

ger Service Act of 1970, and for other purposes.

If that bill is disposed of tomorrow, the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, S. 707.

It is possible that amendments may be called up and voted upon tomorrow. In any event, a cloture motion will be voted on next Tuesday, circa at 2:15 p.m., which motion will be introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, and other Senators, on tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 25, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 24, 1974:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Alan Greenspan, of New York, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers, vice Herbert Stein.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer under the provisions of Title 10, United States Code, Section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of Section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, XXXX FR (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 24, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Stephen S. Gardner, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury.

Charles A. Cooper, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Richard R. Albrecht, of Washington, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Louis M. Thayer, of Florida, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the term expiring December 31, 1978.

Francis H. McAdams, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the term expiring December 31, 1977.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 24, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O praise the Lord, all ye nations; praise Him all ye people. For His merciful kindness is great toward us: and the truth of the Lord endureth forever. Praise ye the Lord.—Psalms 117.

"Holy, holy, holy! Lord God almighty! Early in the morning our prayers shall rise to Thee."

So move Thou into our hearts that we may walk in Thy ways and live in Thy love. By every revelation of Thy glory in daily life do Thou sustain us in our pilgrimage and strengthen us to do justly, to have mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee.

Teach us to listen to Thy still, small voice of wisdom that we may not wander in worried ways. Nor flounder in fluctuating fields which waste our time, divide our energies, multiply our troubles, and subtract from our peace.

Remind us that we are not called to take the place of others but to take our own place doing our own work, always seeking the right, always doing our best, and always leaving the outcome to Thee.

In Thy holy name 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 agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 39) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide a more effective program to prevent aircraft piracy, 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. 3782. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 1 year the authorization of appropriations for Federal capital contributions into the student loan funds of health professions education schools.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15472, AGRICULTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1975

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15472) making appropriations for the agriculture-environmental and consumer protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, SHIPLEY, EVANS of Colorado, BURLISON of Missouri, NATCHER, SMITH of Iowa, CASEY of Texas, MAHON, ANDREWS of North Dakota, MICHEL, SCHERLE, ROBINSON of Virginia, and CEDERBERG.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14592, MILITARY PROCUREMENT AP- PROPRIATIONS—1975

Mr. HÉBERT submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 14592) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve compo-

nent of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93-1212)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14592) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads, 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:

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1975 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft: for the Army, \$320,300,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, \$2,866,200,000; for the Air Force, \$3,286,300,000 of which (1) \$104,900,000 shall be used only for the procurement of A-7D aircraft for the Air National Guard of the United States, and (2) \$405,100,000 shall be available only for procurement in connection with the Airborne Warning and Control System, and shall be available for that purpose only if and after the Secretary of Defense determines and certifies such determination to the Congress that such system is cost effective and meets the mission needs and requirements of the Department of Defense, except that the foregoing certification requirement shall not apply with respect to the procurement of long lead time items for such system.

MISSILES

For missiles: for the Army, \$436,500,000; for the Navy, \$634,500,000; for the Marine

Corps, \$74,100,000; for the Air Force, \$1,579,200,000.

NAVAL VESSELS

For naval vessels: for the Navy, \$3,156,400,000, of which sum \$1,166,800,000 shall be used only for the Trident program; \$502,500,000 shall be used only for the SSN-688 nuclear attack submarine; \$244,300,000 shall be used only for the DLGN nuclear powered guided missile frigate program; \$457,100,000 shall be used only for the DD-963 program; \$16,000,000 shall be used only for the sea control ship program; \$92,300,000 shall be used only for the patrol hydrofoil missile program; \$186,000,000 shall be used only for the patrol frigate program; \$81,400,000 shall be used only for the fleet oiler; \$116,700,000 shall be used only for a destroyer tender; \$10,800,000 shall be used only for a fleet ocean tug; \$104,600,000 shall be used only for the Poseidon conversion of fleet ballistic-missile submarines; \$18,300,000 shall be used only for conversion of a submarine tender; \$22,000,000 shall be used only for craft; \$10,400,000 shall be used only for pollution abatement craft; \$55,300,000 shall be used only for outfitting material and post delivery; \$71,900,000 shall be used only for escalation on prior year programs.

TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES

For tracked combat vehicles: for the Army, \$300,600,000; for the Marine Corps, \$74,200,000.

TORPEDOES

For torpedoes and related support equipment: for the Navy, \$187,700,000.

OTHER WEAPONS

For other weapons: for the Army, \$52,200,000; for the Navy, \$25,500,000; for the Marine Corps, \$500,000.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

Sec. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1975 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, \$1,878,397,000;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), \$3,153,006,000, of which \$57,500,000 shall be available only for application to surface naval gunnery (excluding the Close-In Weapon System) including gun fire control systems, gun mounts, unguided and guided ordnance, and fuzing;

For the Air Force, \$3,389,517,000; and

For the Defense Agencies, \$516,057,000, of which \$25,000,000 is authorized for the activities of the Director of Test and Evaluation, Defense.

TITLE III—ACTIVE FORCES

Sec. 301. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974, and ending June 30, 1975, each component of the Armed Forces is authorized an end strength for active duty personnel as follows:

- (1) The Army, 785,000;
- (2) The Navy, 540,380;
- (3) The Marine Corps, 196,398;
- (4) The Air Force, 627,535.

Sec. 302. (a) The United States military forces in Europe can reduce headquarters and noncombat military personnel relative to the number of combat personnel located in Europe. Therefore, except in the event of imminent hostilities in Europe, the noncombat component of the total United States military strength in Europe authorized as of June 30, 1974, shall be reduced by 18,000. Such reduction shall be completed not later than June 30, 1976, and not less than 6,000 of such reduction shall be completed on or before June 30, 1975; however, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to increase the combat component strength of United States forces in Europe by the amount of any such reduction made in noncombat personnel. The Secretary of Defense shall report semi-

annually to the Congress on all actions taken to improve the combat proportion of United States forces in Europe. The first report shall be submitted not later than March 31, 1975.

(b) For purposes of this section, the combat component of the Army includes only the infantry, cavalry, artillery, armored, combat engineers, special forces, attack assault helicopter units, air defense, and missile combat units of battalion or smaller size; the combat component of the Navy includes only the combat ships (aircraft carrier, cruiser, destroyer, submarine, escort and amphibious assault ships) and combat aircraft wings (fighter, attack, reconnaissance, and patrol); the combat component of the Air Force includes only the tactical fighter reconnaissance, tactical airlift, fighter interceptor and bomber units of wing or smaller size.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall undertake a specific assessment of the costs and possible loss of nonnuclear combat effectiveness of the military forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries caused by the failure of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization members, including the United States, to standardize weapons systems, ammunition, fuel, and other military impediments for land, air, and naval forces. The Secretary of Defense shall also develop a list of standardization actions that could improve the overall North Atlantic Treaty Organization nonnuclear defense capability or save resources for the alliance as a whole. He shall also evaluate the relative priority and effect of each such action. The Secretary shall submit the results of these assessments and evaluations to the Congress and subsequently shall also cause them to be brought before the appropriate North Atlantic Treaty Organization bodies in order that the suggested actions and recommendations can become an integral part of the overall North Atlantic Treaty Organization review of force goals and development of force plans. The Secretary of Defense shall report semiannually to the Congress on the specific assessments and evaluations made under the above provisions as well as the results achieved with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies. The first such report shall be submitted to Congress not later than January 31, 1975.

(d) The total number of United States tactical nuclear warheads located in Europe on the date of enactment of this Act shall not be increased until after June 30, 1975, except in the event of imminent hostilities in Europe. The Secretary of Defense shall study the overall concept for use of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe; how the use of such weapons relates to deterrence and to a strong conventional defense; reductions in the number and type of nuclear warheads which are not essential for the defense structure for Western Europe; and the steps that can be taken to develop a rational and coordinated nuclear posture by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Alliance that is consistent with proper emphasis on conventional defense forces. The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on the results of the above study on or before April 1, 1975.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FORCES

Sec. 401. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974, and ending June 30, 1975, the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces will be programmed to attain an average strength of not less than the following:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 400,000;
- (2) The Army Reserve, 225,000;
- (3) The Naval Reserve, 117,000;
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 36,703;

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 95,000;

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 51,319;

(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 11,700.

Sec. 402. The average strength prescribed by section 401 of this title for the Selected Reserve of any Reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at any time during the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at any time during the fiscal year. Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the average strength for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such Reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strength of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

Sec. 403. (a) The average strength prescribed by section 401 of this title for the Air National Guard of the United States shall be used to man a force which shall include not less than 91 flying units in the Air National Guard during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974.

(b) It is the policy of Congress that any increase in the ratio of aircrew to aircraft for the strategic airlift mission of the Air Force above the present ratio of crewmembers per aircraft should be achieved to the maximum extent possible through the components of the Selected Reserve and not by increasing the active duty force level of the Air Force. To carry out such policy the Secretary of Defense is directed to study the possibility of increasing the strategic airlift crew ratio per aircraft to the required levels by utilizing jointly the resources of the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve. Such study shall specifically include: (1) restructuring the missions of Air National Guard units so as to retain an effective strategic airlift capability within the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve; (2) the utilization of Air National Guard units now in existence so as to avoid the loss of existing skills in those units; (3) alternatives, including, but not limited to, transfer, rotation, "hybridization", and "association", for making available to the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve strategic airlift aircraft in numbers sufficient to support an effective capability; and (4) the desirability of new statutory authority for the limited selective mobilization of members of the Air National Guard under circumstances not leading to a declaration of a national emergency by the Congress or the President. The Secretary shall submit his study to the Congress not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and before the implementation thereof, together with an evaluation of such study, a proposed schedule for its possible implementation, and such recommendations for legislative action relating to the subject matter of this section as he may deem appropriate.

TITLE V—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Sec. 501. (a) (1) For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974, and ending June 30, 1975, the Department of Defense is authorized an end strength for civilian personnel as follows:

- (A) The Department of the Army, 358,717;
 - (B) The Department of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, 323,529;
 - (C) The Department of the Air Force, 269,709;
 - (D) Activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), 75,372.
- (2) The end strength for civilian person-

nel prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, shall be reduced by 32,327. Such reduction shall be apportioned among the Army, Navy, Air Force, and activities and agencies of the Department of Defense as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe. The Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the manner in which this reduction is to be apportioned among the military services and the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense and among the mission categories described in the Manpower Requirements Report. This report shall include the rationale for each reduction.

(b) In computing the authorized end strength for civilian personnel there shall be included all direct-hire civilian personnel employed to perform military functions administered by the Department of Defense (other than those performed by the National Security Agency) whether in permanent or temporary positions and whether employed on a full-time, part-time, or intermittent basis, but excluding special employment categories for students and disadvantaged youth such as the stay-in-school campaign, the temporary summer aid program and the Federal junior fellowship program and personnel participating in the worker-trainee opportunity program. Whenever a function, power, or duty or activity is transferred or assigned to a department or agency of the Department of Defense from a department or agency outside of the Department of Defense or from a department or agency within the Department of Defense, the civilian personnel end strength authorized for such departments or agencies of the Department of Defense affected shall be adjusted to reflect any increases or decreases in civilian personnel required as a result of such transfer or assignment.

(c) When the Secretary of Defense determines that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may authorize the employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized by subsection (a) of this section, but such additional number may not exceed one half of one per centum of the total number of civilian personnel authorized for the Department of Defense by subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify the Congress of any authorization to increase civilian personnel strength under the authority of this subsection.

Sec. 502. It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense shall use the least costly form of manpower that is consistent with military requirements and other needs of the Department of Defense. Therefore, in developing the annual manpower authorization requests to the Congress and in carrying out manpower policies, the Secretary of Defense shall, in particular, consider the advantages of converting from one form of manpower to another (military, civilian, or private contract) for the performance of a specified job. A full justification of any conversion from one form of manpower to another shall be contained in the annual manpower requirements report to the Congress required by section 138(c)(3) of title 10, United States Code.

TITLE VI—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

Sec. 601. (a) For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974, and ending June 30, 1975, each component of the Armed Forces is authorized an average military training student load as follows:

- (1) The Army, 97,638;
- (2) The Navy, 71,279;
- (3) The Marine Corps, 26,262;
- (4) The Air Force, 52,900;
- (5) The Army National Guard of the United States, 12,111;
- (6) The Army Reserve, 6,673;
- (7) The Naval Reserve, 2,536;

- (8) The Marine Corps Reserve, 3,403;
- (9) The Air National Guard of the United States, 2,359; and
- (10) The Air Force Reserve, 1,126.

(b) The average military training student loads for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the Reserve components prescribed in subsection (a) of this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, shall be adjusted consistent with the manpower strengths provided in title III, title IV, and title V of this Act. Such adjustment shall be apportioned among the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the Reserve Components in such manner as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 701. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 401 (a) of Public Law 89-367, approved March 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 37), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) There is authorized to be appropriated as a single appropriation to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, the sum of \$1,000,000,000, including \$263,860,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicle, and other weapons, to support South Vietnamese military forces. Such appropriation shall be administered and accounted for as one fund and may be obligated only by the issuance of orders by the Secretary of Defense for such support. Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be deemed obligated at the time the Secretary of Defense issues orders authorizing support of any kind to South Vietnamese military forces. No support herein authorized may be made available in any manner unless pursuant to a specific order issued by the Secretary."

(b) That portion of paragraph (2) of such section 401(a) which precedes clause (A) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) No defense article may be furnished to the South Vietnamese forces with funds authorized under this or any other Act unless the Government of the Republic of South Vietnam shall have agreed that—"

(c) Section 401 of such Public Law 89-367 is amended by striking out subsections (b), (c), and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) No funds authorized by this or any other Act to or for use by the Department of Defense may be obligated in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, for support of South Vietnamese military forces in any amount in excess of the amount of \$1,000,000,000.

"(c) Any obligation incurred against funds authorized under this section shall, in the case of nonexcess materials and supplies furnished from the inventory of the Department of Defense, be equal to the replacement cost thereof at the time such obligation is incurred, and in the case of excess materials and supplies, be equal to the actual value thereof at the time such obligation is incurred.

"(d) No funds authorized by this section may be used in any way to support Vietnamese or other forces in actions designed to provide military support and assistance to the Government of Cambodia or Laos.

"(e) Within 30 days after the end of each quarter of the fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a written report regarding actual obligations incurred against funds appropriated pursuant to this section. Such report shall indicate the different purposes for which such obligations were incurred and the amounts thereof, together with such other information as the Secretary determines appropriate."

Sec. 702. Subsection (b) of section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) After the date of enactment of this paragraph, no naval vessel in excess of

2,000 tons or less than 20 years of age may be sold, leased, granted, loaned, bartered, transferred, or otherwise disposed of to another nation unless the disposition thereof has been approved by law enacted after such date of enactment.

"(2) After the date of enactment of this paragraph, any naval vessel not subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) may be sold, leased, granted, loaned, bartered, transferred, or otherwise disposed of to another nation in accordance with applicable provisions of law only after the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, has notified the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives in writing of the proposed disposition and 30 days of continuous session of Congress have expired following the date on which notice was transmitted to such committees. For purposes of this paragraph, the continuity of a session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of such 30-day period."

Sec. 703. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for research, testing, and/or evaluation of poisonous gases, radioactive materials, poisonous chemicals, or biological or chemical warfare agents upon dogs for the purpose of developing biological or chemical weapons.

Sec. 704. Section 204 of Public Law 93-166 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the conduct by the Department of the Navy of training operations at the Culebra complex involving the firing of any shells, missiles, or other projectiles from ships or the dropping of any bombs, strafing, firing of rockets or missiles, or the launching of any other projectiles from aircraft at Culebra or at any keys within three nautical miles thereof is prohibited during any period of time that the negotiations required by subsection (b) have been ended on the initiative of the United States Government prior to the conclusion of a satisfactory agreement. In the conduct of the negotiations required by subsection (b) the Secretary of the Navy shall not agree to any relocation of training operations from the Island of Culebra which would be rendered ineffective by any international agreement on the law of the sea which may become international law within three years after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Sec. 705. Section 401 of the Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations Authorization Act, 1974, is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "when his enlistment is needed to meet established strength requirements."

Sec. 706. None of the funds authorized by this Act may be used for the purpose of carrying out any proposed flight test (including operational base launch) of the Minuteman missile from any place within the United States other than Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California.

Sec. 707. (a) No funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other Act may be obligated under a contract entered into by the Department of Defense after the date of the enactment of this Act for procurement of goods which are other than American goods unless, under regulations of the Secretary of Defense and subject to the determinations and exceptions contained in title III of the Act of March 3, 1933, as amended (47 Stat. 1520; 41 U.S.C. 10a, 10b), popularly known as the Buy American Act, there is adequate consideration given to—

(1) the bids or proposals of firms located in labor surplus areas in the United States as designated by the Department of Labor

which have offered to furnish American goods;

(2) the bids or proposals of small business firms in the United States which have offered to furnish American goods;

(3) the bids or proposals of all other firms in the United States which have offered to furnish American goods;

(4) the United States balance of payments;

(5) the cost of shipping goods which are other than American goods; and

(6) any duty, tariff, or surcharge which may enter into the cost of using goods which are other than American goods.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "goods which are other than American goods" means (1) an end product which has not been mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States, or (2) an end product manufactured in the United States but the cost of the components thereof which are not mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States exceeds the cost of components mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States.

SEC. 708. (a) Chapter 401 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 4314. United States Army Command and General Staff College degree.

"Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, and with the approval of a nationally recognized civilian accrediting association approved by the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Commandant of the United States Army Command and General Staff College may upon recommendation by the faculty confer the degree of master of military art and science upon graduates of the college who have fulfilled the following degree requirements: a minimum of thirty semester hours of graduate credit, including a masters thesis of six to eight semester hours, and a demonstration of competence in the discipline of military art and science as evidenced by satisfactory performance on a general comprehensive examination. These requirements may be altered only with the approval of such association. The Secretary of the Army shall report annually to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives the following information: (1) the criteria which must be met to entitle a student to award of the degree, (2) whether such criteria have changed in any respect during the reporting year, (3) the number of students in the most recent resident course graduating class, (4) the number of such students who were enrolled in the master of military art and science program, and (5) the number of students successfully completing the master of military art and science program.";

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis of such chapter:

"4314. United States Army Command and General Staff College degree."

(b) The Commandant of the United States Army Command and General Staff College may confer the degree of master of military art and science upon graduates of the college who have completed the requirements for that degree since 1964 but prior to the enactment of this Act; but the number of such degrees awarded for such period may not exceed two hundred."

SEC. 709. (a) The Congress finds that the defense posture of the United States may be seriously compromised if goods, technology, and industrial techniques which have been developed in whole or in part as a direct or indirect result of research and development programs or procurement programs financed in whole or in part with funds authorized by this or any other Act authorizing funds for the Department of Defense are exported to a controlled country without an adequate and knowledgeable as-

essment having been made to determine whether the export of such goods, technology, and techniques will significantly increase the present or potential military capability of any such country. It is the purpose of this section, therefore, to provide for such an assessment, to insure notice of proposed exports to the Secretary of Defense, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to review the proposed export of goods, technology, or industrial techniques to any such country whenever he has reason to believe that the export of such goods, technology, or techniques will significantly increase the military capability of such country.

(b) Effective upon enactment of this section, any application for the export of any goods, technology, or industrial techniques described in subsection (a) shall, before being eligible for export to a controlled country, be reviewed and assessed by the Secretary of Defense for the purpose of determining whether the export of such goods, technology, or techniques will significantly increase the present or potential military capability of such country.

(c) If the Secretary of Defense determines, after his review and assessment, that the export of such goods, technology or industrial techniques will in his judgment significantly increase the present or potential military capability of any controlled country, he shall recommend to the President that the application for export be disapproved. In any case in which the President disagrees with a recommendation made by the Secretary of Defense to prohibit the export of such goods, technology, or techniques to a controlled country, the President shall submit to the Congress a statement indicating his disagreement with the Secretary of Defense together with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The application for the export of any such goods, technology, or techniques may be approved after submission by the President of his statement and the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense to the Congress and 60 days of continuous session of the Congress has elapsed following such submission unless within such 60 day period Congress has adopted a concurrent resolution disapproving the application for the export of such goods, technology, or techniques.

(d) As used in this section (1) the term "controlled country" means the Soviet Union, Poland, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic (East Germany), and such other countries as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, and (2) the term "days of continuous session of the Congress" shall not include days on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days.

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a written report on his implementation of this section not later than 30 days after the close of each quarter of each fiscal year. Each such report shall, among other things, identify each instance in which the Secretary recommended to the President that exports be disapproved and the action finally taken by the executive branch on the matter.

TITLE VIII—NUCLEAR POWERED NAVY

SEC. 801. It is the policy of the United States of America to modernize the strike forces of the United States Navy by the construction of nuclear powered major combatant vessels and to provide for an adequate industrial base for the research, development, design, construction, operation, and maintenance for such vessels. New construction major combatant vessels for the strike forces of the United States Navy authorized subsequent to the date of the enactment of this Act becomes law shall be nuclear powered, except as provided in this title.

SEC. 802. For the purposes of this title, the term "major combatant vessels for the strike forces of the United States Navy" means—

(1) combatant submarines for strategic or tactical missions, or both;

(2) combatant vessels intended to operate in combat in aircraft carrier task groups (that is, aircraft carriers and the cruisers, frigates, and destroyers which accompany aircraft carriers); and

(3) those types of combatant vessels referred to in clauses (1) and (2) above designed for independent combat missions where essentially unlimited high speed endurance will be of significant military value.

SEC. 803. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress each calendar year, at the same time the President submits the budget to Congress under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 11), a written report regarding the application of nuclear propulsion to major combatant vessels for the strike forces of the United States Navy. The report shall identify contract placement dates for their construction and shall identify the Department of Defense Five Year Defense Program for construction of nuclear powered major combatant vessels for the strike forces of the United States Navy.

SEC. 804. All requests for authorizations or appropriations from Congress for major combatant vessels for the strike forces of the United States Navy shall be for construction of nuclear powered major combatant vessels for such forces unless and until the President has fully advised the Congress that construction of nuclear powered vessels for such purpose is not in the national interest. Such report of the President to the Congress shall include for consideration by Congress an alternate program of nuclear powered ships with appropriate design, cost, and schedule information.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriation Authorization Act, 1975".

And the Senate agree to the same.

F. EDWARD HEBERT,
MELVIN PRICE,
O. C. FISHER,
CHARLES E. BENNETT,
SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
BOB WILSON,
CHARLES S. GUBSER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
THOMAS J. MCINTYRE,
STROM THURMOND,
JOHN TOWER,
PETER H. DOMINICK,
BARRY GOLDWATER,

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. 14592) an act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training statement loads and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effects of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

In Title I of the bill, procurement, there were numerous items in disagreement between the House bill and the Senate amendment thereto.

Twenty-six of these items were procurements designated for the Military Assistance Service Funded (MASF) program for military assistance to Southeast Asia. Of the total authorizations in Title I, \$287.4 million had been requested by the Department of Defense for MASF programs. The House authorized a total of \$263.9 million. The Senate amendment reduced Title I by the amount of \$287.4 million but authorized \$212.3 million in requested MASF procurement and provided that amount under Title VII of the bill. Title VII authorizes to be appropriated as a single appropriation, funds to support South Vietnamese military forces.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment thereto had provided for the MASF account to be administered as a single fund. The Senate amendment, however, provided for establishment of a separate appropriation and account for MASF and for authorizing under Title VII those portions of the procurement requiring authorizations which were related to MASF. The House conferees accepted the Senate language of Title VII relating to MASF, including the earmarking of funds for procurement of weapons systems in that title. The Senate conferees agreed to accept the total of \$263.8 million for procurement items relating to MASF as contained in the House bill, the total to be transferred to Title VII.

