment I tried to pay to Chairman FLOOD and his subcommittee at the time the Labor-HEW bill was before the House a few days ago.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, for part of June 28, June 29, 30, 1973, on account of official business.

Mr. WYATT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the remainder of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. DANIELSON (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness in family.

Mr. REID, for Thursday afternoon and evening, June 28, 1973, in order to attend the funeral of Mrs. Carol Bishop, the wife of the Reverend Joseph Bishop, the minister of the Rye Presbyterian Church, of which I am an elder.

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 include extraneous material:)

Mr. VEYSEY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEELMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SHRIVER, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. MICHEL, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. HOGAN, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. WILLIAMS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CAMP, for 1 hour, Wednesday, July 11, 1973.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LEHMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ALEXANDER, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. BRADEMAs, for 5 minutes, today.
Miss HOLTZMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, to include tables and other extraneous material with his remarks in the debate on the Public Works Appropriation Bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, to revise and extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of Mr. PIKE before the vote on the Dependents Assistance Act.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas to revise and extend remarks in connection with statement made today by Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. DELLUMS following debate on the amendment offered by Mr. McCLOSKEY on H.R. 8947.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LOTT) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio.
Mr. STEELMAN.
Mr. PRITCHARD in 10 instances.
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. HUBER.
Mr. CONTE in two instances.
Mr. COLLIER in five instances.
Mr. STEELE.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in three instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.
Mr. KEMP in four instances.
Mr. RAILSBACK in four instances.
Mr. HOGAN.
Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.
Mr. MICHEL in two instances.
Mr. KEATING in two instances.
Mr. DU PONT in two instances.
Mr. VEYSEY in two instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'NEILL.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. BOLLING in two instances.
Mr. MATHIS of Georgia.
Mr. ROE in two instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON.
Mr. REES in three instances.

Mr. WALDIE.
Mr. GAYDOS.
Mr. BRADEMAs.
Mr. GIBBONS.
Mr. LITTON.
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1352. An act to require loadlines on U.S. vessels engaged in foreign voyages and foreign vessels within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1410. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for one year the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1615. An act for the relief of August F. Walz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1618. An act to name the headquarters building in the Geological Survey National Center under construction in Reston, Va., as the "John Wesley Powell Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1901. An act to amend the act of August 20, 1963, as amended, relating to the construction of mint buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6330. An act to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, relating to the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 7200. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise certain eligibility conditions for annuities; to change the railroad retirement tax rates; and to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to improve the procedures pertaining to certain rate adjustments for carriers subject to part I of the act, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6330. An act to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, relating to the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 29, 1973, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1087. A letter from the Chairman, Emergency Loan Guarantee Board, transmitting the special report with respect to the need to continue the guarantee program beyond December 31, 1973, pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 92-70; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1088. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, entered into during the period June 19-23, 1973, pursuant to section 112(b), Public Law 92-403; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC 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. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 462. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Reform of Our Correctional Systems"; (Rept. No. 93-338). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 185. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of inaugural addresses from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-339). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 219. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of "The Federal Civilian Employee Loyalty Program"; House Report No. 92-1637, 92d Congress, second session; (Rept. No. 93-340). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 233. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of committee hearings establishing a National Institute of Education; (Rept. No. 93-341). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 256. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing as a House document, a revised edition of the House document "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Work?"; (Rept. No. 93-342). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 257. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Street Crime: Reduction Through Positive Criminal Justice Responses"; (Rept. No. 93-343). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 258. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Drugs in Our Schools"; with amendment; (Rept. No. 93-344). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 29. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on illegal, improper, or unethical activities during the Presidential election of 1972; (Rept. No. 93-345). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 457. Resolution to provide for the printing as a House document the booklet entitled "The History and Operation of the House Majority Whip Organization"; (Rept. No. 93-346). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 463. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Organized Criminal Influence in Horse Racing";

with amendment; (Rept. No. 93-347). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DORN: Committee on Veterans' Administration. H.R. 8949. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code relating to basic provisions of the loan guaranty program for veterans; (Rept. No. 93-348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8219. A bill to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act to authorize the President to extend certain privileges and immunities to the Organization of African Unity; (Rept. No. 93-349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 9055. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 477. Resolution providing for the consideration of 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 (Rept. No. 93-351). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 478. Resolution providing for the consideration of 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. 93-352). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 479. Resolution waiving points of order against the bill H.R. 9055. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-354). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on conference. Conference report on H.R. 7528 (Rept. No. 93-353). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 8410 (Rept. No. 93-355). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. McCloskey, and Mr. MITCHELL of New York):