A transfer of \$263.9 million, therefore, was made from Title I as contained in the House bill and a like amount is consequently provided under Title VII in the conference report.

As a concomitant of this, the conferees agreed on an adjusted total authorization ceiling in Title VII of \$1.0 billion for support of the South Vietnamese military forces in Fiscal Year 1975. The House bill had originally contained \$1.126 billion and the Senate amendment had contained \$900 million for this authorization. The \$263.8 million authorized for procurement in Title VII represents that part of the \$1.0 billion authorization for South Vietnamese support which, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 138, requires specific authorization in procurement legislation.

In connection with the procurement items specifically authorized in the MASF account, the conferees agreed that if the Department of Defense finds it advantageous to reobligate funds for the F-5E procurement program during Fiscal Year 1975, it may do so from within the \$263.9 million authorized for procurement. However, such a decision regarding the F-5E program will require a prior approval reprogramming application for this purpose which must be approved by the four cognizant Committees. The Department of Defense had previously advised the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives that the Department had deobligated \$51.9 million of a \$65.0 million contract involving F-5E airframes. Apparently this decision was made by the Department because of a change in priorities in the MASF program for FY-1974 when the Department of Defense elected to use approximately \$51 million of MASF funds to support the Military Assistance Program. Since the Department wishes to retain the option of going forward with the F-5E contract for these aircraft in Fiscal Year 1975, the conferees agreed to this arrangement provided that the funds are reprogrammed from within the \$263.9 million authorized for MASF procurement during FY-1975.

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Aircraft

Army

AH-1Q attack helicopter

The House bill contained \$27.5 million for 21 AH-1Q attack helicopters. The Senate

amendment provided \$15 million for six helicopters, a reduction of \$12.5 million and 15 helicopters from the House bill. The Senate took the position that these 15 helicopters would not be delivered until 1977 and would not require funding until Fiscal Year 1976.

The Department of Defense expressed concern that if funds were not available early in fiscal year 1976, there would be a break in the production line, resulting in cost increases and delays.

The conferees agreed that there should be no break in the production. The House conferees, therefore, reluctantly receded with the specific understanding that included in the authorization are long-lead funds for the required 15 additional helicopters. The conferees further agreed that early release of these funds for the 15 additional helicopters was authorized.

The House recedes.

Modification of aircraft

The House bill authorized \$160.5 million for modification of aircraft, a reduction of \$4.5 million from the Army request. The Senate amendment contained \$158.3 million, a reduction of \$2.2 million from the House amount.

The Army informed the conference committee that the \$2.2 million was no longer required.

The House recedes.

Navy and Marine Corps

A-4M light attack Skyhawk

The House authorized \$57.3 million for the procurement of 24 A-4Ms, and \$2.2 million for advanced procurement. The Senate amendment approved only the \$2.2 million advanced procurement and recommended that these 24 aircraft be funded in fiscal year 1976.

The Senate conferees pointed out that the fiscal year 1974 supplemental contained 24 A-4Ms which will not be delivered until calendar year 1976, at the same time as the 24 requested in the fiscal year 1975 bill. The Senate conferees further noted that already approved A-4Ms, plus others for foreign sale, will result in a high production rate late in calendar year 1976, followed by a complete shutdown of line in calendar year 1977 under the proposed program. While concerned for the adequacy of Marine Corps aircraft, the House conferees agreed that the Senate position could result in a more even and orderly monthly production rate.

The House recedes. The amount authorized is \$2.2 million.

A-7E Corsair II

The Navy request for fiscal year 1975 was \$138.2 million for 34 A-7E airplanes and \$3.8 million for advanced procurement. The House bill approved the entire request. The Senate amendment reduced the aircraft request by \$7.5 million, and approved the authorization for advanced procurement.

The Senate reduction was made because that \$7.5 million is available to apply to the current request because of a change in the fiscal year 1974 appropriation for the A-7E program.

The House recedes. The amount authorized is \$130.7 million for 34 planes, and \$3.8 million for advanced procurement.

F-14A Tomcat

The Navy request for fiscal year 1975 contained \$639.3 million for the procurement of 50 F-14As and \$70 million for advanced procurement. The House approved the entire request.

The Senate amendment reduced the fiscal year 1975 request for procurement, including advanced procurement, to \$687.3 million, a reduction of \$22 million. The Senate rationale was that the sale of 30 F-14's to Iran would reduce the procurement cost by that amount.

The House recedes. The amount authorized is \$617.3 million for 50 airplanes and \$70 million for advanced procurement.

AH-1J Sea Cobra

The Navy's original request was for \$24.9 million to purchase 20 AH-1J's and \$3.9 million for advanced procurement. The House bill included the entire amount, but the Senate amendment reduced the authorization by \$5.4 million and 6 aircraft.

The Senate conferees maintained that because of slippage in the production schedule, 6 of the requested aircraft would not require funding until fiscal year 1976. Therefore, the 6 aircraft could be deferred until next year's request.

The House recedes. The amount authorized is \$19.5 million for 14 helicopters and \$3.9 million for advanced procurement.

T-34 trainer

The original Navy request was \$3.5 million for the modification of 2 T-34B aircraft to T-34C configuration. Study by the House committee revealed that 18 new T-34C aircraft could be purchased for a total of \$7 million. The House bill, therefore, authorized \$7 million for 18 new aircraft. The House conferees were adamant that it was more cost-effective to procure the 18 new aircraft than to modify just 2 18-year-old T-34B aircraft at half the cost.

Further, the committee on conference expects that the engines procured for use in the T-34C aircraft will be assembled in the United States.

The Senate recedes.

Modification of aircraft

The House approved \$335 million, a \$3.5 million reduction from the request, representing denial of the aforementioned \$3.5 million for the T-34B. The Senate amendment reduced the authorization further by \$4.9 million.

The \$4.9 million was to be utilized for the OV-10 night gunship modification. The conferees agreed to defer the OV-10 modification until less costly modifications have been thoroughly evaluated.

The House recedes. The total amount authorized is \$330.1 million.

Aircraft spares and repair parts

The House authorized \$374.2 million, the amount requested, for aircraft spares and repair parts. The Senate amendment reduced this amount by \$800,000, the amount for initial spares of the A-4M airplanes which were eliminated by the conferees.

The House recedes.

Air Force

A-7D attack aircraft

The House bill contained \$100.1 million for the procurement of 24 A-7D aircraft for the purpose of further modernization of the Air National Guard.

There was no similar provision in the Senate amendment.

The Senate conferees agreed to the House action, recognizing the addition was merely the continuation of a program started by the Senate in the fiscal year 1974 authorization bill.

The Senate recedes.

A-10 close air support aircraft

The House bill contained \$140.3 million for the procurement of 26 A-10 aircraft, plus \$28.9 million for advanced procurement, the amounts requested. The Senate amendment increased the request by 4 airplanes and \$18.9 million, reflecting a transfer of 4 aircraft from R&D to the procurement account. The Senate amendment also contained a restriction that the funds authorized be available only for the procurement of A-10's or A-7D's, based on the winner of the flyoff between these airplanes.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense wrote to the Senate Tactical Air-Power Subcommittee on June 20, 1974, certifying that the A-10 was the winner of the comparative evaluation and the flyoff results validated the Air Force request for initial A-10 production.

After lengthy discussion, the House conferees receded on the dollar authorization

and the Senate conferees receded on the restrictive language. The amounts authorized are \$159.2 million for the procurement of 30 airplanes and \$28.9 million for advanced procurement.

E-3A AWACS

The original procurement request for the AWACS was \$494.4 million for 12 airplanes and \$21 million for advanced procurement. The House authorized \$247.2 million for the procurement of 6 airplanes and \$10.5 million for advanced procurement. The Senate authorized the full amount requested. Both houses authorized \$34.4 million for initial spares. Further, the Senate amendment contained language which stated that the procurement funds would be available only after certification by the Secretary of Defense on the capability of AWACS to perform its mission and upon completion of further testing in the November-December 1974 time frame.

After extensive discussion, the Senate conferees reluctantly agreed to a 6-aircraft buy but with an increase of \$81.5 million in the amount authorized to assure adequate funding. The Senate conferees also insisted that these aircraft be delivered at a one-a-month rate to protect the current contract delivery schedule.

The Senate recedes. The amount authorized is \$328.7 million for aircraft and \$42 million for advanced procurement.

The Senate recedes on the Senate language.

F-111F

The House bill contained \$205.5 million for the procurement of 12 F-111F airplanes. The Senate amendment contained an identical provision, plus an additional \$15 million for advanced procurement. The House conferees agreed that advanced procurement funds are necessary for a fiscal year 1975 procurement of F-111F aircraft.

The House recedes.

F-15

The budget request was for \$756.9 million for procurement of 72 F-15 aircraft. Both the House and the Senate approved the full request, and the Senate report commented on the desirability of holding F-15 production at the 9 per month rate which will be obtained by the end of the FY 1974 funded delivery period. The Senate report recommended that the FY 1975 airplanes be delivered in an 8 month period in order to maintain an even monthly production rate.

The conferees agreed with the rationale on production rate expressed by the Senate and specifically authorize an accelerated delivery of the FY 1975 F-15 program.

Civil reserve air fleet (CRAF) modification

The House authorized \$25.0 million of a requested \$132.9 million for the initiation of the CRAF modification program in FY-1975. The Senate deleted the entire amount.

The \$25.0 million authorized by the House would have permitted initiation of the CRAF modification program. This amount would have included funds sufficient to modify two wide-bodied aircraft (one B-747 and one DC-10) and also would have permitted payment of non-recurring costs associated with beginning production (engineering, design, tooling, kit fabrication). Finally, these funds would have also permitted payment to the airlines for offset costs associated with modification and lost revenues due to increased operating weight, etc.

The Senate was adamant in its opposition to initiating this program and was of the view that the Department should re-evaluate any airlift requirement before going forward with this program.

In view of the adamant position of the Senate conferees, the House conferees reluctantly receded. In receding from its position, the House and Senate conferees did, however, concur in the recognition of the need to improve overall strategic airlift capability. Therefore, to this end, the Air Force is directed to affirm overall strategic airlift

requirements and capabilities, including the contribution of CRAF to determine how to best effect such improvements.

The House recedes.

Other production charges

The House approved \$126.7 million, the amount requested. Of this total, \$1.2 million was transferred to Title VII of the bill and \$22.6 million for the ALQ-119 ECM pods.

The Senate also deleted \$22.6 million for the ALQ-119 ECM pods pointing out that an improved ALQ-131 pod would also be procured in fiscal year 1975. The House conferees held that denial of the ALQ-119 authorization would cause a break in the ECM pod production line and that the improved pod is still under development and may not be ready for the scheduled production.

The Senate recedes. The amount authorized is \$125.5 million.

C-141 stretch

The Senate had approved \$31.0 million for the stretch and refueling modification of the C-141. The House did not authorize this program.

The Senate conferees pointed out that \$31.0 million was the minimum amount required to initiate the C-141 modification program which will produce a prototype of the stretched C-141 and validate the technical feasibility of such a modification. The Senate conferees were of the view that the stretch C-141 is the most feasible and immediately attainable method of enhancing the military airlift capability of the Department of Defense.

The House recedes.

Aircraft spares and repair parts

The House bill authorized \$786.3 million for spare parts. The Senate bill authorized \$700.8 million for the same purpose.

After transfer of that portion of the aircraft spares and repair parts attributable to the MASF program, the conferees agreed to adjust the Senate authorization for spare parts for the C-5/C-141 program to \$17.2 million and \$4.8 million for the A-7 program, for a new revised total of \$722.8 million.

The House recedes with an amendment.

Missiles

Army

TOW antitank missile

The House approved \$107.1 million, the amount requested by the Department, for the procurement of TOW missiles and launchers. The Senate reduced this figure to \$104.6 million, a reduction of \$2.5 million—\$2.0 million for TOW missile launchers and \$500,000 for TOW missiles which are part of Support of South Vietnamese Military Forces transferred to Title VII, Section 701, of the bill.

The House recedes.

Navy

Phoenix missile

The House bill contained \$4.7 million, the amount requested, for procurement of Phoenix missiles. The Senate amendment reduced the authorization by \$1.5 million since sale of Phoenix missiles to Iran has reduced the cost of the missiles to be bought by the Navy in Fiscal Year 1975 by this amount.

The House recedes.

Bulldog missile

The Senate amendment contained a \$23.1 million authorization for the procurement of Bulldog class air support missiles for the Marine Corps. The House bill did not have a similar provision. No funds were requested for this program. The Director of Defense Research and Engineering had rejected the Navy's request for production funding in favor of development of a laser-guided version of the Air Force Maverick, it was learned.

The Senate conferees pointed out that a laser-guided Maverick had not begun engineering development by the time the Sen-

ate acted on the bill. The Bulldog has completed R&D and all of its required operational testing with outstanding results, and the missile is ready for production. A total of \$16.8 million was expended in R&D on the project.

The Senate conferees recommended procurement of Bulldog missiles for the Marine Corps as an interim inventory of laser-guided close air support missiles, pending availability of a laser-guided Maverick at some time in the future.

After considerable discussion, the House and Senate conferees agreed to an authorization of \$15.4 million, a reduction of \$7.7 million, for the procurement of half the number of missiles proposed by the Senate.

The House recedes with an amendment, and the Senate agrees to same.

Harpoon

The House had approved the Defense Department's request of \$78.2 million for the procurement of Harpoon missiles.

The Senate amendment reduced the number of missiles authorized by the House, by a reduction of \$7.7 million, on the rationale that the planned production rate of the Harpoon missile was too rapid in the early part of the program.

The House conferees position was that the Harpoon system is needed on an urgent basis to overcome significant deficiencies in the Navy's ability to counter ship, aircraft and submarine launch platforms. The House conferees pointed out that the program is on schedule and within program cost.

The Senate recedes.

Air Force

Maverick (AGM-65)

The House approved the original authorization request of \$88.0 million. The Senate reduced the program by \$30.3 million, which represented the advance buy funds for Fiscal Year 1976, on the basis that current program deliveries should be stretched over Fiscal Year 1976 to prevent a surge in the production rate followed by a slow-down. The House conferees position was that stretching the contract will necessitate renegotiation with the contractor and concomitant increases in the price of the missiles. The advance buy funds will allow continuing the production towards attaining the requirement without a costly gap or stretch which could cost an additional \$26.0 to \$50.0 million.

After discussion, the Senate conferees agreed to the House amount except as to \$7.9 million representing long lead funding for Fiscal Year 1976.

The Conference Committee approved an authorization of \$80.1 million.

Modifications for in-service missiles

The House authorized the full request of \$49.0 million. The Senate reduced the Air Force modification program funds \$8.1 million by reducing the AIM-9J modification funds from \$14.5 million to \$6.4 million on the basis that the Air Force had only a quarter of the planned number of "B" version SIDEWINDER missiles in inventory for this modification.

The House recedes. The amount authorized is \$40.9 million.

Minuteman

The House authorized the full request of \$312.0 million. The Senate amendment reduced the total by \$13.6 million, the amount for the procurement of MINUTEMAN missiles to replace those to be utilized for the Operational Base Launch (OBL) tests from Montana to the Pacific Ocean. The Senate's reduction is in accordance with a Senate provision in Title VII of the Senate amendment prohibiting funds authorized in this Act from being used for flight tests of the MINUTEMAN missile except from Vandenberg Air Force Base, California. The House conferees agreed to the Senate language restriction and, therefore, the dollar reductions.

The House recedes.

Spares and repair parts

The House authorized the full request of \$75.1 million for Missile Spares and Repair Parts. The Senate reduced this amount by \$2.0 million, which would have been used for the procurement of spares and repair parts associated with the MINUTEMAN Operational Base Launch (OBL) tests from Montana to the Pacific Ocean.

The House recedes.

Marine Corps
TOW missile

The House approved \$30.8 million, the amount requested by the Marine Corps, for the procurement of TOW antitank missiles. The Senate reduced this figure to \$28.9 million, a reduction of \$1.9 million, as a result of a recalculation of funding requirements.

The House recedes.

Naval Vessels

Nuclear powered attack submarine (SSN)

The House authorized \$502.5 million for 3 nuclear attack submarines. The Senate amendment contained \$335 million for 2 submarines.

The House conferees pointed out the necessity of maintaining a steady program, especially in the construction of nuclear ships, and the greatly increased reliance on submarines in naval operations.

The Senate recedes.

Sea control ship (SCS)

The House authorized \$142.9 million for the lead sea control ship.

The Senate denied this amount since fiscal year 1974 funds of \$29.3 million for design and long-lead procurement for the lead ship has been held up by the Appropriations Committees.

The Senate conferees pointed out that because of this delay, the sea control ship should not be placed under contract in fiscal year 1975.

The House conferees pointed out that the Navy had given up 47 percent of its fleet in order to get new ships, and that this was the first of the SCS class. The House conferees, therefore, believe strongly that funding for this ship should not be withheld completely, and indicated their desire to move forward with this class of ship.

The House reluctantly recedes on \$126.9 million of the authorization and the conferees agreed to an amount of \$16 million for the sea control ship.

Patrol frigate (PF)

The House bill authorized \$436.5 million for 7 patrol frigates.

The Senate amendment authorized \$186 million for 3 ships.

The House conferees stressed the desirability of authorizing these ships in sufficient numbers to make it attractive to private shipbuilders, and of not increasing program costs further by undue stretchout of the procurement.

The Senate conferees pointed out that the Mark 92 fire control system is still under development and will require extensive additional testing.

The Senate conferees were adamant and

the House conferees agreed to the 3-ship authorization.

The conferees direct that the contract for the 3 ships not be awarded until such time as the Mark 92 system has satisfactorily completed the required test and evaluation. Upon completion of the test and evaluation, the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House are to be advised of the results, including all deficiencies, for review prior to contract award for the fiscal year 1975 program.

The House reluctantly recedes.

Destroyer tender (AD)

The House authorized \$116.7 million for 1 destroyer tender.

The Senate denied this amount.

The Senate conferees stated that other submarine and destroyer tenders for which funds had earlier been authorized and appropriated have not yet been put under contract.

The House conferees pointed out, however, that the destroyer tenders were badly needed to support the new destroyer, the DD-963 class and the DLGN's.

The Senate recedes.

Outfitting and post delivery

The House authorized \$60.8 million for outfitting and post delivery.

The Senate reduced this amount by \$5.3 million.

The Senate conferees point out that \$1.4 million was included for the 2 patrol gunboats earlier removed from the program and that \$3.9 million would not be needed for obligation this year.

The House recedes.

Authorization by item for ship construction

The House language sets forth the amounts of money which are authorized specifically and only for each program. The Senate amendment did not include such language.

The House conferees pointed out the desirability of having better congressional control over shipbuilding funds since in the past many programs have been terminated and the funds transferred to other programs without prior approval of the committees.

The Senate recedes.

Tracked combat vehicles

Army

M30A1 Turret trainer (M60M1)

The House approved the original authorization request of \$6.0 million for the procurement of 34 M30A1 Turret Trainers. The Senate reduced the program with Army concurrence to \$4.5 million.

The House recedes.

M113A1 armored personnel carrier

The House authorized \$24.0 million for the procurement of M113A1 Armored Personnel Carriers (APC). Of the amount authorized by the House, \$9.4 million was for support of South Vietnamese Military Forces and has been transferred to Title VII. The remaining \$14.6 million was added by the House, at the request of the Army, in lieu of the procurement authorization for the

Armored Reconnaissance Scout Vehicle (ARSV).

The Senate amendment did not include the \$14.6 million.

It was the Senate position that the M113A1 is not a satisfactory reconnaissance/scout vehicle for the Army and that the Army should wait until the overall study of the reconnaissance/scout vehicle requirements were complete before investing any funds in the reconnaissance/scout vehicle area.

The House conferees believe that a replacement of the gasoline-operated M114 is necessary, and until a production decision on the MICV is made, the M113 APCs are the best replacement to the M114 that the Army can get.

The conferees agreed on an authorization of \$7.3 million for the procurement of APCs for the Army in Title I of the bill.

Other weapons

Army

Modification of weapons and other vehicles

The House approved \$9.2 million, \$2.3 million more than had been originally requested, for modification of weapons and other vehicles. The \$2.3 million added by the House, at the Army's request, was to provide additional modification kits for approximately 55 VULCAN Air Defense Systems.

The Senate recedes.

M 202A1 launcher, incendiary rocket

The bill contained \$2.6 million, the amount requested, for the procurement of M 202A1 Launchers and Incendiary Rockets. The Senate reduced this amount to \$1.7 million, a decrease of \$900,000. The Senate's position was that \$800,000 was to be utilized for Allied War Reserves which were not adequately justified.

The remaining \$100,000 is for Support of South Vietnamese Military Forces and is transferred to Title VII of the bill.

The House recedes.

M 60 machine gun, 7.62 mm

The House approved \$5.0 million, the amount requested, for the procurement of 6,000 machine guns. The Senate amendment reduced the amount to \$1.0 million, and 1,237 machine guns. The Senate's position was that \$4.9 million was to procure machine guns for the Allied War Reserves. The remaining \$100,000 reduction is part of Support of South Vietnamese Military Forces and is transferred to Title VII of the bill.

The House objected to the Senate reduction of \$3.9 million to the Allied War Reserve on the basis that it is essential that the production line for this weapon be kept open.

The Senate recedes. The total authorization is \$4.9 million.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

General

The Department of Defense requested authorization of \$9,325,039,000 for the fiscal year 1975 Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation appropriations.

The following table summarizes the Senate and House modifications to the Research and Development budget request:

FISCAL YEAR 1975 R.D.T. & E. SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	Conference					
	Change from					
	Request	House	Senate	Reclama	Amount	House Senate
Army	1,985,976	1,878,397	1,883,216	1,948,068	1,878,397	-4,819
Navy	3,264,503	3,153,006	3,178,742	3,260,969	3,153,006	-25,736
Air Force	3,518,860	3,459,760	3,389,470	3,451,470	3,389,517	-47
Defense agencies	528,700	485,500	509,657	521,400	491,057	-18,600
Test and evaluation	27,000	25,000	27,000	27,000	25,000	-2,000
Total program	9,325,039	9,001,663	8,988,085	9,208,907	8,936,977	-64,686
Reimbursements from foreign military sales			-35,673	-35,673	-35,673	-35,673
Total budget authority	9,325,039	9,001,663	8,952,412	9,173,234	8,901,304	-100,359

As shown, the conferees agreed on a total of \$8,936,977,000 which is \$388,062,000 less than the amount requested. The program total is further reduced by \$35,673,000 which

reflects reimbursements from Foreign Military Sales resulting in a total net budget authority of \$8,901,304,000.

The details of the differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment and the changes adopted by the conferees are reflected in the following table:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE ACTION

(In thousands of dollars)

Item number and program element	Fiscal year 1975 request	House		Senate		Conference
		Change	Authorization	Change from House	Authorization	
ARMY						
1. Aerial Scout	6,000		6,000	-5,360	640	1,916
2. Heavy lift helicopter	57,725		57,725	-21,200	36,525	36,525
3. Utility tactical transport system (UTTAS)	54,060	-5,000	49,060	+5,000	54,060	54,060
4. Cobra TOW		+4,500	4,500		4,500	4,500
5. Stinger	33,730		33,730	-1,500	32,230	32,230
6. Chapparral/Vulcan	7,229		7,229	-5,800	1,429	3,029
7. Site defense	160,000	-10,000	150,000	-40,000	110,000	123,000
8. Pershing II	11,200		11,200	-11,200		5,000
9. Advance forward area air defense system	44,668	-29,668	15,000	+29,668	44,668	30,668
10. Advanced ballistic missile defense	91,410	-26,410	65,000	+26,410	91,410	91,410
11. Cannon launched guided projectile	12,556	-6,256	6,300	+6,256	12,556	6,300
12. Surface-to-air missile development (SAM-D)	111,215	-11,215	100,000	+11,215	111,215	111,215
13. Kwajalein Missile Range	84,554	-4,554	80,000	+4,554	84,554	82,000
14. Bushmaster	7,030	-2,930	4,100	+30	4,130	4,100
15. Armored reconnaissance Scout vehicle	8,062	-3,762	4,300	-138	4,162	4,162
16. XM-1 tank	68,790	-3,790	65,000	+290	65,290	65,000
17. Weapons and ammunitions	7,306	-1,600	5,706	+1,600	7,306	5,706
18. Lethal chemical munitions	4,894	-1,894	3,000	-6	2,994	3,000
19. Mechanized infantry combat vehicle	9,011	+1,700	10,711	-1,700	9,011	10,711
20. Triservice tactical communications program	37,273	-2,273	35,000	+2,273	37,273	36,000
21. Clothing, equipment, and packaging technology	2,220	+1,500	3,720	-1,500	2,220	2,220
22. Food technology	5,986	+500	6,486	-500	5,986	5,986
23. Surveillance, target acquisition, and night systems (STANO)	15,398	-2,398	13,000	+2,398	15,398	14,000
24. Classified program	20,529	-4,029	16,500	+4,029	20,529	20,529
Safeguard	60,794		60,794		60,794	60,794
Programs not in dispute	1,064,336		1,064,336		1,064,336	1,064,336
Total, Army program	1,985,976	-107,579	1,878,397	+4,819	1,883,216	1,878,397
25. Reimbursements from foreign military sales				-7,973	-7,973	-7,973
Total, Army budget authority	1,985,976	-107,579	1,878,397	-3,154	1,875,243	1,870,424
NAVY						
1. Tactical air reconnaissance	5,300		5,300	-5,300		2,400
2. Classified program	5,700		5,700	-5,700		2,900
3. VCX (carrier on board delivery program)	4,961		4,961	-4,461	500	500
4. VFX fighter prototype	34,000	-34,000		+34,000	34,000	30,000
5. Surface launched weaponry	13,142		13,142	-4,000	9,142	9,142
6. Sanguine	13,205		13,205	-1,800	11,405	13,205
7. Surface missile guidance (cadv.)	3,000		3,000	-2,000	1,000	1,000
8. Trident missile system	648,767		648,767	-15,000	633,767	641,094
9. Fleet ballistic missile system	46,669	-9,669	37,000	+9,669	46,669	38,669
10. Sidewinder	522	+5,000	5,522	-5,000	522	12,522
11. Air launched air-to-air missile (Agile)	19,987	-19,987		+19,987	19,987	
12. SLCM	44,971	-2,500	42,471	-4,500	37,971	41,000
13. Aegis	67,012	-17,012	50,000	+17,012	67,012	63,000
14. Close-in weapon system (Phalanx)	32,100	-20,000	12,100	+20,000	32,100	15,000
15. Surface missile guidance	32,222	-7,200	25,022	+7,200	32,222	25,222
16. Advanced ship development	19,042	-3,000	16,042	-400	15,642	16,042
17. Radar surveillance equipment (eng.)	10,940		10,940	-3,000	7,940	10,000
18. Surface effect ships	57,981		57,981	-12,200	45,781	45,781
19. Improved SSBN	16,000		16,000	-16,000		
20. Classified program	7,319		7,319	-4,000	3,319	6,000
21. Classified program	24,096		24,096	-1,900	22,196	24,096
22. U.S.S. Hip Pocket	3,129	-3,129		+3,129	3,129	995
Programs not in dispute	2,154,438		2,154,438		2,154,438	2,154,438
Total, Navy program	3,264,503	-111,497	3,153,006	+25,736	3,178,742	3,153,006
23. Reimbursements from foreign military sales				-27,700	-27,700	-27,700
Total, Navy budget authority	3,264,503	-111,497	3,153,006	-1,964	3,151,042	3,125,306
AIR FORCE						
1. A-10 aircraft	93,905		93,905	-12,500	81,405	81,405
2. F-4 avionics	13,600		13,600	-1,000	12,600	13,600
3. Aircraft equipment development	4,994		4,994	-1,000	3,994	4,994
4. Electronically Agile radar	8,000		8,000	-4,000	4,000	4,000
5. Gas turbine technology	14,789		14,789	-1,800	12,989	14,789
6. Advanced tanker/cargo aircraft	20,000		20,000	-15,500	4,500	8,000
7. B-1	498,973		498,973	-44,000	454,973	454,973
8. Air combat fighter	36,000	-5,000	31,000	+5,000	36,000	32,000
9. Advanced ballistic reentry system	119,943	-15,000	104,943	+26,900	131,843	124,000
10. Advanced air-to-air weapons technology	3,100	-3,100				
11. Air launched cruise missile	80,000	-5,000	75,000	-11,000	64,000	71,500
12. Minuteman	142,900		142,900	-19,000	123,900	123,900
13. SLBM radar warning system	8,000	-8,000		+8,000	8,000	
14. NAVSTAR global positioning system	25,400	-2,500	22,900	+2,500	25,400	23,900
15. Conventional weapons	24,900	-4,900	20,000	+4,900	24,900	20,000
16. Improved aircraft gun system	9,690	-7,500	2,190	+10	2,200	2,190
17. Drone/RPV systems development	18,000		18,000	-11,000	7,000	17,000
18. Improved tactical bombing	11,828		11,828	-3,500	8,328	11,828
19. F-4/F-105 protective systems	5,400		5,400	-1,400	4,000	5,400
20. Joint tactical communications	15,700		15,700	-3,000	12,700	14,700
21. Minimum essential emergency communications network	7,500		7,500	-2,000	5,500	6,500
22. Advanced command and control capabilities	1,500		1,500	+5,000	6,500	6,500
23. Conus over-the-horizon (OTH) radar system	12,300	-2,000	10,300	+2,000	12,300	10,300
24. Improved capability for operational test and evaluation	11,900	-3,100	8,800	+3,100	11,900	10,500
25. Precision emitter location strike system	25,100	-3,000	22,100	+3,000	25,100	22,100
Programs not in dispute	2,305,438		2,305,438		2,305,438	2,305,438
Total, Air Force budget authority	3,518,860	-59,100	3,459,760	-70,290	3,389,470	3,389,517

Item number and program element	Fiscal year 1975 request	House		Senate		Conference
		Change	Authorization	Change from House	Authorization	
DEFENSE AGENCIES						
DARPA:						
1. Military sciences.....	41,100	-2,800	38,300	+2,800	41,100	38,300
2. Strategic technology.....	75,000	-6,000	69,000	+3,700	72,700	69,000
3. Management systems technology.....	2,743		2,743	-2,743		
4. Undistributed reduction.....		-8,000	-8,000	+8,000		-3,000
DCA:						
5. WWMCCS-JTSA.....	4,550		4,550	-1,000	3,550	3,550
6. Defense communications system.....	13,605		13,605	-3,500	10,105	10,105
7. Undistributed reduction.....		-5,000	-5,000	+5,000		
DMA:						
8. Mapping, charting and geodesy development.....	5,651		5,651	-1,000	4,651	4,651
9. Undistributed reduction.....		-2,000	-2,000	+2,000		-1,000
DSA:						
10. Defense documentation center.....	11,778		11,778	-500	11,278	11,278
11. Undistributed reduction.....		-500	-500	+500		
12. DIA (classified).....		-1,300		+300		
13. DNA (classified).....		-3,000		+1,000		
14. NSA (classified).....		-10,800		+5,800		
15. Technical support to OSD/JCS.....	18,800	-3,800	15,000	+3,800	18,800	17,800
Programs not in dispute.....	122,373		122,373		122,373	122,373
Total, Defense agencies budget authority.....	528,700	-43,200	485,500	+24,157	509,657	491,057
16. Director of Test and Evaluation.....	27,000	-2,000	25,000	+2,000	27,000	25,000
Total, R.D.T. & E. program.....	9,325,039	-323,376	9,001,663	-13,578	8,988,085	8,936,977
Reimbursements from foreign military sales.....				-35,673	-35,673	-35,673
Total, R.D.T. & E. budget authority.....	9,325,039	-323,376	9,001,663	-49,251	8,952,412	8,901,304

CONFERENCE ACTION ON SELECTED SUBJECTS IN THE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, FISCAL YEAR 1975 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

Surface naval gunnery

Section 201 of the House bill contains language specifying that \$57,500,000 of the amount authorized for Navy RDT&E shall be available only for application to surface naval gunnery excluding the Close-In Weapon System. This is intended to prevent such funds from being reprogrammed to other requirements as has been the practice in the past.

The conferees agreed with the importance of improving the effectiveness of naval gunnery. Newer technology programs such as guided ordnance and the 8" Major Caliber Lightweight Gun (MCLWG) will help achieve this objective.

The reprogramming of funds within the gun programs and projects may be accomplished in accordance with established procedures. The conferees discourage, however, the reprogramming of funds from the MCLWG, guided ordnance, and lightweight gun fire control system development programs.

The surface naval gunnery programs include the following:

Long Range Surface Weapon System (5" and 8" guided projectiles);

Surface Launched Munitions;

Fire Control Systems (Advanced);

Gun Systems including the Lightweight Intermediate Caliber Gun System; and

Fire Control Systems (Engineering) including the MK-68, MK-86 and 8" MCLWG. The Senate recedes.

A-10

Section 201 of the Senate amendment provided that \$81,405,000 shall be available only for the research, development, testing, and evaluation in connection with the A-10 aircraft and only if the A-10 wins the "fly-off" competition against the A-7D. The House bill contains no similar provision.

The Senate recedes.

ADVANCED FORWARD AREA AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM

The House bill authorized \$15.0 million of the \$44.668 million requested by the Army

for this system. The Senate amendment authorized the \$44.668 million request.

The Advanced Forward Area Air Defense System consists of the Low Altitude Forward Area Air Defense Missile (LOFAADS), which is also referred to as the Short-Range Air Defense Missile (SHORAD); the Manned Portable Air Defense System; and the LOFAADS gun programs.

The House reduction of \$29.668 million was directed toward the \$35.1 million requested for the SHORAD program.

SHORAD is intended to fulfill the Army need for an all-weather system that could defend adequately against aircraft attacking in nonvisual conditions.

While there is not a viable threat that has an all-weather capability at this time, both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees recognize the need to establish such a capability against potential threats. The conferees, however, were concerned with the conflicting testimony concerning the planned procurement of a SHORAD system. The Army indicated its intention to conduct an open competition for consideration of three foreign systems—the Roland, Rapier and Crotale, as well as proposals reflecting American technology. Several Defense witnesses, however, submitted prepared statements indicating firm plans to procure one of the three foreign systems. The Department of Defense had estimated that procurement of one of the three foreign systems will result in a savings of several hundred million dollars. The conferees are not convinced that this is necessarily the case.

Other reasons given for the procurement of one of the foreign systems are to realize a savings in time and to demonstrate our willingness to cooperate with our NATO allies. The conferees believe that while expediency is desirable, the time frame for the development of a viable all-weather threat is such that cost and performance effectiveness can be favored over time.

The conferees do not believe that it is necessary to procure a foreign developed SHORAD system solely to demonstrate cooperation with our NATO allies. The United States participation in the development of the NATO Patrol Hydrofoil Missile Ship is a very strong indication of our willingness

to cooperate. While the conferees support cooperative programs with our allies, consideration must be given to the procurement of foreign technology or hardware on a case by case basis.

It is the view of the conferees that any competition conducted for procurement of a SHORAD system must be open to all prospective bidders to insure procurement of the best system at the lowest possible cost and within the required time frame. Therefore, foreign systems must not be favored because of the earlier availability of test firing data. An all-weather American system, for example, may never have been fired but could conceivably provide equal or greater performance than a foreign counterpart at a much lower cost.

The conferees agreed to an amount of \$30.-668 million for the three Advanced Forward Area Air Defense System programs. \$21.2 million of this amount may be applied toward the SHORAD program.

AERIAL SCOUT

The House bill approved the full amount of \$6.0 million requested. The Senate amendment authorized \$640,000, which is \$5,360,000 less than the House and provided only for Army in-house costs. This will permit the Army to issue Request For Proposals to industry in October 1974 as planned, but would not support the planned contract date in mid-May 1975.

The Senate action reflects the fact that the Army has yet to decide whether to modify an existing Army helicopter, adapt a current United States or foreign helicopter for military use, or begin a new helicopter development. Since the planned contract date is only 45 days before the beginning of fiscal year 1976, the Senate considered that there would be little if any impact on the program to delay award of the contract until early in fiscal year 1976. Moreover, by next February, when the 1976 request is being reviewed by the Congress, the Committees will know which alternative the Department has selected and have a more meaningful basis for consideration.

The conferees agreed to authorize \$1,916,000 with the understanding that these funds will be used only for in-house support and costs incidental to issuance of Request for Proposals to industry.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

[In thousands of dollars]

	Request	House	Senate	Conference
Advanced ballistic missile defense.....	91,410	65,000	91,410	91,410
Site defense.....	160,000	150,000	110,000	123,000
Safeguard.....	60,794	60,794	60,794	60,794
Total.....	312,204	275,794	262,204	275,204

The House bill authorized \$275.8 million of the \$312.2 million requested for the three ballistic missile defense programs. The Senate amendment authorized \$262.2 million, or \$13.6 million less than the House. The conferees agreed to authorize \$275.2 million as indicated in the preceding table. This restores the Advanced Ballistic Missile Defense program to the full amount requested, and results in a reduction of \$37.0 million in the amount requested for the Site Defense program.

The conferees agreed that the primary objective of the Site Defense program should not be directed toward a prototype demonstration but rather the development of subsystems and components to advance the technology in such elements as sensors, missiles, and software. The conferees recognize the need to closely review the progress of this program next year together with technical progress of related developments in the Advanced Ballistic Missile Defense program, and the implications of any results of SALT II and continuation of the ABM treaty. This should provide a basis for determination of the actions to be taken on the fiscal year 1976 authorization request for these programs.

CANNON LAUNCHED GUIDED PROJECTILE

The House bill authorized \$6.3 million of the Army's request for \$12.556 million. The Senate amendment authorized the full amount requested.

The conferees concurred with the Army's need for a guided projectile but expressed concern over the number of developments in this area. The Army has two contractors for their parallel development effort while the Navy is developing a 5-inch guided projectile. The conferees believe that the possibility of the Navy 5-inch round to the 155mm configuration for use by the Army. Even with the increased drag caused by the sabot, the range of the Navy round is far greater than that of the Army's present round.

The conferees direct that the Director, Defense Research and Engineering define funds for procurement of an adequate number of sabot 5-inch rounds for a flyoff with the 155mm rounds during the fiscal year. The conferees believe that the possibility of using a common round will offset the investment for a flyoff.

The conferees believe that the \$6.3 million will be adequate for completion of the development of the Army's 155mm round and the flyoff. The flyoff will lead to a special meeting of the Defense Systems Acquisition Review Council in January 1975 to decide on the next phase of the program. If the results of the DSARC require the application of additional funds during the last half of fiscal year 1975, the conferees agreed that a prior approval reprogramming of funds from lower priority programs would be considered if submitted in accordance with established procedures. The Senate recedes.

HEAVY LIFT HELICOPTER

The House bill provided the full amount of \$57.7 million requested for the HLH program. The Senate amendment approved \$36.5 and denied \$21.2 million requested for a second prototype helicopter including reliability and maintainability improvement of components.

The Senate position reflects the concern that the start of a second prototype in fiscal year 1975 would be premature for this advanced development program particularly since serious technical problems and schedule delays have been encountered. However, the Senate recognized that if the first prototype succeeds in proving the Advanced Technology Components (ATC) programs, additional development prototypes would be appropriate coincident with a decision to begin engineering development.

The House recedes but the conferees agreed that if the present technical problems involving the ATC program are solved and the program progresses satisfactorily through the first half of the fiscal year, a reprogramming action may be submitted in accordance with established procedures to increase the program to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense.

PERSHING II

The House bill authorized \$11.2 million as requested by the Army. The Senate amendment provided no funds for this program. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment authorized \$12.0 million as requested to support the Radar Area Correlation project which will prove the technology required for Pershing II.

The Senate conferees agreed to restore \$5.0 million in the Pershing II program. The conferees agreed, however, that studies should be undertaken to provide an updated cost effective analysis of this program that considers all available tactical weapons that could be employed. The conferees further request that the Army explore the feasibility of participation in this development effort by the NATO countries. The Army is requested to provide this data as part of the FY 1976 request for authorization for this program.

AEGIS

The House bill authorized \$50.0 million of the \$67.012 million request by the Navy. The Senate amendment authorized the full amount.

The House action was based on the belief that the Navy had not accomplished an acceptable level of system planning that is commensurate with the \$400.0 million expended to date on the Aegis program.

The conferees agreed to increase the funding level to \$63.0 million for the fiscal year 1975 planned effort which includes development of the Combat Systems Engineering Development Site. The conferees concur in the fact that subsequent authorization requests for Aegis will be predicated upon:

Successful at-sea testing that demonstrates the ability of Aegis to meet its prescribed performance objectives;

At-sea operation and maintenance of the Aegis system by shipboard personnel only;

Definition and approval by both the Navy and the Department of Defense of the platform(s) for Aegis; and

A cohesive integration plan specifying the interface of Aegis with the platform(s) and other weapon and command/control systems.

AIR-TO-AIR DOGFIGHT MISSILES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Request	House	Senate	Conference
Agile.....	19,987	0	19,987	0
AIM-9L.....	522	5,522	522	12,522
CLAW.....	3,100	0	0	0

The conferees agreed to an amount of \$12.522 million for Air Force and Navy air-launched air-to-air missile programs as outlined above.

Of the \$12.522 million, \$4.522 million is authorized for the AIM-9L Sidewinder development program. This missile is the latest

product improvement to the Sidewinder series and will be used by both the Navy and the Air Force. Navy testimony on the program indicated that the budget request of \$0.522 million was based on starting procurement in fiscal year 1975 but that technical problems with the missile had caused production to be delayed. The Navy indicated that additional funds of \$4.0 million would be required to support the development program this year, and the conferees agreed to provide that amount.

The conferees expressed concern over the conflicting requirements provided by both the Navy and Air Force for an advanced technology follow-on missile to the Sidewinder series. The Navy indicates the need for a missile with the off-bore-sight acquisition capability of the Agile; yet the Air Force contends that this characteristic would provide virtually no added combat capability. After expending \$75.0 million on the Agile program, the Navy stated that they were in the process of reviewing the dogfight mission requirements to establish how the intercept took place, what the angles were, how much off-bore-sight acquisition capability was required, and what percentage of the required performance could be achieved with an improved Sidewinder. The data provided to the conferees has not supported either the Claw or Agile approach.

The Senate recedes and agrees to terminate the Agile program in its present form.

The conferees agreed to authorize \$8.0 million to initiate the development of a common Air Force/Navy dogfight missile for the 1980 time frame. This amount has been added to the Sidewinder AIH-9L account. Prior to expenditure of these funds, however, the Navy and Air Force must agree upon a mutually approved joint requirements document that delineates the performance requirements for the common dogfight missile. When the Services inform both Committees that this has been accomplished, the technology base already developed in the Agile, Claw and Sidewinder programs can be used as a basis to start this new program.

The conferees further agreed that compatibility of the missile with the new lightweight fighter/attack aircraft must be both considered and attainable.

The conferees believe that there are no technical reasons that preclude the development of a common dogfight missile for both Services. Firm requirements, however, must be established prior to the expenditure of funds to develop complex technology that may not even be required. The Committees on Armed Services wish to be kept advised of progress during the ensuing year on this program development.

CLOSE-IN WEAPON SYSTEM (PHALANX)

The House bill authorized \$12.1 million of the \$32.1 million requested by the Navy for this program. The Senate amendment authorized the full \$32.1 million.

CIWS was designed as a fast reaction, last ditch defense against the anti-ship missile. An engineering prototype has been in test for over one year.

The House conferees pointed out that the validity of the tests performed to date is questionable insofar as the simulated targets do not adequately reflect the intended threat.

The conferees agreed to authorize \$15.0 million for the conduct of performance effectiveness tests against dynamic target replicas, i.e., simulated targets by the Navy, and to gather preliminary reliability and maintainability information necessary for a production decision. This data will provide a basis for Congressional consideration of the fiscal year 1976 request.

IMPROVED SSBN

The House bill authorized the \$16.0 million requested to initiate development of an improved submarine launched ballistic missile system called the SSBN-X. The Senate

amendment provided no funds for this program because it was deemed premature. The conferees support the concept of this submarine system, which would contain much of the Trident system technology but be smaller and less costly. The plan for a hi-lo mix of Trident and the SSBN-X in the late 1980s and beyond, when Poseidon replacement will become necessary because of age, is considered to have merit.

The conferees agreed that a delay of one or two years in the initiation of this program would also permit the lessons learned in developing the Trident system to be applied to the SSBN-X. The lead submarine contract for Trident has not yet been awarded and much development work still remains to be done.

The conferees considered that preliminary investigations of the SSBN-X, if required, would be appropriate for the Navy to conduct under the Advanced Ship Development program for which \$16,042,000 is authorized. The House recedes.

NAVY RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAMS

The Navy request for authorization included \$5.3 million to initiate the development of a reconnaissance pod to be carried on tactical fighter and attack aircraft, and \$5.7 million to initiate the development of a carrier-based electronic intelligence airplane (called TASES) to replace the present EA-3B. The House bill authorized both requests, while the Senate amendment deleted the funds for both programs.

The Senate questioned whether the A-7E attack airplane was suitable for performing reconnaissance missions and stated that the Navy had not resolved the operational concept of utilizing fighter and attack airplanes in the reconnaissance role. The conferees agreed that the Senate's questions were valid and required resolution before the reconnaissance pod development program is initiated. The conferees restored \$2.4 million of the request, which was specifically identified by the Navy for development of improved sensors that could be used in a reconnaissance pod or in the present RA-5C aircraft.

The Senate's objection to the TASES program was the announced plan to install the electronic intelligence-gathering equipment in anti-submarine warfare airplanes. The conferees agreed with the Senate position that a dedicated TASES airplane should be procured, and restored \$2.9 million to start development on the TASES system with the understanding that these funds are made available only if the dedicated concept is pursued.

USS HIP POCKET

The House bill deleted the entire \$3.129 million requested by the Navy. The Senate amendment authorized the full amount.

In the USS Hip Pocket program the Navy installs new technology aboard ship for at-sea evaluation. The conferees believe that the Navy can use its development assist type tests for such evaluations and does not need dedicated funding for this purpose. The conferees agreed to restore \$995,000, as reclaimed by the Department of Defense, to the fiscal year 1975 program for completion of those tests for which long lead items were procured.

The Senate recedes and agrees that this funding will conclude the USS Hip Pocket program.

NAVY FIGHTER PROTOTYPE

The Navy's request was for \$34.0 million to begin development of a VFX lightweight fighter to be a complement to and follow-on for the F-14 in the 1980's. The House deleted the entire request since the Navy did not present a solid argument in favor of developing another lightweight aircraft. Further, the Navy could not adequately describe the reasons why either Air Force prototypes, the YF-16 or YF-17, could not be made carrier compatible to satisfy the requirement.

The Senate approved the full request giving strong endorsement for the VFX as defined by the Navy fighter study group but also recognized the possibility of adapting one of the Air Force prototypes to the Navy role.

Subsequent to the House bill, the House conferees were provided with additional testimony by the Navy that described and better defined the need for a VFAX, a common lightweight fighter/attack aircraft.

The conferees, therefore, agreed with the Senate position that the Navy should proceed with this program. The House was persuasive that \$30.0 million should be entirely adequate to support the Navy's planned program in fiscal year 1975.

ADVANCED TANKER/CARGO AIRCRAFT

The House bill authorized the \$20.0 million requested. The Senate amendment authorized \$4.5 million, because the requirement had not been clearly defined and because the amount provided would be adequate to support the three competing contractors in concept development, trade-off studies and preliminary design during the last half of the fiscal year.