H.R. 9028. 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. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. McCloskey):

H.R. 9029. A bill to authorize the construction of transmission facilities for delivery to the continental United States of petroleum reserves located on the North Slope of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 9030. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9031. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require that radio and television receivers meet certain technical standards for filtering out interference; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9032. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of charitable contributions of inventory and certain other ordinary income property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9033. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from 22 to 24 the age until which child's insurance benefits may be paid on the basis of full-time student status, and the age before which a child must have become disabled in order to qualify for such benefits on the basis of disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENITEZ (for himself, Mr. DE LUCA, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9034. A bill to extend to residents of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, the social security benefits normally provided for aged, blind, and disabled persons, under the Supplemental Security Income program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. PIKE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. HUBER, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. GAIAMO, and Mr. TOWELL of Nevada):

H.R. 9035. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 9036. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9037. 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. DULSKI:

H.R. 9038. A bill to authorize a program for the improvement and restoration of the Buffalo metropolitan area, New York; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9039. A bill to limit certain legal remedies involving the involuntary busing of schoolchildren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9040. A bill to prohibit most-favored-nation treatment and commercial and guarantee agreements with respect to any non-market economy country which denies to its citizens the right to emigrate or which imposes more than nominal fees upon its citizens as a condition to emigration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 9041. A bill to amend section 505 of title 10, United States Code, to establish uniform original enlistment qualifications for male and female persons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 9042. A bill to amend the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 to meet the needs of runaway youths and facilitate their return to their families without resort to the law enforcement structure; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. MINISH, and Mr. MACDONALD):

H.R. 9043. A bill to amend the United Na-

tions Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome and to restore the United States to its position as a law-abiding member of the international community; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUNTER:

H.R. 9044. A bill to limit Federal court jurisdiction to order busing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 9045. A bill to require the President to include in the budget transmitted to Congress additional information showing the regional impact of budget proposals by State and congressional districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9046. A bill to create a National Historic Records Commission, to establish a program for preserving and making accessible documentary resources throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9047. A bill to prohibit use of the mails to effect the sale or other delivery of mailing lists for purposes of commercial or other solicitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself,

Mr. DORN, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. HALEY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. DANIELSON, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. WYLLIE, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MARAZITI, Mr. ABRNOR, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 9048. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ (for himself, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. WINN, Mr. SEBELIUS, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 9049. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to allocate crude oil and refined petroleum products to deal with existing or imminent shortages and dislocations in the national distribution system which jeopardize the public health, safety, or welfare; to provide for the delegation of authority to the Secretary of the Interior; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 9050. A bill to amend section 14 of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 to prohibit certain expenditures from the Airport and Airway Trust Funds in connection with certain projects involving the location of an airport unless the legislature of each State in or near which such project is located has approved such project; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELMAN:

H.R. 9051. A bill to establish the Big Thicket National Biological Reserve in Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 9052. A bill to amend section 1951, title 18, United States Code, act of July 3, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 9053. 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. YOUNG of South Carolina:

H.R. 9054. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to execute a subordination agreement with respect to certain lands in Lee County, S.C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 9055. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself, Mr. Diggs, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. HOWARD):