The conferees request that the Air Force provide a detailed and comprehensive analysis of airlift requirements in support of the fiscal year 1976 authorization request for this program which will include consideration of all aircraft, whether in inventory, being procured, or under development, and the airlift assets of our NATO allies.

The conferees agreed to authorize \$8.0 million as reclaimed by the Department of Defense. This increased amount represents a revised estimate of the cost of the work described above for the three competing contractors.

B-1 AIRCRAFT

The House bill authorized the full \$499.0 million requested. The Senate amendment authorized \$45.0 million. The Senate stated it was dissatisfied with continued increases in cost and delays in schedule.

The program proposed by the Air Force for fiscal year 1975 provides for continuation of the program presented last year plus an initial request for a fourth development aircraft, acceleration of some development effort that previously had been planned to be conducted after the production decision, and some production type engineering design effort.

The conferees are concerned that the management reserve funds requested by the Air Force may not be adequate to meet the technical problems and schedule delays that might occur during the coming year. The House conferees agreed with the Senate action to increase the management reserve fund by \$30 million.

The Senate Committee in its report provided restrictions on the development of new initiatives and the fourth aircraft. After considerable discussion, the conferees agreed to the following statement of intent regarding new initiatives and the development of the fourth aircraft.

The effort toward the development of, or new initiatives relating to, the fourth or subsequent aircraft is contingent upon and may not commence prior to successful first flight of the prototype aircraft. At that time, the Air Force can initiate a prior approval reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures to use the unexpended portion of the management reserve funds to initiate this development.

The conferees are concerned with the accomplishment of a successful first flight.

The conferees believe that the comprehensive cost effectiveness study being conducted by the Department of Defense under the cognizance of the Director, Defense Research and Engineering will provide an important basis for consideration of the authorization request to be submitted for fiscal year 1976.

The House recedes and agrees to a funding level of \$455.0 million.

SUBMARINE LAUNCHED BALLISTIC MISSILE RADAR WARNING SYSTEM

The House bill deleted the entire \$8.0 million Air Force request for the Submarine Launched Ballistic Missile radar warning system. The Senate amendment approved the full amount.

The House rationale was based upon the fact that the Air Force did not establish that the technology of the proposed system was necessary to meet the early warning requirements.

The Senate recedes; however, the conferees agreed to delete the funds for this program without prejudice.

The conferees request the Air Force to examine existing radar systems for performance and cost effectiveness and to reestablish the requirement for them in light of the overlapping capability with other systems. Upon further study, should the Department of Defense establish a convincing need to proceed with the research and development aspects of this program in fiscal year 1975, i.e., this type of system is required and is necessary to replace older systems which have excessive logistic support and maintenance costs relative to their operational effectiveness, the matter would be appropriate for submission of a reprogramming action. Consideration should be given to the Army's efforts in this area.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO OSD/JCS

The House bill authorized \$15.0 million of the \$18.8 million request by the Department of Defense. The Senate amendment authorized the full amount.

The House action was directed toward the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group (WSEG). The utility of their studies was questioned insofar as they seemingly had little impact on the Research and Development programs.

Subsequent to this action, the Director, Defense Research and Engineering has clarified the role of the WSEG and has taken measures to enhance its effectiveness.

The conferees agreed to increase the level of funding for OSD/JCS support to \$17.8 million. The \$1.0 million reduction may be applied on a program priority basis.

TITLE III—ACTIVE FORCES

Title III of the bill contains the authorization for the end strength of the active-duty component of the armed forces for fiscal year 1975.

The House bill had reduced the authorization by the military departments by 2,810, all of the reduction coming from the Air Force.

The Senate amendment had reduced the total authorization by an additional 46,213, including numerical reductions from the separate components as follows:

Army, 16,700;
Navy, 13,380;
Marine Corps, 3,598; and
Air Force, 12,535.

The Senate conferees insisted upon the soundness of their position and maintained that manpower reductions could and should be made without affecting combat units.

The House conferees, however, were adamant that reduction of the magnitude prescribed by the Senate amendment could not be made without seriously affecting the capabilities of our forces. The conferees considered this matter in great detail, and agreed to the component strength authorization as provided in the House bill.

The Senate reluctantly recedes.

Support forces in Europe

The Senate amendment contained a provision, section 302(a), expressing the sense of Congress that U.S. military forces in Europe have an excessive number of headquarters and noncombat military personnel rela-

tive to the number of combat personnel located in Europe. The provision would have required the noncombat component of the Army strength in Europe to be reduced by an amount of not less than 20 percent over a two-year period, with 50 percent of the reductions completed on or before June 30, 1975. The provision further stated that the Secretary of Defense could increase the combat component strength of the Army in Europe to the extent support forces were reduced. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The House conferees were opposed to the Senate provision in its original form and expressed their deep concern that no unilateral reductions be made in U.S. forces in Europe inconsistent with the NATO position at the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) negotiations and that no action to reduce forces be taken in such a manner that it would violate the understanding achieved with NATO allies pursuant to the Jackson-Nunn amendment in the fiscal year 1974 procurement authorization act. The House conferees also expressed the belief that the support reductions would be excessive if charged exclusively against the Army strength in Europe. It would have required a reduction of approximately 23,000 support troops. The Senate conferees assured the House conferees that the thrust of the amendment was not to enforce any unilateral reductions but to bring about an improvement in the forces by reduction in support personnel accompanied by corresponding increases in combat personnel. The Senate conferees were insistent that reductions could be made in support personnel in Europe.

After extensive discussion, therefore, the conferees agreed on a modified version of the Senate provision which stipulates that the noncombat component of total U.S. military strength in Europe shall be reduced by 18,000 to be completed not later than June 30, 1976, with not less than 6,000 of such reduction completed on or before June 30, 1975, and that the Secretary of Defense is authorized to increase the combat component strength of the U.S. forces in Europe by the amount of any such reductions made in noncombat personnel.

Standardization in NATO

The Senate amendment contained a provision, section 302(b), requiring the Secretary of Defense to make an assessment of the loss of effectiveness in NATO because of the failure to standardize weapons systems, ammunition, fuel and other items, and further charged the Secretary of Defense to bring such assessments, together with recommendations for standardization actions, to the attention of NATO so that such assessments and recommendations can become part of the NATO review of its force goals. The House bill contained no such provision.

The House conferees did not object to the conduct of the study or desirability of standardization but believed that the Secretary of Defense should report to the Congress prior to submitting his findings to the NATO Council so that Congress would have an opportunity to make a prior judgment on the recommendations if it so wished. The House conferees, therefore, recede with a revision of the language providing that the Secretary of Defense shall report his findings to the Congress and subsequently bring them to the attention of the appropriate NATO bodies.

Tactical nuclear warheads

Section 302(c) of the Senate amendment contained language freezing the number of tactical nuclear warheads in Europe as of the date of enactment of the bill except in the event of hostilities.

The House conferees accepted this Senate provision with a revision which limited the freeze until June 30, 1975, and deleted the semi-annual reporting requirement.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FORCES

Title IV of the bill contains the annual authorization for the average strength of the Selected Reserve for each Reserve component of the Armed Forces. The House and Senate differed on the strength figures for the Army National Guard, the Army Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve and the Air National Guard. There was no difference in the authorization for the Air Force Reserve or the Coast Guard Reserve.

The House and Senate compromised their figures as follows:

For the Army National Guard the Senate had authorized 390,000 while the House had authorized 408,000. The conference agreed on 400,000.

For the Army Reserve the Senate authorized 220,000 while the House authorized 225,000. The Senate recedes.

For the Naval Reserve the Senate authorized 110,000 while the House authorized 117,000. The Senate recedes.

For the Marine Corps Reserve the Senate authorized 36,703 while the House authorized 38,000. The House recedes.

For the Air National Guard the Senate authorized 93,412 while the House authorized 95,000. The Senate recedes.

Where the Senate yielded, it was on the basis that recruiting results and current strength provisions had exceeded original Senate estimates. That is, the Senate believed that the higher figures were justified but had authorized a lower amount based on expectations of what the Reserves could obtain.

The House receded in the case of the Marine Corps Reserve because it is believed that the average strength figure could not be obtained based on the Marine Corps failure to increase their Reserve strengths in fiscal year 1974.

In the case of the Army National Guard where both Houses receded, it was believed that the figure 400,000 was adequate without the disestablishment of any units and would permit a desired manning level.

Airlift crew ratio and use of Air Guard and Reserve

The House in section 402 of the bill stated that the average strength prescribed by section 401 of this title for the Air National Guard of the United States shall include a force of not less than 91 flying units. The Senate had no comparable section.

However, in section 303 of the Senate amendment it was declared to be the policy of Congress that any increase in the ratio of aircrew to aircraft for the strategic airlift mission of the Air Force above the present ratio of 2.00 active-duty crewmembers and 1.25 Reserve force crewmembers per aircraft should be achieved through the components of the Selected Reserve and not by increasing the active-duty force level of the Air Force. The section also directed the Secretary of Defense to formulate a plan to increase the strategic airlift crew ratio per aircraft to the required levels by utilizing jointly the resources of the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve. The plan, under the Senate amendment, shall specifically include:

(1) restructuring the missions of Air National Guard units so as to retain an effective strategic airlift capability within the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve;

(2) the utilization of Air National Guard units now in existence so as to avoid the loss of existing skills in those units;

(3) alternatives, including, but not limited to, transfer, rotation, "hybridization," and "association," for making available to the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve strategic airlift aircraft in numbers sufficient to support an effective capability; and

(4) a test of the "hybrid concept" for Air National Guard units in the strategic airlift role using C-5 or C-141 aircraft at not

less than 2 existing Air National Guard facilities.

The Senate amendment section also required the Secretary of Defense to submit his plan to the Congress not later than 90 days after enactment of this act.

Both the House and Senate receded in their language and substituted new language which requires that the Air National Guard of the United States shall be used to man a force which shall include not less than 91 flying units in the Air National Guard during fiscal year 1975.

It also states as a policy of the Congress that any increase in the ratio of aircrew to aircraft for the strategic airlift mission of the Air Force above the present ratio of crewmembers per aircraft should be achieved to the maximum extent possible through the components of the Selected Reserve and not by increasing the active-duty force level of the Air Force. The Secretary of Defense is directed to study the possibility of increasing the strategic airlift crew ratio per aircraft to the required levels by utilizing jointly the resources of the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve.

In making such a study it is directed that the study should include:

(1) restructuring the missions of the Air National Guard units so as to retain an effective strategic airlift capability within the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve;

(2) the utilization of Air National Guard units now in existence so as to avoid the loss of existing skills in those units;

(3) alternatives, including, but not limited to, transfer, rotation, "hybridization," and "association," for making available to the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve strategic airlift aircraft in numbers sufficient to support an effective capability; and

(4) the desirability of new statutory authority for the limited selective mobilization of members of the Air National Guard under circumstances not leading to a declaration of a national emergency by the Congress or the President.

The Secretary of Defense is required to submit to the Congress not later than 180 days after the enactment of this act, and before the implementation thereof, his evaluation of such a study, the proposed schedule for its implementation, and such recommendations for legislative action relating to the subject matter of this section as he deems appropriate.

The conferees dropped a Senate provision that have implied transfer of control of C-5A and C-141 Air Force strategic airlift aircraft to the various state national guards.

TITLE V—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Both the Senate and House authorized civilian personnel end strengths by services and Defense agencies.

The House reduced the number requested by the Department of Defense by 15,000 with the reductions to be allocated among the services by the Secretary of Defense.

The Senate amendment reduced the DOD request by 44,600 and specified where the cuts should be made.

After extensive discussions both the House and Senate receded and agreed to a fiscal year 1975 end strength for Defense civilian personnel of 995,000. This is a reduction of 32,327 from the Defense Department request and is to be apportioned among the military departments and Defense agencies by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives within 60 days after the enactment of this Act on the manner in which this reduction is to be apportioned among the military departments and the Defense agencies and among the mission categories described in the Manpower Requirements

Report. Because the reduction includes many unfilled spaces and because over 200,000 new civilian employees are expected to be hired in fiscal year 1975, the Department of Defense should be able to accomplish the full reduction by normal attrition without layoffs of present employees.

Civilian strength adjustment

Section 502 of the Senate amendment declared the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense use the least costly form of manpower and directed that the Secretary of Defense in developing annual authorization requests be required to consider the advantages of conversion of military to civilian personnel and vice versa. There was no similar provision in the House bill. However, the House bill, in section 501 (c), provided for an adjustment for civilian strength authorized whenever the Secretary of Defense or Service Secretary determines that a function or activity will be performed by direct-hire civilian employees and vice versa.

Both the Senate and the House receded and new language was agreed to providing that it is the sense of Congress that the Defense Department use the least costly form of manpower that is consistent with military requirements and other needs of the Department of Defense. It further directed that in the development of the annual manpower authorization requests to the Congress, the Secretary of Defense shall consider the advantages of converting one form of manpower to another (military, civilian or private contract) for the performance of a specified job. The justification of any conversion from one form of manpower to another shall be contained in the Annual Manpower Requirements Report to the Congress required by section 138(c) (3) of title 10, United States Code.

Section 502 of the House bill authorized the Secretary of Defense, when he determines that such action is in the national interest, to employ civilian personnel in excess of the numbers authorized by section 501, provided that the number of additional personnel to be employed shall not exceed 1 percent of the total number of civilian personnel authorized by section 501, and further provided that the Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify the Congress of any decision to increase civilian personnel strength pursuant to this authority. The Senate amendment did not provide such authorization.

The conferees adopted the House language but provided that the authority of the Secretary under this section shall be limited to 1/2 of 1 percent for use on a temporary basis to meet emergencies.

TITLE VI—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

Section 601(a)

The Senate amendment provided the authorized Military Training Student Loads as requested by the Department of Defense as follows:

Army	97,638
Navy	71,279
Marine Corps	26,262
Air Force	52,900
Army National Guard	12,111
Army Reserve	6,873
Navy Reserve	2,536
Marine Corps Reserve	3,403
Air National Guard	2,359
Air Force Reserve	1,126

The House added 3,000 to the Army Reserve and 500 to the Marine Corps Reserve, as requested by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs and concurred in by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Education.

The Senate authorized the strengths requested but in section 601(b) required the Secretary of Defense to adjust the Military

Training Student Loads consistent with the manpower strengths in Titles III, IV, and V. This would meet the intent of the House increases.

The House, therefore, recedes.

Education assistance

A floor amendment to the Senate amendment would have precluded the Department of Defense from denying financial assistance to any person pursuing an educational program solely on the grounds that such person is enrolled in a college that terminated ROTC.

The House conferees were adamant that this provision be deleted from the bill.

If the universities and colleges wish to divorce themselves from the training program offered by ROTC, the House conferees believe the Department of Defense should be allowed to withhold financial assistance to persons at those institutions. The choice of whether such colleges or universities desire to reinstate the ROTC is totally up to the institution.

The Senate reluctantly recedes.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Military assistance in support of South Vietnam

As indicated in the discussion of Title I, in the explanation of the transfer of procurement authorization for Military Assistance to South Vietnam to Title VII, the conferees agreed on a limitation of \$1 billion on authorization for appropriation for support of South Vietnamese forces.

Both Houses had included new language providing for this military assistance program to be managed as a single account. The conferees agreed to accept the more restrictive language of the Senate amendment providing for the establishment of a separate appropriation and account for military support to South Vietnam. Pursuant to the agreement authorization for procurement was transferred from Title I to Title VII.

The conferees wish to emphasize that prior year's military assistance to South Vietnam which was Service funded was an annual authority and expired at the end of each fiscal year. Since the conference report does not include any new service funded authority for FY 1975, all unused Military Assistance Service Funded (MASF) authority automatically expired at the end of FY 1974. Hence the Department of Defense has no authority to use any unobligated balances in Service funds for support of South Vietnamese military forces.

Disposal of old ships

The Senate amendment contained a provision, section 702, requiring that any naval vessel in excess of 2,000 tons or less than 20 years of age may be sold, leased, granted, loaned, bartered, transferred, or otherwise disposed of only in accordance with a law enacted hereafter. It also stated that any other naval vessel may be transferred only after the proposed transfer has been presented to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House for 30 days of continuous congressional session.

The Senate conferees pointed to the necessity of getting formal congressional control over the transfer of naval vessels to other nations. The House conferees noted, however, that the language was far broader than that required to cover transfers to other nations. The conferees, therefore, agreed on modified language for the section consistent with the Senate's intent.

The House recedes.

CIA activities

Section 703 of the Senate amendment was a floor amendment to revise the National Security Act of 1947 so as to assure prohibition of CIA involvement in domestic activities. The amendment was not germane to the House bill and the House conferees

informed the Senate conferees that they could not consider nongermane amendments because of the Rules of the House. The House Committee indicated its intention to immediately consider legislation similar to the Senate provision.

The Senate, therefore, recedes.

Enlisted aides

Section 704 of the Senate amendment contained a provision that only 218 enlisted men may be assigned on a temporary basis to perform the duties of enlisted aides. The House bill did not address the issue.

The Senate conferees expressed the belief that the enlisted aide program was still being abused, there were too many unnecessary social activities engaged in by high ranking military personnel and that curtailment of authority for aides would help curtail unnecessary functions.

The House conferees pointed out that the congressional action taken during fiscal year 1974 reduced the number of aides from 1,722 to 675. This latter number was to be put into effect beginning July 1, 1975, and had not been given an opportunity to work. The House conferees were insistent that the agreement of last year be permitted to operate, at least on an experimental basis, before further reductions are made. The Senate conferees insisted that last year's action was insufficient. The Senate conferees agreed to yield on the number limitation provided the matter receives further scrutiny.

The conference, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to study the need for enlisted aides to provide military assistance to senior military officials and to report to the Congress the results of that study within 90 days. It was further agreed by the conferees that the House or Senate Armed Services Committee, or both, would hold hearings on these alternatives as soon thereafter as practicable.

Prohibition of research on dogs

The Senate amendment contained a provision, section 705, prohibiting the use of funds authorized by this act for the purpose of carrying out research, testing and/or evaluation of poisonous gases, radioactive materials, poisonous chemicals, biological or chemical warfare agents upon dogs. The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The conferees were advised by the Department of Defense that this provision would prohibit the conduct of all research involving the use of dogs even where the purpose was for the health and safety of civilian and military defense personnel, or for the benefit of dogs and other animals.

Many cases could be cited where use of dogs in research contributed to the health of human beings, cases where other species could not have been used.

For example, university experts related their experiments with a chemical that is found as a contaminant in the preparation of white flour for bread. When the bread containing this chemical was fed to dogs, even with very low levels of the chemical, it caused seizures. The importance of this finding was that a similar occurrence of convulsions might be expected in children. Of special significance, there were no adverse effects observed when the bread containing this contaminant was fed to other species.

The conferees do not support the use of dogs for research in chemical and biological agents whose only purpose is to destroy life. The conferees believe it is essential, however, that research to improve and save lives of either man or animal be continued. The conferees agreed that while the provision had merit, it required modification to permit certain research to be conducted that would benefit the health and safety of man. The conferees agreed to modify the language of section 705 of the Senate bill. The language as agreed to by the conferees will prohibit

the utilization of dogs in research for the purpose of developing biological or chemical weapons. However, it will not prohibit research on dogs for other purposes such as establishing immunologic levels, occupational safety hazard levels and other vital medical research designed to improve and save lives.

Prohibiting expenditure to stimulate domestic economy

The Senate amendment contained language, adopted on the Senate floor, which would prohibit the expenditure of any funds by the Department of Defense for the purpose of stimulating or otherwise forcing a change in the domestic economy, unless hereafter authorized by law.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The Senate language was not germane to the House bill and, as indicated, the House conferees were unable to accept nongermane amendments because of the Rules of the House. The House conferees further pointed out that the committees of both Houses had examined the purpose of the authorization in the present bill in great detail and in no case are funds authorized for the purpose of stimulating the domestic economy.

The Senate recedes.

Continuation pay for military physicians in initial residency

The recently passed physicians' bonus legislation, Public Law 93-274, precludes those in "initial residency" from receiving the new bonus. The new law also terminates continuation pay for physicians below the grade of O-6 (colonel/captain). Subsequent to the passage of the law it became known that some military doctors delayed their initial residency for some years and performed general medical duty during which service they received continuation pay. The effect of Public Law 93-274, therefore, would be that such physicians would lose continuation pay at the commencement of residency, thus suffering a substantial reduction in pay not intended by the Congress.

The Senate bill contained a provision authorizing continuation pay for physicians in initial residency, so that the Department of Defense could provide such pay to those in initial residency who are otherwise qualified. Five years of service are required by regulation for doctor to be eligible for continuation pay.

Because the provision was found to be nongermane to the House bill, the House conferees could not accept the provision. However, recognizing the merits of the amendment, the House conferees agreed to introduce separate legislation in the House and to give the legislation prompt consideration.

The Senate recedes.

Culebra

The Senate bill contained a provision prohibiting expenditure of funds by the Navy after December 31, 1975, for operations involving target practice at the Island of Culebra. The House bill contained no such provision.

The House conferees expressed their concern that adequate practice facilities be available to the Navy. The House accepted the Senate provision with a language modification which prohibits the use of the Culebra complex for target practice during any period of time that negotiations required by Public Law 93-166 have been ended on the initiative of the U.S. Government prior to the conclusion of a satisfactory agreement on a new site. In Public Law 93-166 Congress authorized the appropriation of \$12 million for construction and equipment of a site for the relocation of the ship-to-shore gunfire and bombing

operations from the Island of Culebra. Written into the law was the provision that the relocation of such operations from Culebra is conditional upon the conclusion of a satisfactory agreement to be negotiated by the Secretary of the Navy or his designee with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. To date, negotiations have not identified a satisfactory alternative site.

The purpose of the provision agreed to by the conferees, therefore, is to assure that authorities for both the U.S. Government and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico diligently pursue negotiations for the purposes of satisfactorily resolving this issue at the earliest possible date.

The conferees noted the receipt of a communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense reiterating the intention of the Executive Branch of relocating the target site from the Culebra complex no later than December 31, 1975, but emphasizing that the Department of Defense has no intention of relocating the training facilities currently on Culebra until a suitable permanent site is agreed upon.

Authority to enlist non-high school graduates

A provision included in the DOD Supplemental Authorization for Appropriations Bill for FY 1974, reads as follows:

"No volunteer for enlistment into the Armed Forces shall be denied enlistment solely because of his not having a high school diploma."

Section 709 of the Senate amendment included a provision that would add the wording to the above language, "... when the enlistment is needed to meet requirements established by the Secretary of the service concerned."

There was no similar provision in the House bill.

The Senate conferees stated the provision in the Senate amendment was intended to insure that a non-high school graduate would not be denied original enlistment solely because the potential recruit was not a high school graduate, particularly when the enlistment was needed to meet established requirements for new accessions to the Armed Forces. But they pointed out that the language in the Supplemental Bill could conceivably be given the interpretation that the Armed Forces could not give preference to enlisting high school graduates over non-high school graduates. By the additional language of Senate amendment this would permit the Secretaries of the various departments to use educational levels as indications of qualifications for personnel management and for the screening of personnel acquisitions.

The House recedes.

Recruiting advertising

The Senate amendment contained a provision stating the sense of Congress that in advertising activity for the recruitment of military personnel the Department of Defense should utilize "all major forms of public media, including the broadcast media." The House bill contained no such provision.

The House conferees pointed out that there was nothing in law at present specifically prohibiting the use of advertising in any one specific media and that it would appear to be consistent with the sound legislative practice to pass a law to permit something not prohibited by law. In addition, the House conferees pointed out that the amendment could be taken as a move to require equal distribution of advertising funds among all media without regard to the most cost-effective means of conducting an advertising campaign. The House conferees, therefore, were adamant in their opposition to the amendment.

The Senate reluctantly recedes.

Operation base launch

Section 711 of the Senate amendment provided that none of the funds in the bill may be used for the purpose of carrying out flight tests (including operational base launch) of the Minuteman missile from anywhere in the United States other than Vandenberg AFB, Lompoc, California.

The Senate language would prevent the Air Force from flight testing Minuteman under operational conditions from missile wings in Montana and elsewhere. Such testing had been planned by the Air Force and the House bill included \$13.6 million for tests.

The House conferees strongly supported the desirability of such realistic testing. However, the Senate conferees were adamant. The House, therefore, recedes.

War reserve stock limitation

The Senate amendment contained a provision designed to prohibit the use of funds authorized in the bill for stockpiling war material for use of any Asian country except as authorized by section 701, the Foreign Assistance Act, or the Foreign Military Sales Act. The language further prohibited transfer of already stockpiled material to any Asian country except as specifically authorized by law.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The House conferees strongly opposed the Senate provision. The House conferees noted that no hearings had been held on the provision and that this is a very complex matter which could seriously hinder the planning of the Armed Forces for their own requirements as well as coordination with allies in a crisis.

The House conferees were adamant and the Senate, therefore, reluctantly recedes.

Procurement of medicine and medical supplies

The Senate amendment contained a provision adopted without hearings eliminating the existing exclusion in law which permits the purchase of medicine or medical supplies by other than competitive procurement with formal advertising. The House bill contained no such provision. The Department of Defense opposed the amendment.

The House conferees pointed out that this would be a procedural change in a complex procurement area which could involve significant delays in the procurement of medicines and medical supplies and could involve consideration of proprietary rights. Further, the House conferees pointed out that the writing specifications for use in formal advertising could complicate the procurement of medicines. The Senate conferees agreed that there were complex questions involved which had not been thoroughly aired as would have been the case if public hearings were held. Most importantly, the House conferees insisted the amendment was nongermane under the rules of the House.

The Senate, therefore, recedes.

Kahoolawe

The Senate amendment contained a provision which would have directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct an investigation for the purpose of locating an uninhabited island other than Kahoolawe to be used for target practice by the military services. The House bill contained no such provision. The House conferees pointed out that there is a requirement for air-to-surface and surface-to-surface bombardment training by our military forces and pointed out that a Defense Department study completed in 1972 reaffirmed the need for meeting this requirement at the Island of Kahoolawe.

The Senate recedes.

Awarding of master's degrees

The Senate amendment included a provision to allow—subject to the approval of a

nationally recognized civilian accrediting association approved by the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare—the Commandant of the Army Command and General Staff College to confer the degree of master of military art and science upon graduates of the college. There was no such language in the House bill. During the 90th Congress the House passed similar legislation but no action was taken in the Senate.

Since 1963 the Command and General Staff College has conducted a graduate program which was, until 1966, accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This is a voluntary program offered only to a very limited number of officers who have been rigorously screened for academic and professional competence. By accrediting the program, military art and science was recognized as a distinct academic discipline by the North Central Association. However, the accreditation was withdrawn on June 30, 1966, only because the Command and General Staff College did not have degree-granting authority.

The Senate conferees pointed out that the granting of such degree would promote wider recognition by the civilian academic community of the military calling as a profession by providing a related scholastic discipline. Further, this would be a major help in securing faculty recognition of ROTC instructors who could obtain a graduate degree in the discipline in which they teach.

The House recedes.

Formal advertising

The Senate amendment contained a provision adding a new report required relating to military procurement. The provision would have required the head of an agency to submit to Congress a report describing each purchase or contract, the value of which amounted to \$1 million or more, where formal advertising was not used. The House bill contained no such provision.

The House conferees maintained that the amendment would have instituted an extensive reporting requirement without substantial benefit to the Congress. The House conferees believe that adequate information on procurement procedures can be obtained by the Congress under present procedures. The Congress is continuing to improve its information-gathering function by use of such procedures as the recently revised Selected Acquisition Report. The House conferees believe that additional reporting requirements should not be instituted except in response to detailed study by the Congress to assure that such reporting is necessary. The House conferees further stressed that the provision was not germane. The House conferees were, therefore, adamant in their opposition and the Senate reluctantly recedes.

Export of technology

The Senate amendment contained language which would have provided the Secretary of Defense with substantially more authority in all administrative decisions relating to the granting of export licenses on the sale of goods or technology to foreign countries. There was no similar provision in the House bill.

The House conferees accepted the Senate provision with a modification which restricted the purview of the Secretary of Defense to goods, technology, and industrial techniques which have been developed in whole or in part as a direct or indirect result of research and development or procurement programs of the Department of Defense. The conferees were unanimous in their expression of concern over the fact that our country has apparently unwittingly committed itself to the sale of items which will enhance the military capabilities of our potential enemies.

CXX—1573—Part 19

It should be noted that under the conference report the Congress, by concurrent resolution, may override the decision of the President where he reverses a decision of the Secretary of Defense to recommend against the approval of an export license.

Deadline extension for military decorations and awards

The Senate amendment contained a provision, section 719, to extend the time limits for the award of military decorations to individuals for service between July 1, 1958, and March 28, 1973. Written recommendation would have to be made within one year and awarding of the decoration within two years. The House bill had no similar provision.

The principal purpose of the amendment is to benefit individuals who served in Vietnam. Delays have been experienced in receiving recommendations or in gaining substantiating information because many individuals involved were prisoners of war.

The House conferees recognized the merits of the amendment and did not wish to prevent the awarding of decorations in meritorious cases involving former prisoners of war. However, the House conferees were unable to accept the provision because it is not germane to the House bill and, therefore, could not be accepted under the Rules of the House. The House conferees stated that separate legislation to accomplish the purposes of the provision has been introduced in the House and would be given a hearing in the near future.

The Senate conferees, therefore, reluctantly recede.

Recomputation of military retired pay

The Senate bill contained a floor amendment not considered in committee which would have provided recomputation of military retired pay on January 1, 1972, pay scales. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The House conferees indicated they were unable to consider the amendment because it was nongermane to the House bill and the Rules of the House precluded the acceptance of nongermane amendments in conference.

The House conferees indicated plans to consider major legislation revising the military retirement system in the future and indicated that recomputation proposals would have an opportunity to be presented during those hearings.

TITLE VIII—NUCLEAR-POWERED NAVY

The House bill had a separate title, Title VIII, that would establish the policy of the United States to modernize its naval strike forces by making its new major strike combatant ships nuclear powered.

The House language defines the major combatant vessels, requires the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the Congress, and requires that all authorizations and appropriations for major combatant vessels shall be for nuclear-powered vessels, unless the President fully advises the Congress that construction of nuclear-powered vessels for such purposes is not in the national interest.

The House conferees reviewed the many instances in which it took congressional initiative to bring about nuclear-powered ships for the Navy.

The Senate conferees desired to make the definition of major combatant vessels more explicit by spelling out that the ships that would be traveling with aircraft carriers could be cruisers, frigates and destroyers, and that ships which might operate independently could also be cruisers, frigates and destroyers in addition to submarines and aircraft carriers. The conferees do not intend that ocean escort ships, such as the sea control ship, the patrol frigate, the patrol hydrofoil missile ship, the surface effect ship or amphibious ships such as the landing heli-

copter assault ship (LHA) be included in this "major combatant" category requiring nuclear propulsion.

The language of the title was modified accordingly.

The Senate recedes.

SUMMARY

The bill as agreed to in conference, totals \$22,195,037,000, of which, \$35,673,000 will come from reimbursements for foreign military sales.

The figure arrived at by the conferees is \$935,102,000 less than the amount requested by the Department of Defense.

F. EDW. HÉBERT,
MELVIN PRICE,
O. C. FISHER,
CHARLES E. BENNETT,
SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
L. C. ARENDS,
BOB WILSON,
CHARLES S. GUBSER,

Managers on the Part of the House,

JOHN C. STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
THOMAS J. MCINTYRE,
STROM THURMOND,
JOHN G. TOWER,
PETER H. DOMINICK,
BARRY GOLDWATER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LET JUSTICE BE DONE

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, truth and justice ultimately will prevail in the United States. The U.S. Supreme Court in its unanimous decision of today ruled that no man is above the law and that we are a government of laws not of men. The President sought to frustrate the pending criminal proceedings instituted by the Special Prosecutor by denying to the Special Prosecutor evidentiary matter. He sought to establish an exemption for himself under the guise of executive privilege, and the Supreme Court said, "No." It is surely true that "justice though moving slowly seldom fails to overtake the wicked."

There will be some who will now urge further delay of the impeachment proceedings in order to give the President an opportunity to comply with the Supreme Court order, and should he comply, to allow the Judiciary Committee to listen to the tapes. I do not believe that further delay is necessary or justified. The Judiciary Committee need only establish that there is probable cause that the President has committed impeachable acts. It is not its function to have a trial on those issues nor to consider all the evidence that might be adduced at a trial.

In my opinion the evidence supporting articles of impeachment now being considered by the Judiciary Committee is overwhelming and I cannot believe that a further delay in those proceedings will be tolerated by the membership of that committee. We are approaching the end of the drama. After the Judiciary Committee makes its report there are two further actions to be taken: a vote by

the full House of Representatives and the subsequent trial of the President by the Senate.

Let justice be done.

MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., SAYS NATION NEEDS ECONOMIC LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has announced that he will make an address on the economy tomorrow night.

I hope that he will address himself to the full range of our economic problems: From the inflation that keeps pushing prices up, to the recession which is cutting back production and threatening jobs.

New Government figures have underscored once again the seriousness of our economic predicament. Consumer prices went up another 1 percent in June, and the inflation has now spread to a wide range of goods and services.

Meanwhile, take-home pay dropped 4½ percent from a year ago, after inflation is taken out.

Production also dropped, for the second consecutive quarter, and that used to be the definition of a recession before the administration tried to change the definition.

The other thing that is going up, besides prices, is the number of people who have no confidence in the administration's ability to solve economic problems. That figure reached 83 percent, according to a new poll out yesterday.

It is high time that the Nixon administration faces up to these problems. The administration has gone several months now with no economic policy at all, except tight credit and hands off everything else. The Nation needs better economic leadership than that.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICS AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Aeronautics and Space Technology of the Committee on Science and Astronautics may meet during debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF JUDGE KERNER

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that Federal Appeals Court Judge Otto Kerner, who has been convicted on several criminal charges, and is on his way to Federal prison, re-

signed this morning. As I announced last Thursday, it was my purpose to offer a resolution of impeachment in the House of Representatives tomorrow to impeach Kerner and strip him of his status as a Federal judge. That now becomes moot, as far as I am concerned.

I appreciate the fact that Kerner finally demonstrated the decency to resign, and thereby make it possible to sever him from the Federal payroll, and he will not further disgrace the judiciary by spending his time in prison as a Federal judge.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. 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. 403]

Andrews, N.C.	Dorn	Minshall, Ohio
Biaggi	Dulski	Murphy, N.Y.
Blatnik	du Pont	Owens
Boggs	Evins, Tenn.	Railsback
Brasco	Ford	Rangel
Breaux	Fulton	Reid
Burlison, Mo.	Gibbons	Rodino
Burton, Phillip	Gray	Roe
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Idaho	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Harsha	Satterfield
Clark	Heckler, Mass.	Smith, N.Y.
Clay	Hillis	Steele
Conyers	Hogan	Symington
Culver	Hollifield	Teague
Davis, Ga.	Ichord	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	Jones, Tenn.	Udall
Dennis	Kemp	Vander Jagt
Diggs	Kling	Wiggins
Dingell	Landrum	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 378 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1975

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16027) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. McDade, and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16027, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the Members are well aware the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act is scheduled to be debated after conclusion of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill. I know the Members are anxious to proceed with that bill. However, I would be extremely remiss if I did not explain some of the details of the \$3.1 billion Interior and related agencies appropriation bill.

Prior to that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation to the members of the subcommittee and members of the full committee, because this is the last bill I will bring to the House. I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman in the chair, who has presided over all the bills which this subcommittee has brought to the House while I have been chairman. I would also like to express my appreciation to the people at the desk, who have been so courteous; and to the members of the staff of the subcommittee and of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, today the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies presents to you its annual bill for your consideration. Since this will be the last time that I have the privilege of bringing this to the House, I would particularly like to express my appreciation to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, who has presided over the Committee of the Whole each year when we have brought our bill before you. His courtesy and knowledge of our problems are unsurpassed.

I would also like to express my appreciation to staff members at the desk who have been so courteous. I would also like to express my deepest appreciation to all the members of the Interior Subcommittee who have so faithfully participated in our committee activities. It has been rewarding to work with members from so many areas of this Nation who have performed diligently and responsibly in carrying out the activities which are nationwide and which spell out in capital letters—"America."

I salute Congressman YATES of Illinois; Congressman McKAY of Utah; Congressman LONG of Maryland; Congressman EVANS of Colorado; and Congressman VEYSEY of California. I would

also like to pay a tribute to our retiring member from Oregon, WENDELL WYATT—my distinguished colleague and neighbor. The Congress is going to miss Congressman WYATT's participation in our national endeavors.

To my very distinguished ranking minority member, JOE McDADE, my deepest appreciation for his unfailing courtesy, his continuing presence at committee meetings, and his great understanding of our national problems.

At this time I think it is also appropriate to express my appreciation to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the full committee who is and has always been cooperative, courteous, and helpful.

To our staff, David Willson and Byron Nielson, my gratitude and appreciation for long hours of service far beyond the call of duty. This appreciation also goes to Keith Mainland of the full committee.

To each Member of the House of Representatives who has participated in our public hearings and who has written us and talked to us about funding in terms of that funding's meaning to our national environment, economy, land management and human progress, my thanks.

May I recommend to the members of this committee that all of you read our volumes of hearing testimony for in these you will find not only detailed budgetary analyses, innumerable facts relative to the operation of the departments and agencies funded here today, but answers to many of the questions which America is currently asking.

The details of these hearings may help you to explain to your constituents exactly those problems which our Government and its citizens face in this year, problems which are not entirely soluble with money, but need a deep dedication to future management of U.S. resources.

There are highly controversial problems arising within the next few years. For example, we must carefully weigh the desire of Americans to utilize energy and yet fail to make adequate provision for the development of energy independence in this country. Instead we persistently rely upon fragile foreign commitments for major energy sources. Can the American economy survive if it must become a beggar before other nations of the world? How do we prevent failure of survival?

During the past year's energy crisis, we heard many words and gave lip service to conservation as well as development of energy independence. However, it is rather sad to discover that the moment oil is available again, no one seems to consider driving 55 miles an hour necessary, no one bothers about air-conditioning excesses, et cetera, and neither do Americans consider it necessary to proceed at full speed to develop our own energy source exploration. It is almost as if some of the American people were saying, "Let's live it up and to hell with the future." I do not believe that our Nation can survive with this attitude.

Our economy and our way of life is too involved with energy resources. At the

same time, it is necessary for America to realize that most energy resources are not renewable—oil and gas among them. Once depleted, they are gone forever. Therefore, this Nation must make its choices—use with conservation and judgment or consumption until destruction.

If one is under any illusions that energy does not enter into even the most remote community's economy, the hearings held in our committee, some of which were detailed in the earlier energy bill and some of which are detailed in the hearings on this current bill, should soon convince every Member of this body of the impact of energy loss.

Many communities sustain themselves exclusively by the tourist industry and lack of gasoline and the inability to purchase gasoline spells bankruptcy for the segments of this industry. This is actually true in almost every category of American life.

However, again let me emphasize that along with new sources of energy available to the American public, the American public must also use this energy with reason and some degree of appreciation for its precious life-building infusion for America.

In the category of alternatives facing the United States, we cannot escape the fiscal responsibilities of management nor the political responsibilities of judgment. If this Nation is to harvest its coal, what limitations must be put upon the land before there is a wholesale defacement which will last until eternity? If oil shale is to be pounded or changed into oil, will our Government find the resources to first announce the answers to that problem which is lying beneath every ton of rock in the West, "What about water?"

Our Government—Congress and the executive branch—have been singularly remiss for many decades on land management funding. They seemed to think that ownership, per se, was all that was important in land and its resources. The acquisition of land by anyone, including the Government, implies management.

We have some of the worst grazing land in the United States under the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. We have coal leases which were granted years ago and on which nothing has been done, either to recoup them for the Government or to proceed with orderly production and exploration. We have forest land which has been depleted and no reforestation done. We even have a struggle to find money to repair flood control damage on public lands.

I do not need to say it again for the committee has said repeatedly that the budget has never reflected in its preparation for us, land management—all it is is land occupancy. This year, which I shall note a little later, we are turning from that policy.

The committee has also warned repeatedly that if we were to remain a free Nation, we had to develop our options relative to energy. It was not until gasoline was not available that the Office of Management and Budget "got with it." Earlier they "spared no ponies" to make sure that Vietnam got all the

gasoline it needed. In fact, they drank it up over there, but what was the United States doing about developing alternate sources? Nothing! The budget was "pennywise and pound foolish." This administration is not the only guilty one. The problem goes back for several years.

Not only do we have the problem of choices to make in energy knowledge, and more particularly in the knowledge that will give to us energy without destruction of the land, air and water, but we also have come to the crossroads where we either declare that the management of our forests is for the future or it is a "cut and clear" irresponsible attitude of shrugging governmental shoulders about management. Our forests are the single renewable resource the United States has, but it is impossible to have this renewable resource available to the American public in the future if we do not make an investment in it now.

The committee has added substantially to the forest budget this year, and I may say this is without benefit of the blessing of the Office of Management and Budget because the committee realizes that to have a tree in 2020 that tree must be planted this year or next.

The Office of Management and Budget is sitting in a never never land dreaming under some kind of palms. I would suggest that they remove themselves from these exotic isles and face the brutal consequences of what happens when we have no watershed protection, no timber resources, and no recreation spaces for an ever-expanding America. They will feel reactions rather than the gentle tap of palm frond.

I make a strong and earnest plea also to the new budget committee which has been created by this Congress to take into account not only the military defense of this land, but the resource defense of the land. Unless the budget committee forthrightly faces its needs and provides management money for our natural resources, the congressional budget process will be as bad if not worse than it was before the creation of a budget committee.

There should be no single department in our natural resource domain that does not begin to inventory its needs and what will happen environmentally with production. Alternatives should be developed and long-range planning done.

The Federal Government may have achieved no success with land-use planning for private citizens, but there is no excuse on Earth why the Federal Government cannot implement land-use planning on its own acres, which, as I will note later, occupy one-third of this Nation.

It seems to me a salutary bit of planning to know, for example, when acres of land are to be scheduled for sale, what the environmental impact of that sale will be, so that the terms of the sale may acknowledge the environmental problems. This is true with coal, oil shale, rock, gravel, trees, et cetera.

If a computer can figure out what people like to wear and what they should eat, it seems to me that we can com-

puterize and assemble from all the vast data available to us, knowledge of our lands and our water.

As I have said to you for many years, the Interior Subcommittee does not spend the largest amount of money in the budget. In fact, the budget is barely more than 1 percent of Federal spending. Think of that in terms of the fact that this must provide management, exploration, et cetera, for one-third of the Nation's land. It is unfortunate we do not spend more. However, the significance of the committee's activities is in the immensity of the land and problems we serve, the people of the land and the relationship of the resources to the survival of America.

In this budget we have substantial increases for many categories including the U.S. Park Service which is the finest in the world. There are increases in other areas, and with this budget I bring to this committee of the whole House a plea for your tolerance. It is not easy to take the wide variety of agencies we handle—27—and go from the national forests to fine arts and not say, "Well, I can't see why those people should have money. Of what importance are they?"

We are not like many of the appropriation bills which deal with items of transportation or national defense or health because we deal with all of them. We have roads, health, and resources which are the national defenses. We also deal with education, art, culture, environment, water, fish, and humanistic programs. In fact, the great gentleman who preceded me as chairman of this subcommittee used to call this Interior bill, "the all-American bill" for it reflects the entire spectrum of our national life.

The committee has never been able to afford the luxury of prejudice. We have to view tolerantly the archaeological explorations in the Near East, to understand the water transportation system of the trust territories, the necessity for boarding schools for Indians located in isolated areas, and the need to propagate with fish the streams of the United States.

Our responsibility runs from Micronesia to Maine, from Alaska to Florida and in this budget today we present to you management funds proposed for the preservation and orderly development of our natural resources and for the well-being of the American citizen represented in this budget.

There are those who will rise on the floor and discuss some silly-sounding title of some project developed through the cooperation of a foreign government and the Smithsonian Institution. On pages 205 and 206 of volume 2 of our hearings you will discover that in a discussion as to strange-sounding titles that Dr. Chalmers of the Smithsonian very carefully points out several references to subjects which picked out of context sound extremely strange yet they have had a deep impact on the total scientific knowledge and today's basic information relative to studies which have resulted in benefits for all mankind.

We present this bill not in the amounts which the committee wishes, nor in the amounts which we think responsible, but

within severe fiscal responsibility restraints.

There are those who will say that recreation across the far-flung areas of our domain is of less than no consequence and yet these same people will pile themselves into a car on Friday night and depart for a junket into our national forests or our national parks and growl if there isn't a TV hookup for their trailers. Needless to say, our national parks and national forests welcome the public for they agree with the committee that it is far far better for a Nation to be outdoors enjoying the sunshine and the beauty of America than to be sitting on some city street figuring out ways to tear up the pavement or destroy their neighbors.

As I have said for 8 years, we have not been legislating for Illinois, Washington, Utah, Maryland, Oregon, California, Colorado, Pennsylvania, or Texas. We have had to become Americans and to appropriate money for the entire United States. The letters "US" in the committee's vocabulary stands for us—America.

Our Nation is wide and long—our needs and our people are divergent. Ladies and gentlemen of this committee, America is a dream woven of many strands of national need, desires, and goals—a dream that becomes, when finished, a great and mighty fabric.

Within this bill there is a reflection to some degree of the best which is in each of us, and the understanding we need to give this Nation for its strength. Perhaps we also reflect our failures and our shortcomings, but if in this budget we also reflect the use of these lessons and try to build a more successful tomorrow, we will have accomplished our purpose.

So, in summary again please regard the bill with tolerance for the American who loves an art gallery, for the American who wants to tramp in the wilderness, for the American who wants a better education for his child. Accept the challenge and please note that the committee is trying to reflect, moneywise, the steps necessary to achieve survival, growth, and greatness.

I will go into the bill with reference to various categories so that you may have an opportunity to understand what the hundreds of items are about and what relationship they bear to the total management of our world for 1975.

We are a small amount over the budget, and I have no apologies whatsoever. We could have cut forestry, we could have cut Indians, we could have cut health, and we could have cut forest protection. But, to what purpose?

If you will look at the table in our committee report, which I shall note in a moment, you will find that our bill brings in more revenue to the Treasury of the United States than is herein appropriated. Also, measure what this bill does as against other expenditures in this Government. One helicopter for God knows whose use costs about three times the amount of the sum we are over the budget.

I am also sure that we have some highly unpopular items in the bill and some, as I noted, which will be the target of the funmakers, but I am also sure we have some very popular items or the

committee would not have been besieged with so many requests from Members and the general public.

Our bill does not reflect your total wants nor your district's, as I noted earlier, it reflects the best we could do.

I have said some very unkind things about the Office of Management and Budget not only this year, but in the past. For once, I want to express my appreciation to them for recognizing the tremendous needs of the Indian Health Service and placing in our fiscal budget the amounts of money which were additions last year, thus reflecting the desire of Congress and the administration—because of the presidential signature—in wanting to better the health and lives of one of the most poverty-ridden segments of our American population.

I trust that in future years the Office of Management and Budget will be as sensible about other items and that they will understand full well it is necessary to provide funding for laboratories to solve the problems of forest insects, that they will decide once and for all Indian children should not be sent to school in firetraps that could be of great peril to their lives, and finally that the Office of Management and Budget will be so pleased with their stand for humanity and take such pride in their sensible humanitarian activities that they will continue to add to the health budget for the Indian people.