H.R. 9056. A bill to reorganize the governmental structure of the District of Columbia, to provide a charter for local government in the District of Columbia subject to acceptance by a majority of the registered qualified electors in the District of Columbia, to delegate certain legislative powers to the local government, to implement certain recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 9057. A bill to assure the availability of certain public records in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HEINZ (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KEMP, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 9058. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide a more equitable method of allotting funds for vocational rehabilitation services among the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 9059. A bill to create an Office of Federal Procurement Policy within the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9060. A bill to distinguish Federal procurement and grant-type assistance transactions, standardize use of legal instruments for procurement and grant-type assistance transactions, and authorize use of a procurement or grant-type instrument, as appropriate, under existing authorizations to enter into contracts, grants or similar transactions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9061. A bill to provide policies and procedures for the procurement of property and services by Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9062. A bill to provide for the resolution of claims and disputes relating to Government contracts awarded by executive agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 9063. A bill to designate certain lands in the Mendocino National Forest, Calif., as the "Snow Mountain Wilderness" for inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 9064. A bill to provide for Federal grants and loans to small business concerns which are adversely affected by transportation disputes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 9065. A bill to amend the act of October 12, 1968, to increase from \$5 million to \$7.5 million the amount authorized for grants to Eisenhower College, Seneca Falls, N.Y., and to provide authorization for grants to the Samuel Rayburn Library, Bonham, Tex., for establishment and maintenance of a Dwight D. Eisenhower Study Center; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.J. Res. 647. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 648. Joint resolution to extend the authority for the flexible regulation of interest rates on deposits and share ac-

counts by financial institutions for 60 days; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 475. Resolution amending clause 5 of rule I of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H. Res. 476. Resolution providing that clause 5 of rule I of the Rules of the House of Representatives be amended; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

267. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to providing adequate protection for the coastal fisheries against excessive foreign fishing; 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. BURTON:

H.R. 9066. A bill for the relief of Robert Dona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 9067. A bill for the relief of James A. Horkan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9068. A bill for the relief of Morris and Lenke Gelb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

248. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Thomas J. Garvey, Philadelphia, Pa., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JUNE DAIRY MONTH

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the rise of prices for needed commodities has been a concern of American consumers since our country was born. In recent years, we have seen prices make especially large increases, and consumers have grown more vocal in expressing their grievances.

Earlier this year, there was a meat boycott, as thousands of Americans gave up meat for a time in an effort to drive prices down. In addition, the President imposed a ceiling on meat prices.

All of this has made it appear that farmers are key figures in creating the price spiral. In fact, they are victims of that spiral.

Few people realize that farm prices are up only 6 percent over 20 years ago. The House Agriculture Committee reported recently that farmers have just now raised themselves to the economic level of 20 years ago.

Too many have forgotten that when

it comes to food commodities, particularly meat, the law of supply and demand is of critical importance. No governmental policy can increase beef production faster than cows can produce calves and farmers can feed them so they can be marketed.

America's farmers have done a remarkable job of supplying sufficient food not only for our country, but for others throughout the world. Even while meeting these fantastic demands, they have enabled U.S. families to spend far less of their family budget for food than families in any other country in the world.

We, in Wisconsin, pride ourselves as being residents of "America's Dairyland." Each year we celebrate June Dairy Month in recognition of the dairy industry which means so much to our State.

An editorial which appeared in the June 7 Chilton Times-Journal presents an excellent discussion of some of the thoughts we need to consider during dairy month. I now insert that editorial in the RECORD:

JUNE "DAIRY MONTH"

June Dairy Month 1973 can, and should, take on a double meaning for Wisconsin residents.

Traditionally, the month-long dairy industry and dairy product promotional cele-

bration will renew interest in consumer purchases of nature's most nearly perfect food. Most of us, although living in America's Dairyland and close to this great industry, need the annual reminder that milk and dairy foods are at the top of the list of enjoyable and nutritious foods.

At least 50 Wisconsin county June Dairy Month committees have taken this responsibility every year and are prepared for the 1973 edition.

This year, however, JDM promotional committees, have a second opportunity to advance the cause for their dairy food economy in Wisconsin. It has to do with inflation, the rising costs of all foods and the lack of information reaching consumers as to the position of dairy products as well as all foods in the price increases during the recent years.

For instance, how many of the people realize that, in the past five years, 1968 through 1972, the cost of living rose by 38 per cent, yet retail costs of all foods increased by only 23.5 per cent. In the same period dairy product prices advanced by 17.1 per cent.

Since the first of the year, retail meat costs have gained the most attention, bringing a "boycott" movement. The problem there is that homemakers admit that if the price of meat goes down, they will buy more. But the sad fact is that there is not "more meat" to be had at the immediate time.

While meat prices were escalating in 1972, the cost of milk and dairy products rose only by 1½ per cent, as all foods went up 5.1 per cent. Personal income, according to the