This bill, by the way, is really the fourth part of the Committee's appropriation activities. A breakdown of the other three are as follows:

First. In the second supplemental appropriation bill, nearly \$160 million was appropriated for a wide variety of programs. Included was more than \$97 million for the U.S. Forest Service including money to pay for firefighting on public lands and \$6,213,000 for insect control. In the wake of the energy crisis, the bill also provided some \$18 million to help meet Government costs in counteracting the Nation's crisis.

Second. The special energy research development and appropriation bill of some \$2.2 billion was enacted by Congress. This was in response to filling the fuel tanks and redirecting our national resources toward greater self-sufficiency and items included are listed as follows:

Geological Survey:	
Geothermal investigations...	\$9,774,000
Energy-related geologic investigations	30,851,000
Water resource investigations	2,125,000
Total, Geological Survey	43,125,000
Bureau of Mines:	
Energy research (mostly coal liquefaction and gasification)	86,098,000
Metallurgy research related to energy	4,100,000
Mining research	52,100,000
Subtotal, Bureau of Mines	142,298,000
Office of Coal Research	261,278,000
Fuel allocation, oil and gas	69,590,000
Energy conservation and analysis	26,875,000
Grand total	543,166,000

Third. The continuing resolution kept the generated forces of the Federal Government moving at a constant level but paused to instruct the Department of Interior to increase environmental research to make certain that energy development would not sacrifice environmental excellence—research fleets.

While we are prone in Congress to reflect only our failures and be extremely critical, I cannot help but remind the members of this committee that during the past 8 years there has been progress and genuine progress in many fields.

In 1960, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was sponsoring 612 students in colleges and universities. In 1974 the number reaches 17,471 Indian youths enjoying the grants for higher education which this budget has funded. Yet, we are confronted with our own Government reports which say:

American Indian students, for example, score lower at every grade level than does the average student. In addition, Indian students have greater problems with reading and mathematics development. Further, the drop-out rate among Indian students is exceptionally high.

That is only one more aspect of problems facing American Indians. Beyond the administration's budget, the subcommittee received requests totaling more than \$500 million for a wide variety of Indian needs, wants, and dreams. We have met a fraction of the challenge.

In the field of Indian health, may I suggest that you may want to read, beginning on page 465 of volume 1 of the committee hearings, the discussion of Indian health problems, programs, and progress. I would also like to point out the following accomplishments:

*Health improvement—calendar year
1955-72*

Death rates:	Percent decrease
Infants.....	67
Under 28 days.....	58
28 days to 11 months.....	72
Maternal.....	54

Influenza and pneumonia.....	58
Certain diseases of early infancy.....	66
Tuberculosis, all forms.....	85
Gastritis, et cetera.....	81
Congenital malformations.....	52
Incidence rates:	
New active tuberculosis cases.....	61
Trachoma.....	64
Increased use of service—Fiscal year 1955-73	
Hospital admissions.....	104
Women provided family planning services.....	79
Outpatient visits.....	412
Dental services.....	379

However, it is also not inappropriate to call to the attention of the committee some of the problems remaining:

First. The effects of rising medical care costs and energy—supply and shortages;

Second. The need for continuing preventative health service;

Third. The continuing need for better alcohol control programs and mental health programs;

Fourth. Maternal and child care—the time after the mother has returned from the hospital with her child still remains a critical health time in the Indian world;

Fifth. Much has to be done to improve the housing and sanitation facilities of Indian homes to correct health deficiencies;

Sixth. More knowledge and training must be given to the Indian mother in the matter of nutrition and child care;

Seventh. Dental health needs to be stepped up, for although we take care of the very young, we are not even attempting to solve the problems of the middle-aged and the elderly with dental programs;

Eighth. Much needs to be done in the entire field of nutrition; and

Ninth. There remains the deficit in construction.

There is a total backlog of \$370 million for medical facilities construction. We are building one new Indian hospital this year although 20 are outmoded. Interestingly enough, if you will study the foreign operations budget and list the hos-

pital construction that Congress has managed for countries overseas, there has been a great deal of attention given to hospital construction.

As I noted last year, in the years from 1965 through 1972 this Congress authorized the expenditure of \$43,675,000 for the construction and capital improvements of American hospitals abroad in Beirut, Paris, Turkey, Rome, Taiwan, Nigeria, Israel, Poland, Afghanistan, India and in those same years hospital construction for American Indians in the United States of America was \$19,693,900. These figures speak for themselves, but as a footnote, may I remind this Congress that American Indians are our own citizens, and it was probably due to their cooperation that we are now here as a nation.

Some recipients of hospitals abroad, I daresay, seldom bother to worry about the United States for more than the cash that has been spent there. I am interested in good hospitals wherever they be, but let us not forget that our American Indians have a priority.

Also, as we appraise our successes, may I repeat for your information what the committee learned during its hearings relative to a very interesting application of space technology to Indian health needs.

In the Tanana Valley in Alaska, community health aides are now communicating with doctors via the ATS-1 satellite and are able to get prompt advice on the care of sick patients. For years, communication in the remote villages of Alaska has been a chronic problem. Regular radio communication is often so garbled as a result of the high mountains and the northern lights phenomenon that messages are completely unintelligible. As a result of this experiment in the Tanana Village, the Indian Health Service has decided that the only way to handle communication in the remote areas of Alaska is by satellite.

Mr. Chairman, it is now time to give you the summary of this bill:

SUMMARY OF BILL

Item	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1975	Recommended in bill	Comparison
Title I, Department of the Interior:			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	\$2,060,643,000	\$2,067,645,000	+\$7,002,000
Title II, Related Agencies:			
New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,073,951,710	1,085,870,310	+11,918,600
Subtotal, this bill.....	3,134,594,710	3,153,515,310	+18,920,600
Special energy research and development appropriation act.....	(561,633,000)	(543,166,000)	(-18,467,000)
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	(3,696,227,710)	(3,696,681,310)	(+453,600)

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

In addition to the amounts in the accompanying bill, which are reflected in the table above, permanent legislation authorizes the continuation of certain Government activities without consider-

ation by the Congress during the annual appropriations process.

Details of these activities are listed in appropriate tables appearing at the end of this report. In fiscal year 1974 these activities are estimated to total \$1,191,-

950,176. The estimate for fiscal year 1975 is \$970,391,038.

The following table reflects the total budget obligational authority contained both in this bill and in permanent appropriations for fiscal years 1974 and 1975:

Item	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	Change
Interior and related agencies appropriation bill.....	\$2,577,876,200	\$3,153,515,310	+\$575,639,110
Permanent appropriations, Federal funds.....	944,534,176	774,528,038	-170,006,138
Permanent appropriation, Trust funds.....	247,416,000	195,863,000	-51,553,000
Total, budget authority.....	3,769,826,376	4,123,906,348	+354,079,972

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES TOTAL BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEARS 1974-75

REVENUE GENERATED BY AGENCIES IN BILL

The following tabulation indicates total new obligational authority to date

for fiscal years 1973 and 1974, and the amount recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1975. It compares receipts generated by activities in this bill on an

actual basis for fiscal year 1973 and on an estimated basis for fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

Item	Fiscal year 1973	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975
New obligational authority.....	\$2,649,45,300	\$2,577,876,200	\$3,153,515,310
Receipts:			
Department of the Interior.....	4,431,759,000	8,563,017,000	8,703,740,000
Forest Service.....	469,747,535	417,320,000	458,785,000
Total receipts.....	4,901,506,535	8,980,337,000	9,162,525,000

SUMMARY OF INCREASES AND DECREASES

Following is a summary by bureau of the major increases and decreases in new obligational authority recommended for fiscal year 1975, including the reduction for agencies normally funded in this bill but included this year in the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act, 1975, compared with the budget estimates:

Major increases:

Forest Service.....	+ \$32,306,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs (excluding Revolving Fund for Loans).....	+17,685,000
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.....	+5,421,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	+2,500,000
Bureau of Mines.....	+2,164,000
Office of Water Resources Research.....	+1,095,000
Subtotal, major increases.....	+61,171,000

Major decreases:

Decrease below the budget in the energy appropriations bill.....	-18,467,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	-16,000,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs, Revolving Fund for Loans.....	-12,000,000
National Park Service.....	-4,458,000
Smithsonian Institution.....	-3,986,000
Geological Survey.....	-2,381,000
Bureau of Land Management.....	-1,773,000
Office of the Secretary.....	-748,000
Subtotal, major decreases.....	-59,813,000

Other decreases..... -904,400

Net total, increase above budget estimates..... +453,600

EFFECT OF COMMITTEE ACTION ON PROJECTED BUDGET EXPENDITURES (OUTLAYS) IN FISCAL YEAR 1975

The budget estimates for bureaus and agencies funded in this bill projected new obligational authority of \$3,134,594,710, and total expenditures of \$3,153,367,000.

The committee has recommended total new budget—obligational—authority of \$3,153,515,310, an increase of \$18,920,600 above the budget estimate. In the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act, 1975, the Congress approved a net reduction of \$18,467,000 in new budget—obligational—authority, making a net increase for agencies normally funded in this bill of \$453,600. Concurrent with its recommendation of an increase in new budget—obligational—authority, the committee has also recom-

mended a reduction of \$2,410,000 in appropriations to liquidate contract authority.

The estimated net effect of committee action on expenditures for all bureaus and agencies normally funded in this bill for fiscal year 1975 will be a decrease of about \$1,300,000, consisting of a decrease of about \$9,600,000 in the special energy bill and an increase of about \$8,300,000 in this bill.

EXTENT OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN BILL

There follows a listing of selected items which indicate the extent of activities funded in this bill, and in the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act, 1975, for agencies normally funded in this bill:

Management of public lands:

Acres onshore:

Bureau of Land Management.....	451,043,353
U.S. Forest Service.....	187,255,013
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	52,635,948
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.....	31,148,846
National Park Service.....	29,117,412
Subtotal, acres onshore.....	751,200,572

Acres offshore:

Under 200 meters.....	515,000,000
Over 200 meters.....	631,680,000
Subtotal, acres offshore.....	1,146,680,000
Total acres.....	1,897,880,572

Current 1975 Construction

Road construction (miles):

Bureau of Land Management.....	44,330	182
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	22,000	725
National Park Service.....	10,204	17
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.....	6,022	---
U.S. Forest Service.....	201,317	8,000
Total miles.....	283,873	8,924

Recreation visitation (millions):	1973 actual	1975 estimate
National Park Service.....	216	236
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.....	25	20
Bureau of Land Management.....	50	60
U.S. Forest Service.....	188	202
Total visitations (millions).....	479	518

TIMBER PRODUCTION
FOREST SERVICE

An estimated harvest of 12.6 billion board feet is anticipated for 1975, with

receipts from sales of approximately \$437 million. This volume represents about one-fourth of the total timber and 30 percent of the softwood timber cut for industrial purposes annually, and is equivalent to the construction of about 1.2 million average sized homes.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Administers the sale of over 1.3 billion board feet of timber annually. Timber receipts are estimated to be \$126.2 million in 1975.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION
FOREST SERVICE

The national forests of the West, about 20 percent of the area, produce about 50 percent of the water, conservatively estimated at a value of over \$1 billion annually.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Administers an active program of soil stabilization practices on 160 million acres of public lands covering about 2,200 watersheds. Practices are designed to conserve and develop public land soil and water resources and include construction of small water control structures, contouring and cultivation, revegetation, protective fencing, and water developments.

GRAZING

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Administers grazing of approximately 9.1 million head of livestock and 2.4 million big game animals. Grazing receipts are estimated to be about \$14 million in 1975.

FOREST SERVICE

Administers the grazing of 6.1 million head of livestock, including offspring. This provides a continued and necessary source of grazing required by 16,600 family-type ranch units. In addition, an estimated 4.1 million big game animals graze on national forest lands.

MINERAL RESOURCES

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Administers mining and mineral leasing on approximately 819 million acres of land in the continental United States and more than 515 million acres of submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf within 200 meter water depth.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Provides the basic scientific and engineering data concerning water, land, and mineral resources; and supervises the development and production of minerals and mineral fuels on leased Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf lands. The value of production expected in fiscal year 1975 on Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf mineral leases is \$6.1 billion, with royalties accruing to the Government of \$880 million.

Bonuses from lease sales this fiscal year will approximate \$7.1 billion.

FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Produces in excess of 7.6 million pounds of fish a year. The cumulative effect is estimated to support approximately 44 million fisherman-days annually. In addition, this Bureau's refuges accommodate about 1.6 billion waterfowl-use days, not including Alaska. These refuges also support almost 6.3 million hunting and fishing-use days.

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

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

INDIAN EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools, 57,500.

Indian children in public schools, 98,000.

Indians provided with welfare guidance service, 96,100.

Operation and maintenance of 300 Indian irrigation systems.

ENERGY ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN THIS BILL

In the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act, 1975, a total of more than \$543 million was provided for agencies normally funded in this bill. Energy research programs funded in that bill were those of the Office of Coal Research, the Geological Survey, and the Bureau of Mines. Funding was also provided for the petroleum allocation and energy conservation and analysis activities now transferred to the Federal Energy Administration.

A large number of activities included in this bill also relate to energy but were not included in the Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act because they did not relate directly to energy research or were so closely tied to related nonenergy programs of the various bureaus that they were difficult to separate. In addition, budget amendments in some of these programs were received after the bill was considered by the House. Energy related activities included in this bill total approximately \$122.5 million, of which the principal components, along with the 1974 funding and the recommended funding for fiscal year 1975, are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Bureau/appropriation/activity	Fiscal year 1974	Committee bill 1975
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT		
Management of lands and resources:		
Land-use planning in energy areas.....	1,317	2,367
Environmental analysis for energy areas:		
Oil and gas.....		1,400
Arctic gaslines.....		3,500
Other non-Bureau energy initiatives.....	1,500	5,400
BLM initiatives.....	505	505

Bureau/appropriation/activity	Fiscal year 1974	Committee bill 1975
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT		
Energy leasing activities:		
OCS leasing.....	3,460	18,585
Coal.....	770	1,820
Oil shale.....	765	865
Geothermal steam.....	550	1,200
Upland oil and gas.....	1,550	1,860
Surface protection:		
Stipulations and compliance.....	1,050	1,700
Energy minerals rehabilitation inventory and analysis.....		1,400
Trans-Alaska pipeline inspection.....	7,214	8,714
Total, energy programs, Bureau of Land Management.....	18,681	49,316
U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY		
Surveys, investigations, and research:		
Special projects:		
Geothermal investigations.....	288	1,095
Energy impact evaluation.....		2,600
Arctic-environmental studies.....		400
Alaska pipeline.....	905	347
Water resources: Hydrologic studies.....	1,100	1,200
Conservation:		
Lease management.....	10,603	16,010
Resource evaluation and classification.....	6,040	16,328
EROS.....	225	50
Total, energy programs, Geological Survey.....	19,161	38,030
BUREAU OF MINES		
Mines and minerals:		
Mining research:		
Health-related research in coal mines.....	3,509	3,566
Safety research in coal mines.....	23,482	24,110
Data collection and analysis.....	2,850	3,000
Total, energy programs, Bureau of Mines.....	29,841	30,676
U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE		
Resources management:		
Coal and oil shale research.....	200	1,100
Trans-Alaska pipeline.....	450	500
Powerplant siting.....		700
Total, energy programs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.....	650	2,300
Subtotal, Department of the Interior.....	68,333	120,322
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FOREST SERVICE		
Forest protection and utilization: Surface Environment and Mining.....	1,750	2,220
Grand total.....	70,083	122,522

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING

The committee held extensive hearings on numerous budget proposals relating to the proposed accelerated oil and gas leasing program on the Outer Continental Shelf. The administration has proposed, as a part of Project Independence, to go from a current program of about 3 million acres leased in calendar year 1974 to a target program of 10 million acres leased in calendar year 1975.

The committee supports the objective of greater self-sufficiency in energy. However, the committee has grave reservations about the practical aspects of such a vastly accelerated OCS leasing program in 1 year. The committee believes that several ramifications of the effort to achieve this goal indicate that the public interest may be sacrificed. Specifically, the committee is concerned about the following:

For those lands which are leased, there must be assurances that there is expeditious exploration and development. The committee does not want the United

States to find itself in a situation, similar to the previous coal leasing program, where millions of acres are leased to companies which defer development on them in order to reap greater profits from future price increases. The committee understands that OCS leasing is under a different law than coal leasing, but the committee is concerned that through lease extensions, and so forth, a similar situation could result.

The committee wants assurances that the environmental impact of proposed OCS leasing actions is carefully and fully assessed before the leases are made. The committee understands that this is now a requirement under the Environmental Policy Act. However, the committee believes that environmental assessments must not be made merely to provide strict compliance with the procedures and the policy established by that act but also to gain a full understanding of the total impact of these leasing actions. In addition there should be the fullest public participation and dialog so that there is a complete knowledge by the Government and the U.S. public of the consequences of leasing activity or the lack of leasing activity on the relationship between production, consumption, and U.S. energy needs.

There must be assurances that the prices paid for the leases reflect fair market value and a fair return to the U.S. Government. The committee is concerned that private sector capital might diminish as a result of continuing large sales. In this case, the companies might fail to make bids which reflect the actual worth of the resource and that, with a stated "10-million-acre target," bids could be accepted at much less than fair market value in order to attain the target. The committee believes that it might be a far wiser policy to lease fewer acres in 1975 and extend the program into future years so that fair market values and environmental values may be attained.

The committee is also concerned that a lack of availability of materials such as drilling rigs and pipelines, particularly in deep water areas, could serve as a deterrent to the development of OCS leases and that there could be unwarranted lease extensions.

In summary, the committee believes that a "target of leasing 10 million acres" may be a reasonable one. However, the committee emphatically believes that this objective should be treated for what it actually is—a goal. In the pursuit of this goal, the United States must not sacrifice the public interest, for these are resources that belong to all the people, and all of the people are entitled to protection and consultation in their disposition.

The committee has not made substantial reductions in the budget requests that relate to the proposed 10-million-acre leasing program. With the funds provided, the Department should pursue its stated objective and prepare for a sound leasing program. The committee directs the Department to appear expeditiously before the committee and

justify the leasing of additional acreage before further calls are made for nominations of tracts which would lead to leasing in excess of 3 million acres.

The acquisition and evaluation of data under studies proposed in the budget pertaining to the level of leasing should be completed before a final decision is made on the level of an expanded offshore leasing program. This would include, at a minimum, justification of the proposed leasing level in terms of: First the role of offshore oil and gas in a comprehensive energy strategy or plan; second, the availability of drilling rigs, steel pipe, and personnel to support an expanded leasing program; third, the availability of capital to make the bonus bids and finance the exploration and development of the leases; fourth, the ability of the Bureau of Land Management and Geological Survey effectively to administer the program; fifth, the effect on revenues returned to the Federal Government of leasing the proposed acreage; sixth, the relative environmental risks involved in each of the areas proposed for lease; seventh, the onshore environmental, social, and economic impacts; and eighth, the relationship of potential offshore production to total reserves, total consumption, and energy conservation practices.

If you will read the hearings, you will also note that the committee has held extensive discussions with witnesses from the Department of Interior on how we should exercise our responsibility for managing our Outer Continental Shelf resources, a reevaluation of our sales procedures, and other highly controversial issues which need to be resolved.

These issues lie within the responsibilities of the legislative committee. However, it has long been my feeling, and some management people within Interior share my feelings, that alternative methods of sales procedures must be tried.

I realize that this can be nothing more than experimental, but whether we retain the bonus system with its demands to tie up substantial amounts of capital and result in larger corporations because of their maneuverability, securing the bids, or whether we move to an all royalty system, must be resolved. The entire problem of leasing public lands needs continuing legislative review and it needs the close scrutiny of legislative committees.

The committee has noted before, and I will note again, that there is also a tendency for certain dominant groups in one energy field to secure leases that will also allow them dominance in other energy fields. We know from our hearings that groups which produce oil now seek to secure geothermal leases. For the well-being of the country and its people and for the continuing credibility of industry itself, this situation should be under careful and constant review.

I feel that I have been highly privileged as a member of this committee for 10 years to review in the last 8 of those years the entire procedures and processes of our land policies including oil leasing and to have had the opportunity to

familiarize myself with many of the problems. I only wish every American might have shared this opportunity.

Responsibility will be reflected in the management of our lands and resources by completely openminded explorations of all the facets. We are a system based on private capital, but the public has a distinct interest in the use to which this private capital is put for it is unwarranted that at any time in this Nation an entire segment of the economy can be imperiled by greed or extraordinary profits.

Through our system of open hearings we have had all segments of our population representing, I am sure, the people, industry and the Government in attendance. A continuing dialogue among all three must continue. The people too little understand all facets of the problems, industry sometimes ignores the responsibility to the Nation whose system allows it to survive, and Government has not realized the tremendous managerial responsibility thrust upon it to make sure that the United States does not become a jungle of conflict and if continued will only result in bonfires meaning total destruction of credibility and common sense.

For many years, the committee has been concerned that budget constraints have resulted in inadequate budget resources for the U.S. Forest Service. The Forest Service is charged by law with multipurpose management of the 187 million acres under its jurisdiction. Not only must it provide a sustained yield of timber and fiber, but it must protect wildlife, provide recreation opportunities for all the people of the country, manage rangelands, and provide soil and water conservation.

Last year, the committee directed the Forest Service to develop a long-range, multiyear budget and management plan to bring the management of Forest Service lands up to standards consistent with multi-use objectives. In response to this request, the Forest Service has developed an "environmental program for the future." The committee held lengthy hearings on this plan and supports the current objectives and means to achieve them which the Forest Service has proposed. The Forest Service should now provide the widest opportunity for public comment on the plan's contents. When these comments are secured, the committee expects to have further discussions with the Forest Service so that the Congress can begin to implement its recommendations.

To further the solution to the coming problems which the years hold for our forests, and realizing that there is an obvious worldwide wood fiber shortage, the committee is moving ahead with expanded funding for the Forest Service.

A tree planted today obviously cannot be harvested tomorrow. More than 3 million acres of unreforested national forest lands are capable of growth for commercial use. Since trees are a renewable resource, to leave these areas unreforested is a waste to both the people and the Federal Government. It has been clearly established that for every dollar invested in reforestation and timber

stand improvement several dollars are returned to the Treasury. We have inflation in the value of wood products. We have an evershrinking land base. Future demand is going to increase. The one and the obvious relief is to expand the fiber supply.

Broad, bold, comprehensive action is required now if we are to prevent an acceleration in softwood lumber and plywood prices, and if, in fact, we are to provide fiber at any cost to meet the housing needs of the Nation in the years ahead.

The committee, therefore, proposes to institute this year a 10-year reforestation and timber stand improvement program. The committee is adding \$15 million to the administration's requested \$35 million to make a total of \$50 million available in the first year of this undertaking. This additional funding will provide planting for an additional 30,000 acres and the committee understands that this is the maximum amount the Forest Service can utilize. If these 30,000 acres had been planted years ago and were now forested with mature timber, that timber would be worth more than \$100 million. The committee believes that if this program is pursued for another 9 years, the entire 3.3 million acres of backlog can be completely reforested.

Costs of the program during the last 9 years will be even greater than that of this first year. Inflation will add more to the future costs. But, whatever the cost, the job must be done. It is a sound investment and will help solve the inflationary prices of softwood lumber, plywood, and homebuilding.

We urgently request that the Forest Service proceed immediately with the expansion of necessary nursery capacity and we urge that this program be vigorously pursued until completed. The committee is fully aware that the start of this program will not result in an immediate increase in the allowable cut, and must not be used as an excuse for such an increase in the cut. The entire goal and purpose would be defeated.

Not only is the committee concerned about the production of timber but also with the well-being of watersheds, the solution which trees can provide for environmental betterment, adequate provision for visitor use, and protection of fish and wildlife.

Therefore, the committee has, in this critical budget year, also provided additional funds, over the Forest Service budget, to accelerate work in these areas. Specifically, the committee has added \$739,000 for recreation use, \$1,000,000 for rangeland management, \$900,000 for soil and water management, \$360,000 for trees and timber management research, \$2,500,000 for watershed management research, \$760,600 for wildlife, range, and fish habitat research, \$570,000 for insect and disease research and \$4,921,000 for cooperation in forest fire control. It is expected that with these additions to the budget estimates, a basis for the expanded program in future years will be made so that the management of Forest Service lands may be brought to a level which is consistent with its multiple use objectives and with national needs. The committee makes no apology for meeting

a problem before it becomes a crisis and urges the new Committee on the Budget to hold adequate hearings to determine our natural resources budget requirements and responsibilities.

For the information of the Committee

of the Whole House, I would like to report that we held hearings on the various levels of funding necessary to bring varying degrees of achievement of a forest response to national needs. At this point I am presenting for your information

here the alternatives for a higher, moderate, and low management program so that the people in the United States in reading this hearing and that the Members of this Committee may know what they can provide for our future forests.

[During the period 1975-79 unless otherwise noted]

		High alternative			Moderate alternative			Low alternative		
		National forests	Assistance to private owners and States	Totals	National forests	Assistance to private owners and States	Totals	National forests	Assistance to private owners and States	Totals
Units of quantity										
Timber sales, per year	billion board feet	17.1	7	24.1	14.8	6.0	20.8	13.4	4.8	18.2
Increased timber supply from better utilization	do		11.4			7.3			4.0	
Timber access roads	miles	48,750			46,350			37,200		
Reforestation	million acres	3.4	12.1	15.1	2.2	9.1	11.3	2.0	5.0	7.0
Thinning	do	4.5	3.7		2.4	2.9		2.0	.9	
Increased annual allowable harvest by 1984	billion board feet	3.8			.8			.2		
Seedlings and improved trees	billions		6.9			5.1			3.5	
New recreation capacity	people at one time	351,000			87,000			15,000		
New recreation roads	miles	2,000			600			None		
New recreation trails	do	6,100			1,800			None		
Improved wildlife habitat	million acres	23.7	1.6	25.3	19.4	1.5	20.9	16.7	1.4	18.1
Range allotments under improved management	number	8,300			7,570			7,070		
Available grazing	thousand animal-unit-months	16,300			13,300			11,300		
Insect/disease detection surveys	million acres	3.4			2.5			1.8		
Erosion control and stabilization	acres	300,000	188,000	488,000	190,000	110,000	300,000	100,000	83,000	183,000
Acres saved from burning		350,000			260,000			35,000		
Man-caused fires prevented		5,000			3,700			500		
Fire improvements		245			90			None		
Fuel and firebreaks	miles	15,250			12,000			8,000		
Land acquisition	acres	375,000			130,000			74,000		
Property corners established	number	32,100			21,800			13,200		
Cash receipts (1975-79)	millions	\$2,327			\$2,273			\$2,248		
Timber sales in 1984	do	\$846			\$815			\$802		
Returns to States and counties	do	\$528			\$516			\$510		
Budget for 1975	do	\$1,080.5			\$766.5			\$669.2		
Budget for 1975-79	do	\$6,776.9			\$4,682.8			\$3,345.5		

LOG EXPORTS

The committee has renewed a limitation on the use of funds available under this act for sales of unprocessed timber made by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture where timber will be sold for export, or to be used as a substitute for timber exported by the purchaser. The limitation would not apply to the use of such funds for activities under sales made prior to the effective date of the fiscal year 1974 Interior Appropriations Act. The committee expects that the Secretaries shall include provisions in future timber sales contracts that will assure that the timber involved will not be exported, or used by the purchaser as a substitute for timber he exports, or sells for export.

Some confusion has existed as to what the committee meant by the term substitution. The committee defines substitution as the purchase of a greater volume of public timber by an individual purchaser than his historic pattern within a reasonable time of the sale by such purchaser of a greater volume of his private timber than has been his historic pattern. The committee also requests that the Secretaries shall include in future contracts a provision preventing a purchaser from selling timber to another person who would use the said timber as a substitute for timber he exports.

The committee has noted that there has been a substantial traffic in so-called cants. O cant is produced by slicing a log lengthwise into pieces which are slightly greater than 8 inches. This practice permits a purchaser to take a log from Federal land, to slice it 2 or more times, to do no more manufacturing, and then to export the resultant cant. The committee views this as a clear attempt to circumvent the intention of the Congress to

embargo the export of whole logs from Federal lands. The Secretaries are, therefore, directed to require a purchaser to perform a greater amount of manufacture of logs from Federal lands before the product can be exported. The committee recommends the manufacturing requirements of the British Columbia Regulation R as such additional manufacture. It is not intended that this additional manufacturing requirement apply to the State of Alaska which has a long-established trade in cants.

INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION

The committee held extensive hearings on the current administration policy of Indian self-determination, and will continue to be interested in the progress of this program. The committee fully supports this policy and has approved funds to continue it in fiscal year 1975. However, the committee requests that this policy be implemented very carefully so that the Indian community achieves maximum benefit from it and is not disappointed by possible adverse side effects of implementation.

The policy of self-determination is implemented, in part, by contracting with the various tribes for services previously supplied by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Budget justifications reviewed by the committee revealed that the Bureau of Indian Affairs anticipated that it would provide approximately \$155 million to the tribes in such contracts during fiscal year 1975 and that they would be able to reduce the total permanent positions in the Bureau by approximately 1,000. Further, the Bureau has allocated specific funds to be used by the tribes in managing these contracts. The committee wants to be sure that, in assuming responsibilities for programs formerly operated by the Bureau, the various tribes have the administrative

capability to manage them effectively. It is incumbent upon BIA to assure that this capability exists and that adequate technical and management assistance is provided to the tribes in transition. The committee wants to insure a full accounting of the funds used and the programs operated so that there is maximum program effectiveness. In short, the committee wants to be sure that self-determination is not implemented so hastily that there is a net decrease in services to the Indian people, with resulting disappointment to all concerned.

In addition, it is clear to the committee that as the tribes assume more responsibility for Indian program operation, there is a fundamental need for the development of more sophisticated tribal administrative machinery than has heretofore existed. In particular, the committee believes that there will be a need for the establishment of well-managed personnel, retirement, auditing, and budget and accounting systems, and other facets of modern organizational management, adapted, of course, to meet the unique and special requirements of the Indian people.

The committee expects a full review of the Bureau's response to its concerns in the 1976 budget hearings.

This year, as in past years, the committee was confronted with a flood of requests for numerous unbudgeted projects by various tribes and Indian groups. Those totaled more than half a billion dollars. The committee listened carefully and patiently for 2 days as various projects were described by outside witnesses. The committee believes that most if not all of these projects were meritorious. It has done its best, within the overall parameters of a constrained budget, to accommodate as many as possible. The committee has added more than \$17 mil-

lion above the budget estimates of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of the Indian Revolving Loan fund. The committee is pleased that the Congress has passed and the administration has requested funding for the Indian Financing Act, which authorizes grants, direct loans, and loan guarantees and interest subsidies. This bill includes \$68 million to implement that act. It is expected that many of the very meritorious projects described to the committee by outside witnesses and Members can be provided for with these funds. In the case of the direct loan program—revolving fund for loans—the committee realized that there would be many demands and little repayment of loans after the end of the first year. Since the \$50 million requested was a one-time authorization, the committee decided it would be wiser to defer appropriation of part of the authorized amount. This will provide available authorization for appropriation in future years.

The committee continues to be concerned about the various Federal programs affecting Indian education. After months of delay, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have finally formed a joint study of the programs which provide grants or other assistance to public schools with Indian children. It is hoped that this study will identify needed changes in legislation and regulations so that the funds provided for these programs are distributed fairly and equitably to the Indian community. In addition to those programs which provide assistance to the operation of schools with Indian children, the committee continues to be concerned with the funding of construction of public schools with Indian children. The committee is aware that Public Law 815 does not operate to provide safe, modern school facilities in wide areas of the country. Yet the list of construction needs grows longer each year. It is the opinion of the committee that some solution should be found. Indian children are entitled to protection from fire and disaster.

REPROGRAMMING PROCEDURES

The House Committee on Appropriations for many years has had an informal agreement with the various agencies and bureaus funded in the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriation bill with respect to guidelines and procedures for reprogramming funds by deferring approved projects and utilizing funds appropriated for these projects to accomplish others.

It has come to the attention of the committee that the practice of requesting approval for reprogramming or notifying the committee about reprogramming actions is not uniformly understood by the 27 various agencies funded in this bill.

The committee is well aware of the need of the administering agencies to reprogram funds to carry out an effective program. Changing conditions due to various factors may result in variations of cost estimates. However to maintain integrity in the appropriation process the committee must be kept fully apprised of all proposed reprogrammings

of projects and programs within each activity undertaken by the agency involved.

It is with this thought in mind that the committee has established the following criteria, generally parallel to those guidelines established in Senate Report No. 971, 88th Congress, 2d session for all reprogrammings:

First. No funds shall be reprogrammed from approved projects and programs within activities without a written request from the agency involved requesting specific approval.

Second. Such proposal should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises; and then only if postponement of the project or the activity until the next appropriation year will result in actual loss or damage. Mere convenience or desire should not be factors for consideration.

Third. Any project or activity which may be deferred through reprogramming shall not later be accomplished by means of further reprogramming; but, instead, funds should again be sought for the deferred project or activity through regular appropriation processes.

Fourth. Greater care should be expended in both legislative and appropriation processes to estimate costs more accurately and realistically in order to avoid situations wherein costs are underestimated to such an extent that requests for additional authorizations or for authority to expend greatly increased amounts must be made.

Fifth. It is desirable that in every possible instance funds for a project or activity should be expended or obligated during the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made.

The criteria pertaining to reprogramming for land acquisition under the Land and Water Conservation Fund contained in Senate Report No. 172, 89th Congress, 1st session, shall remain in effect.

The committee is highly displeased at the manner in which budget amendments have been submitted by the administration. The committee has had to consider almost \$500,000,000 in budget amendments submitted after the original budget was presented, and the committee is aware that there are still proposals languishing at the Office of Management and Budget. For the most part, these amendments have had to be considered out of context of the regular budget justifications. The committee expects that the administration will process these amendments more expeditiously in the future.

GSA SPACE RENTAL

The committee has included a provision in the bill, identical to provisions in other appropriations bills for fiscal year 1975, which limits the payment for GSA space and services to 90 percent of the GSA billing. The committee recommendations for the various appropriations in the bill include reductions to implement this provision. These reductions total \$7,787,000.

PROGRAMS NOT INCLUDED IN THE BILL

The budget estimates for fiscal year 1975 included funding for the following activities:

Saline Water Research.....	\$3,029,000
Youth Conservation Corps.....	10,240,000
National Museum Act.....	1,000,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.....	831,000
Total	15,100,000

Existing legislation authorizing these appropriations expired June 30, 1974, or is insufficient to cover the amount requested in the budget.

Hearings were held on the budget estimates, but in absence of authorizing legislation for these activities in fiscal year 1975, the committee has decided to pass over these items without prejudice.

LIMITATION ON UNIT COST OF EMPLOYEE HOUSING

The limitation on the unit cost of employee housing—regardless of the source of financing—in the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Territories shall be \$45,000. This limitation includes engineering and design costs, but excludes provision of utilities to the lot line. Any exceptions to this monetary limitation shall be submitted to the committee for its advance review and approval. Employee houses shall not exceed the standards outlined by the committee in House Conference Report No. 2049, 87th Congress, 2d Session.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Management of lands and resources

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$116,682,000
Estimate, 1975.....	142,469,000
Recommended, 1975.....	140,696,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+24,014,000
Estimate, 1975.....	—1,773,000

The amount recommended by the committee, compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate, 1975
Resource management, conservation, and protection.....	113,244	+84,733	—1,080
Cadastral survey.....	11,889	+3,265	-----
Firefighting and rehabilitation.....	5,400	—20,300	-----
General administration.....	3,853	+430	—20
GSA space costs.....	5,160	+4,736	—573
Pay cost increases.....	1,150	+1,150	—100
Total, management of lands and resources.....	140,696	+24,014	—1,773

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for the conservation, management, and development of about 451 million acres of the Nation's public lands, including 278 million acres in Alaska.

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

The reduction of \$1,773,000 below the budget estimate consists of the following decreases:

Environmental impact of proposed Arctic gaslines.....	-\$1,000,000
GSA space costs.....	-573,000
Increased pay costs.....	-100,000
Oil and gas leasing onshore.....	-50,000
Geothermal leasing.....	-30,000
General administration.....	-20,000

The budget estimate for this account reflected an increase in forest management programs on public domain lands. The increase was offset by a decrease in the funds provided in this account for the management of the Oregon and California grant lands. The justification for this diversion was that increased revenues from timber sales in the Oregon and California counties provided adequate funds for the management of these lands. While the committee has approved this one-time diversion, the committee does not approve of the continuing use of Oregon and California earmarked funds for management of public domain lands, other than Oregon and California lands. This year's budget should in no way be considered a precedent for future years. The Oregon and California lands are among the most efficiently managed in the country, and should be a model for other areas to follow. The committee in no way supports any action which will have the effect of diminishing the intensity of management of these lands.

The committee is aware and concerned about the rate of destruction of cultural treasures in certain areas of our public domain lands. The 300-percent increase in the budget for protection of these items will enhance the protection but will not approximate in any manner the job that needs to be done. Although the committee has recommended no additional funds above the budget for this activity, it would give sympathetic consideration of a reprogramming request if the Bureau is able to identify savings in other areas.

The committee bill provides an increase of \$24,014,000 over the 1974 budget. Despite this increase, the budget for the Bureau of Land Management remains lamentably small given the vast responsibilities the Bureau has over one-third of our Nation's land, particularly in view of the enormous growth in recreation use as well as natural resource demands.

Please do not be alarmed about the \$20 million 1974 item shown as a reduction this year. This is fire cost money which will be reflected as usual in the supplemental budget at the end of the fire season. The amount then presented will reflect the actual costs.

Construction and maintenance

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$6,800,000
Estimate, 1975.....	6,855,000
Recommended, 1975.....	6,855,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	-145,000
Estimate, 1975.....	

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,855,000. The budget estimate, for construction and maintenance of various facilities necessary for the proper administration of public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

Liquidation of contract authority

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$4,000,000
Estimate, 1975.....	4,070,000
Recommended, 1975.....	4,070,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+70,000
Estimate, 1975.....	

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

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for maintaining about 44,000 miles of roads on the 451 million acres administered by the Bureau. Of the 32,000 miles of roads which are classed as primitive, 30,000 are in need of up-grading. There is an additional need of 6,700 miles of road construction and surfacing in order to serve the long-term management needs of the public lands.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

Indefinite appropriation of receipts

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$28,750,000
Estimate, 1975.....	28,750,000
Recommended, 1975.....	28,750,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	
Estimate, 1975.....	

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

It is estimated that a total of \$28,750,000 will be available during fiscal year 1975 for construction, acquisition, and operation and maintenance of access roads and improvements, and for forest protection and development on the re-vested lands and on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land grant counties of Oregon.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

Indefinite appropriation of receipts

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$3,242,000
Estimate, 1975.....	4,503,000
Recommended, 1975.....	4,503,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+1,261,000
Estimate, 1975.....	

The committee recommends an indefinite appropriation of \$4,503,000 to be derived from public lands and Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act lands grazing receipts for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements.

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF RECREATION FACILITIES

(Indefinite, Special Fund)

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$165,000
Estimate, 1975.....	242,000
Recommended, 1975.....	242,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+77,000
Estimate, 1975.....	

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$242,000, the budget estimate. This is an appropriation of receipts from admission fees and user charges from recreation users of lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management. The funds will be used to perform corrective and preventative maintenance at recreation facilities and

to construct and improve facilities in support of the BLM off-road vehicle management program.

OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$13,769,000
Estimate, 1975.....	12,700,000
Recommended, 1975.....	13,795,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+26,000
Estimate, 1975.....	+1,095,000

The objective of this program is to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the fields of water and resources which affect water, in order to assist in assuring the Nation of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$13,795,000, a net increase of \$1,095,000 over the budget estimate, consisting of an increase of \$1,101,000 for State institutes and a decrease of \$6,000 for GSA space costs. The increase will provide \$110,000 per State for the 50 States and Puerto Rico where institutes have already been established. In addition, \$10,000 each is provided for newly authorized institutes in the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia. The committee regrets that budget constraints prevent the recommendation of greater increases. Witnesses appearing before the committee stated that this is far more than just a land grant college assistance program. The committee understands that water is a vital factor in our national life and knowledge of our water resources is necessary if we are to maintain an adequate supply in the future.

The amount included in the bill provides the following:

Assistance to States for institutes.....	\$5,640,000
Matching grants to institutes.....	3,000,000
Water resources research to be formed by any qualified entity or individual as provided under Title II of the Act.....	3,170,000
Scientific information center.....	940,000
Administration.....	992,000
GSA space.....	53,000

Total..... 13,795,000

FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$4,696,000
Estimate, 1975.....	5,040,000
Recommended, 1975.....	5,010,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+314,000
Estimate, 1975.....	-30,000

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

The Bureau also administers a program of matching grants to States for

recreation planning, for acquisition of land and water areas, and for the development of such areas.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,010,000, a reduction of \$30,000 below the budget estimate. The re-

duction consists of \$9,000 for pay costs and \$21,000 for GSA space costs.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Appropriation, 1974..... \$76,223,000
Estimate, 1975..... 300,000,000
Recommended, 1975..... 300,000,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974..... +\$223,777,000
Estimate, 1975.....

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

Activity	Budget estimate	Committee bill	Change	Activity	Budget estimate	Committee bill	Change
Assistance to States.....	\$196,000,000	\$180,000,000	-\$16,000,000	Forest Service:			
Federal programs:				Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity NRA.....	\$550,000	\$550,000	
National Park Service:				Sawtooth NRA.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Recently Authorized Areas:				Oregon Dunes NRA.....	800,000	800,000	
Bighorn Canyon NRA.....	447,000	447,000		Flaming Gorge NRA.....	250,000	250,000	
Biscayne NM.....	1,000,000	1,000,000		Mt. Rogers NRA.....	1,100,000	1,100,000	
Buffalo NR.....	7,000,000	7,000,000		Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks NRA.....	1,100,000	1,100,000	
Capitol Reef NP.....	375,000	375,000		Appalachian Trail.....	3,550,000	3,550,000	
C. & O. Canal NHP.....	7,190,000	7,190,000		Wilderness and primitive areas.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Cowpen NB.....	1,000,000	1,000,000		Specially designated recreation areas.....	4,650,000	18,550,000	+\$13,900,000
Cumberland Island NS.....	9,925,000	9,925,000		Deficiency awards and inholdings.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Delaware Water Gap NRA.....	4,183,000	4,183,000		Total, Forest Service.....	17,000,000	30,900,000	+13,900,000
Effigy Mounds NM.....	13,000	13,000		U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:			
Fort Donelson NHP.....	150,000	150,000		Special legislation:			
Golden Gate NRA.....	10,000,000	15,000,000	+5,000,000	San Francisco Bay NWR.....	6,000,000	6,000,000	
Gulf Island NS.....	342,000	342,000		Tinicum Environmental Center.....	200,000	1,200,000	+1,000,000
Lincoln Home NHS.....	500,000	500,000		Endangered species.....	1,300,000	1,300,000	
Minute Man NHP.....	3,000,000	3,000,000		Recreation additions:			
Muir Woods NM.....	400,000	400,000		National Elk NWR.....	750,000	750,000	
Perry's Victory IPM.....	250,000	250,000		Mason Neck NWR.....	250,000	250,000	
Piscataway Park.....	825,000	825,000		Total, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.....	8,500,000	9,500,000	+1,000,000
Sleeping Bear Dunes NL.....	1,150,000	1,150,000		Bureau of Land Management:			
Subtotal.....	47,750,000	52,750,000	+5,000,000	King Range NCA.....	445,000	445,000	
Wild and scenic rivers:				Pacific Crest Trail.....	55,000	55,000	
Lower St. Croix.....	1,450,000	1,450,000		Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	500,000	500,000	
Upper St. Croix.....	800,000	800,000		Administration.....	6,033,000	5,980,000	-53,000
Subtotal.....	2,250,000	2,250,000		GSA space costs.....	467,000	420,000	-47,000
Deficiency awards.....	1,500,000	1,500,000		Total.....	300,000,000	300,000,000	
Inholdings.....	20,000,000	16,200,000	-3,800,000				
Total, National Park Service.....	71,500,000	72,700,000	+1,200,000				

The committee recommends the full budget request of \$300,000,000 for the land and water conservation fund, but has made several adjustments within the total.

The total recommended for assistance to States is \$180 million, or 60 percent of the total appropriation. This level of funding is consistent with funding levels recommended by the committee in past years and will provide the States with adequate funding resources to carry out recreation land acquisition and development programs. Funds provided to the States shall be available to assist in the acquisition of properties at fair market values existing prior to the occurrence of Hurricane Agnes which are authorized by Pennsylvania State law to be acquired without consideration of any loss in value attributable to that disaster and which are acquired by the borough of Tunkhannock, Pa., for the River Street Park land and water conservation fund project. No person otherwise eligible for any kind of replacement housing payments under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-646), with regard to this project shall be denied such eligibility as a result of his being unable to meet the occupancy requirements set by that act because of that disaster.

The committee recommends an allocation of \$16,200,000 for acquisition of National Park Service inholdings. During hearings on the 1975 proposed land and water conservation fund program, the Park Service identified numerous inholding opportunities, which are currently available or might be available in the near future. The committee expects the

Department to submit these requests to the committee for approval using the normal procedure. The committee has indicated its interest in expediting payments to landowners who have offered to sell their property to the National Park Service under its opportunity inholding program. In furtherance of this effort, this committee approves the following procedures with respect to this program:

As has been the custom in the past, periodically proposed acquisitions are to be consolidated and submitted for consideration by the committee. The committee will make every effort to take action on any of the proposed acquisitions within 30 days of the date of the transmittal of the program to the committee.

The Department of the Interior has already initiated action to expedite processing of these programs. The Office of Management and Budget is also requested and encouraged to take similar action to improve the processing of offers taken under this program in order to expedite payments to the landowners. It is therefore suggested that the Office of Management and Budget give simultaneous consideration to these proposed acquisitions so that total processing time may not exceed 30 days.

The committee has recommended an increased allocation of \$13,900,000 for land acquisition of the U.S. Forest Service. The increase is to be divided as follows: \$10,000,000 for acquisition of lands in the Lake Tahoe basin, Calif.; \$2,000,000 for acquisition of lands in the Sabine, Sam Houston, and Angelina National Forests, Tex.; \$1,500,000 for acquisition of lands in the Green Mountain National

Forest, Vt.; and \$400,000 for land acquisition at the Council Bluffs project, Clark National Forest, Mo.

The premise on which the 1975 budget estimate was submitted would permit the Forest Service to acquire land for national recreation areas, wilderness and primitive areas, and the Appalachian Trail but would restrict land acquisition in specially designated recreation areas within national forests to only \$4,650,000. Recreation use on the lands of the National Forest System continues to grow at a rate in excess of many past projections.

The committee disagrees with this proposed policy especially in view of the fact that additional recreation lands could be acquired in the eastern portion of the Nation where there are numerous areas of dense population. In addition, adherence to the proposed policy would drastically interfere with coordinated recreation plans of the Forest Service and the various States.

The Forest Service requires an annual program of about \$70 million for the remaining 16 years of the fund to accomplish the purchase program envisioned initially over the 25-year period of the fund. In preparing future budgets the Forest Service program should reflect this need, with adequate attention given to land acquisition in specially designated recreation areas.

The committee recommendation includes an additional \$1,000,000 for land acquisition at the Tinicum Environmental Center, Pa., for a total 1975 program of \$1,200,000. The center is administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Resource management

Appropriation, 1974	\$86,537,000
Estimate, 1975	101,095,000
Recommended, 1975	100,666,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+14,129,000
Estimate, 1975	-429,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate, 1975
Habitat preservation	\$16,158,000	+\$3,750,000	-----
Wildlife resources	43,329,000	+4,668,391	-----
Fishery resources	21,760,000	+420,000	-----
Endangered species	5,318,000	+658,000	-----
Interpretation and recreation	5,880,000	+210,000	+\$50,000
Administration	3,623,000	-----	-----
GSA space costs	3,798,000	+3,622,609	-422,000
Pay cost increases	800,000	+800,000	-57,000
Total, resource management	100,666	+14,129,000	-429,000

The net decrease of \$429,000 below the budget estimate consists of an increase of \$50,000 for recreation use at the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, and decreases of \$57,000 for pay costs and \$422,000 for GSA space. Within the funds provided in the bill for "Fishery resources" the committee directs that the production level of 4.6 million lake trout per year from the Jordan River National Fish Hatchery be maintained in fiscal year 1975.

The committee continues to be concerned about proposals by the Fish and Wildlife Service to turn over the operation of certain Federal fish hatcheries to State governments. In the course of its hearings, the committee learned that a special task force of outside fisheries experts has been established to consider the whole question of the Federal role in the nationwide fisheries program. In the meantime, however, the Service continues to negotiate with States for transfer of certain hatcheries. The committee is concerned that in its haste to achieve a certain numerical objective in its hatchery transfer program, important Federal interests will be sacrificed. Specifically, the committee wants to be sure that the Federal investment in land and capital equipment in these hatcheries is maintained and that the States which assume responsibility for operating them have adequate budget resources to do a proper maintenance and management job. The committee directs that the Department secure the approval of the committee before any agreement is entered into for the transfer of ownership and/or operation of a Federal fish hatchery.

The committee is also concerned about certain proposals to realine the regional boundaries and regional cities of the Service. Such proposals are often advocated for the principal purpose of making regional boundaries and cities conform to the so-called standard Federal regions and often have no relationship to efficiency and effectiveness in the

operations of the Service. The committee directs that no realignment of regional boundaries and cities of the Service be made without prior approval of the committee.

The committee continues to be concerned about curtailment of recreation use on wildlife refuges. The committee understands that the primary purpose of these refuges is wildlife protection and that recreation should be controlled when public use becomes harmful to the primary purpose of the refuge. However, the committee believes that recreation use should not be unnecessarily curtailed and directs the Service to continue to provide adequate recreation use where it is not inconsistent with wildlife protection.

The committee is recommending an increase of \$14,129,000 over last year's appropriation to carry out the many important responsibilities with which the Service is charged. The recommended allowance will provide for an additional 123 positions. The committee believes that the important work of the Service has to be focused in the field and not in the Washington office. The committee directs that to the maximum extent possible, the new positions provided in this bill be assigned to the field and not be used to increase the staff of the Washington office.

The committee is sympathetic to the appeal from the Service on the effects of the 1967 limitation of \$25,000 for rehabilitation and improvement projects funded in this account. In the future, the cost of each rehabilitation and improvement project at any one of the Service's installations shall not exceed \$60,000. Should the cost of any such project exceed \$60,000, it is not to be undertaken without the prior approval of the committee.

Construction and anadromous fish

Appropriation, 1974	\$8,126,500
Estimate, 1975	8,597,000
Recommended, 1975	13,447,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+5,320,500
Estimate, 1975	+4,850,000

This appropriation finances the construction and rehabilitation of fish hatcheries and wildlife refuge facilities, and fishery and wildlife research facilities. It also provides funds to carry out the provisions of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act, to preserve, develop, and enhance anadromous fishery resources within the several States and the Great Lakes:

In addition to those projects included in the budget estimate, the committee recommendation includes the following projects:

Hatchery building, Allegheny National Fish Hatchery, Pennsylvania	+\$300,000
Canal rehabilitation and flood damage repair, Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Georgia	+200,000
Visitor facilities, Horicon National Wildlife Refuge, Wisconsin	+400,000
Site work, Makah National Fish Hatchery, Washington	+940,000
Hatchery facilities, White River National Fish Hatchery, Vermont	+1,523,000

Hatchery facilities, Warm Springs National Fish Hatchery, Oregon	+\$1,187,000
--	--------------

In addition, the committee has provided \$300,000 over the budget estimate in the anadromous fish program for matching with the State of Washington. These funds are to be used to assist in the implementation of the recent decision by U.S. District Court Judge George H. Boldt concerning Indian fishing rights. The committee understands that a budget recommendation for this activity will be shortly coming from the administration, but it was not received in time for committee action on the bill.

The 1975 program recommended by the committee will provide \$2,633,000 for the anadromous fish program and \$10,814,000 for construction and maintenance.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

Definite, repayable advance

Appropriation, 1974	\$3,500,000
Estimate, 1975	-----
Recommended, 1975	1,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	-2,500,000
Estimate, 1975	1,000,000

Under the provisions of the wetlands legislation, this appropriation provides advances to the fund for acquisition of refuges. The advances are to be repaid from receipts beginning in fiscal year 1977. The congressional intent in approving advance funding was to enable purchase of wetlands before land price escalation. The budget policy of eliminating this advance funding is shortsighted. Last year the Congress approved funds in this appropriation over the objection of the administration and this year the committee is recommending funds when none have been requested by the administration.

In addition to funds provided in this appropriation, receipts from the sale of duck stamps, estimated at \$11,000,000 in fiscal year 1974 and \$12,000,000 in fiscal year 1975, will be available for acquisition of wetland areas.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Operation of the National Park System

Appropriation, 1974	\$193,752,000
Estimate, 1975	210,058,000
Recommended, 1975	209,437,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+15,685,000
Estimate, 1975	-621,000

The amount recommended by the committee, compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate, 1975
Park management	195,894	+8,444	-----
Forest fire suppression and rehabilitation of burned areas	700	-----	-----
Executive direction	5,342	+59	-40
GSA space costs	4,601	+4,282	-511
Pay cost increases	2,900	+2,900	-70
Total, operation of the National Park System	209,437	+15,685	-621

The reduction of \$621,000 below the budget estimate consists of decreases of \$70,000 for pay cost increases, \$511,000 for GSA space, and \$40,000 for executive direction.

The committee directs that within available funds, the National Park Service assist Indian tribes in planning museums and culture centers. The Indian community has recently shown an increased interest in developing its cultural resources and providing the American public an opportunity to learn more about the cultural heritage of the American Indian. The committee believes that the National Park Service has expertise in this area and can provide valuable technical assistance.

Planning and construction

Appropriation, 1974	\$20,012,000
Estimate, 1975	57,303,000
Recommended, 1975	53,466,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+33,454,000
Estimate, 1975	-3,837,000

The committee recommends reductions below the budget estimate of \$5,874,000 for Constitution Gardens—providing a total program of \$2,000,000—and \$1,000,000 for advance planning—providing a total program of \$1,700,000. In addition, the committee directs that the National Park Service utilize, by reprogramming, \$2,800,000 included in previous appropriations for projects which cannot now be carried out or must be delayed until future years. Including this reprogramming and the decreases noted above, the National Park Service will be able to carry out the following unbudgeted projects within the \$53,466,000, which the committee recommends:

Reconstruction and restoration, Bent's Old Fort, Colo.	+ \$2,336,000
Reconstruction and restoration, Fort Vancouver, Wash.	+ 225,000
Visitors Center, George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, Ind.	+ 532,000
Road construction and visitor facility planning, Grant Kohrs National Historic Site, Mont.	+ 30,000
Project planning Newhalen campground facilities, North Cascades National Park, Wash.	+ 270,000
Park development, Bailly Homestead Area, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.	+ 319,000
Visitors center and exhibits, Lincoln Home National Historic Site, Ill.	+ 746,000
Fort stabilization and restoration, Gulf Islands National Seashore, Fla.	+ 700,000
Fort stabilization and restoration, Gulf Islands National Seashore, Miss.	+ 250,000
Fort reconstruction, Fort Scott National Historical Site, Kansas	+ 429,000

Road construction (liquidation of contract authority)

Appropriation, 1974	\$35,000,000
Estimate, 1975	23,000,000
Recommended, 1975	24,126,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	-10,874,000
Estimate, 1975	+1,126,000

This appropriation provides for liquidation of obligations incurred for construction of parkways and roads and trails by the National Park Service under contract authority provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

The committee recommends the following reductions in the program proposed in the budget:

Construction Gardens (leaving a total appropriation in this account of \$2,000,000)	-\$1,941,000
Advance planning (leaving a total appropriation in this account of \$2,100,000)	-1,000,000

The committee recommends the following additional projects not included in the budget request:

Natchez Trace Parkway:	
Section 3-C (Mississippi)	+\$2,400,000
Planning, section 3-P-6 (Mississippi)	+100,000
Planning, sections 3-V-2, 3-V-1, and 3-U-2 (Mississippi)	+450,000
Section 2-D (Alabama)	+1,000,000
Grant Kohrs National Historic Site, Mont.	+100,000
Park development, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.	+17,000

In addition, the committee directs the National Park Service to accelerate work on the Alabama segment of the Natchez Trace Parkway to the maximum extent possible using available contract authority and liquidating cash. The Alabama segment will provide a direct connection with the Mississippi segment already under construction. The committee also urges that construction on the northern Mississippi segment be accelerated.

Preservation of historic properties

Appropriation, 1974	\$15,842,000
Estimate, 1975	24,375,000
Recommended, 1975	24,375,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+8,533,000
Estimate, 1975	-----

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$24,375,000, the budget estimate. The amount provided includes the following activities:

Grants-in-aid	\$16,000,000
Special Bicentennial grants-in-aid	4,000,000
Maintenance of the National Register	751,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Support	543,000
Historic Sites Survey	578,000
Historic American Buildings Survey	448,000
Historic American Engineering Record	236,000
Archeological Investigation and Salvage	1,819,000
Total	24,375,000

The committee directs that within the funds available for archeological investigation and salvage, \$175,000 be included for continuation of work at the Mahkah-Ozette diggings.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF RECREATION FACILITIES

Indefinite, special fund

Appropriation, 1974	\$30,738,000
Estimate, 1975	11,900,000
Recommended, 1975	11,900,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974	-18,478,000
Estimate, 1975	-----

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$11,900,000, the budget estimate. Authority for this program originates from Public Law 92-347, approved July 11, 1972, whereby fees collected by the National Park Service for admission to designated units of the System and for special recreation-use facilities are earmarked for appropriation for its own use.

The committee recommendation will provide for the following activities:

Enhancement of fee collection systems	\$6,000,000
Alternate transportation systems	4,608,000
Planning, rehabilitation and repair of recreation facilities	1,292,000
Total	11,900,000

The committee directs that, within the funds available for transportation systems, \$150,000 shall be used for a field study of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Travel Study.

John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

Appropriation, 1974	\$2,400,000
Estimate, 1975	2,420,000
Recommended, 1975	2,420,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+20,000
Estimate, 1975	-----

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,420,000, the budget estimate, for the cost of the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. These funds will provide for maintenance, security, information, interpretation, janitorial, and all other services necessary to the nonperforming arts functions of the Center.

ENERGY AND MINERALS

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Surveys, investigations, and research

Appropriation, 1974	\$160,240,000
Estimate, 1975	\$250,576,000
Recommended, 1975	203,195,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+42,955,000
Estimate, 1975	-2,381,000

¹ Excludes \$10,642,000 base for budget estimates considered in the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act, 1975.

² Excludes \$43,125,000 budget estimate considered in the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act, 1975.

The total amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	Bill compared with—		
	Committee bill, 1975	1974 appropriation	Estimate 1975
Special resource and environmental projects	3,363	+3,790	-----
Alaska pipeline related investigations	347	-558	-----
Topographic surveys and mapping	41,525	+4,741	-160

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate 1975
Geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping	41,408	+2,691	-6
Minerals discovery loan program	198	-93	
Water resources investigations	46,426	+946	
Conservation of lands and minerals	32,323	+14,550	-300
Facilities	10,800	+5,068	-171
Earth resources observation systems	7,549	-1,405	
Resource and land investigations program	944		
Land use data and analysis	2,000	+2,000	-509
General administration	3,000	-87	-87
GSA space costs	9,412	+9,412	-1,045
Pay cost increases	1,900	+1,900	-103
Total, geological Survey	203,195	+42,955	-2,381

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

The reduction of \$2,381,000 below the budget estimate consists of the following decreases:

Small scale and special mapping	-\$160,000
Land resource surveys	-6,000
General administration	-87,000
Headquarters operation, Reston, Va.	-71,000
Movement of personnel and goods	-100,000
Land use data and analysis	-509,000
Pay cost increases	-103,000
GSA space	-1,045,000
OCS lease supervision	-250,000
Oil shale lease supervision	-50,000

MINING ENFORCEMENT AND SAFETY

ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974	\$59,040,000
Estimate, 1975	68,146,000
Recommended, 1975	67,803,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+8,763,000
Estimate, 1975	-343,000

¹Included under the heading "Mines and minerals," Bureau of Mines.

This is a new appropriation, reflecting a recent reorganization in the Interior Department which split from the Bureau of Mines responsibilities relating to mine health and safety enforcement. A new agency, the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration, now carries out these responsibilities in the Department.

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the comparable 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate, 1975
Coal mine health and safety inspections	38,833	+4,220	
Metal and nonmetal mine health and safety inspections			
Education and training	10,109	+2,100	
Technical support	5,564	-1,500	
Program administration	8,823	+1,235	
GSA space costs	1,417	+28	
Pay cost increases	2,307	+1,980	-256
	700	+700	-87
Total, mining enforcement and safety administration	67,803	+8,763	-343

BUREAU OF MINES Mines and Minerals

Appropriation, 1974	\$71,989,000
Estimate, 1975	75,539,000
Recommended, 1975	77,703,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974	+5,714,000
Estimate, 1975	+2,164,000

¹Excludes \$33,611,000 base for budget estimates considered in the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act, 1975.

²Excludes \$137,108,000 budget estimate considered in the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act, 1975.

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate, 1975
Metallurgy research	15,672	+200	
Mining research	36,283	-6	
Data collection and analysis	11,619	+1,762	-238
Engineering, evaluation, and demonstration	9,996	+1,004	+2,700
Program administration	1,419	+28	
GSA space costs	2,214	+2,214	-246
Pay cost increases	500	+500	-52
Total, Bureau of Mines	77,703	+5,714	+2,164

The net increase of \$2,164,000 above the budget estimate consists of decreases of \$238,000 for world mineral consumption and recycling statistics, \$52,000 for pay costs, and \$246,000 for GSA space, and increases of \$2,000,000 for mined land investigations and demonstrations—anthracite area and \$700,000 for filling mine void areas at Rock Springs, Wyo.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Operation of Indian programs

Appropriation, 1974	\$415,271,000
Estimate, 1975	464,107,000
Recommended, 1975	467,096,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+51,825,000
Estimate, 1975	+2,989,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate 1975
Education	221,934	+22,989	+2,918
Indian services	97,199	+3,290	+895
Tribal resources development	67,609	+13,284	
Trust responsibilities	17,885	+3,441	
General management and facilities operation	57,746	+4,098	-300
GSA space costs	4,723	+4,723	-524
Total, operation of Indian programs	467,096	+51,825	+2,989

The net increase of \$2,989,000 above the budget estimate consists of decreases of \$524,000 for GSA space and \$300,000 for transfer of functions of the National Council on Indian Opportunity, and the following increases:

Higher education scholarships	+\$1,000,000
Law enforcement and safety, including \$120,000 for the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Colorado; \$120,000 for the Southern Ute Tribe, Colorado; and \$100,000 for the Lower Elwa Tribe, Washington	+370,000
Work-learn program	+25,000
Operation of the Busby School, Montana	+125,000
Operation of the Ojibway School, North Dakota	+218,000
Operation of the St. Francis School, South Dakota	+75,000
Operation of the Navajo Community College, Arizona	+1,400,000
Pilot experimental program in early childhood education	+100,000
Indian fishing rights, Washington, including \$75,000 for law enforcement, \$175,000 for resources management, and \$120,000 for tribal operations for the Quinault Tribe, Washington	+500,000

The committee considered carefully the budget request of \$300,000 to provide assistance to Indian tribes and organizations in making their views known to a proposed domestic council committee on Indian policy. At the time of the hearings, the Bureau of Indian Affairs had only very vague ideas concerning the structure and operation of the process and did not subsequently provide the committee with further information concerning the views of the Indian community, as requested. As noted above, the committee has disallowed the budget request but will consider this proposal in the future when the plans and procedures are more definite.

The committee is concerned about the slowdown in the Indian housing program. The housing needs of the Indian people are increasing each year. According to a recent survey, there are about 106,900 Indian homes of which only 40,600 existing dwellings are in standard condition. About 47,100 can be renovated to standard condition and about 47,100 new homes are required to replace existing substandard dwellings. The committee expects the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of the Interior, and other agencies involved to jointly make every possible effort to alleviate the Indian housing situation. Within the funds provided in this appropriation, the committee directs that \$240,000 be used for repair and restoration of homes on the Papago Reservation.

Within funds available under the adult vocational training program, the committee directs that the training program at the Lummi School of Aquiculture be continued.

Within funds available for Indian services, the committee directs that \$24,000 be used for social services for the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Colorado, and \$26,000 be provided for the Squaxin Island tribal government development program, Washington.

Within funds available for tribal resources development, the committee directs that \$20,000 be provided for the Papago travel study, \$40,000 be available for road maintenance for the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Colorado, \$400,000 be

provided for forestry programs of the Quinault Tribe, Washington; \$300,000 be provided for purchase of road equipment for the Los Coyotes Reservation, Calif.; and necessary funds be included for continuation of Indian action teams for the Northern Cheyenne Resources Development Corporation and the Colville Confederated Tribes.

The committee believes that there are valuable services being performed by the Intermountain Indian School and the National Indian Training Center at Brigham City, Utah. Accordingly, the committee directs that no action be taken to transfer personnel and equipment or close or transfer this facility without the consent of the committee. The committee further directs that the school shall have an enrollment of no less than 800 students and that no less than \$3,475,000 be expended on the Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City, Utah, by the BIA in fiscal year 1975. At least \$304,000 shall be expended for the National Indian Training Center programs in fiscal year 1975, unless otherwise approved by the committee. The committee has no objection to the transfer of the administration of National Indian Training Center programs to Haskell Indian Junior College so long as NITC functions remain headquartered in Brigham City, Utah.

Construction

Appropriation, 1974	\$54,723,000
Estimate, 1975	51,875,000
Recommended, 1975	66,571,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+11,848,000
Estimate, 1975	+14,696,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$66,571,000, an increase of \$14,696,000 above the budget estimate. The increase above the budget estimate includes the following projects:

On farm developments related to the Navajo irrigation project	+2,000,000
Power and irrigation construction, Colorado River Indian irrigation project	+2,000,000
Surveys and planning, land leveling, and canal lining, San Carlos Indian irrigation project	+1,000,000
Construction of San Simon School, Arizona	+4,000,000
Dormitory construction, Riverside Indian School, Oklahoma	+2,225,000
Design of new high school, Fort Totten, N. Dak.	+375,000
School construction, Brockton, Mont.	+1,300,000
School construction planning, Hays/Lodgepole, Mont.	+145,000
Big Springs Domestic Water System, Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Utah	+1,433,000
Planning and construction of school facilities at Keshena and planning of facilities at Neopit, Wisconsin	+218,000

The committee continues to be concerned about the proposed replacement facility for the Chemawa School in Oregon. The committee believes that before funds are appropriated for this facility there needs to be an assessment of the educational needs of Indian children in the Northwest area, with specific refer-

ence to the need for a boarding facility, and with specific attention to the amount of remedial education needs that can be provided for in public schools. There should also be a study of the possible use of other facilities which could be converted for use for Indian education.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Liquidation of contract authority

Appropriation, 1974	\$43,000,000
Estimate, 1975	59,000,000
Recommended, 1975	59,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+16,000,000
Estimate, 1975	

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

Indian loan guaranty and insurance fund

Appropriation, 1974	
Estimate, 1975	\$20,000,000
Recommended, 1975	20,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+20,000,000
Estimate, 1975	

This program was established by the Indian Financing Act of 1974—Public Law 93-262. The funds provided in this appropriation are part of the \$68,000,000 recommended in this bill for implementation of that act.

The funds recommended will provide for the following activities:

Reserve for losses on guaranteed and insured loans	\$6,635,000
Interest subsidies	12,065,000
Technical assistance	500,000
Administrative expenses	800,000

Total 20,000,000

Revolving fund for loans

Appropriation, 1974	\$900,000
Estimate, 1975	50,000,000
Recommended, 1975	38,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+37,100,000
Estimate, 1975	-12,000,000

This program was established by the Indian Financing Act of 1974—Public Law 93-262. The funds provided in this appropriation are part of the \$68,000,000 recommended in this bill for implementation of the act. This appropriation will provide for direct loans to Indian tribes and individuals at interest rates and terms established by the act.

The Indian Financing Act provided a one-time authorization for this program of \$50,000,000. During the hearings, it was learned that there will be little repayment of loans in the first year of the program. Since this is a revolving loan fund, appropriation and obligation of the full \$50,000,000 authorized for this program in fiscal year 1975 would leave only very small amounts for loans in future years. The committee believes that it would be more prudent to appropriate less in the fiscal year of the program and reserve some of the authorization for appropriation in future years.

The committee wishes to emphasize that it fully supports this program, as well as the other programs of the Indian Financing Act, and believes that these programs can make a large contribution to the goal of Indian self-determination.

Alaska Native fund

Appropriation, 1974	\$70,000,000
Estimate, 1975	70,000,000
Recommended, 1975	70,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	
Estimate, 1975	

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

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

The bill includes \$70,000,000, the budget estimate, which is the amount specified in the authorizing legislation for deposit in the Alaska Native fund in fiscal year 1975.

Miscellaneous Tribal funds

Appropriation, 1974	\$18,500,000
Estimate, 1975	18,500,000
Recommended, 1975	18,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	
Estimate, 1975	

Funds held in trust for Indian tribes under the provisions of various acts are used for expenses of tribal governments, administration of Indian tribal affairs, employment of tribal attorneys, establishment and operation of tribal enterprises, investments, and the welfare of Indians.

TERRITORIAL AFFAIRS

OFFICE OF TERRITORIAL AFFAIRS

Administration of territories

Appropriation, 1974	\$14,500,000
Estimate, 1975	15,000,000
Recommended, 1975	14,950,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+450,000
Estimate, 1975	-50,000

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

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

The \$13,950,000 included in the bill for American Samoa will provide for priority programs in education, public health, public works operations, and administrative services. The committee calls attention to the progress made by the legislative branch of the government of American Samoa in accepting more responsibility and providing additional funds for various construction programs in American Samoa. This year, for the first time, all construction projects in American Samoa are being financed by local revenues.

The decrease of \$50,000 below the budget estimate for American Samoa includes decreases of \$25,000 for the Governor's office, \$4,000 for the Chief Justice and High Court, and \$21,000 for administrative services.

The committee held extensive hearings on the use of educational TV in the school system of American Samoa. The committee understands and appreciates the contribution which television can make to the educational process. However, the committee believes that television can never replace the teacher as a focal point in the classroom. The committee is concerned that too much reliance is being placed on educational TV in the educational system in American Samoa and directs that all available steps be taken to assure that TV does not become a substitute for the classroom teacher.

Trust territory of the Pacific Islands

Appropriation, 1974.....\$59,386,000
Estimate, 1975.....61,000,000
Recommended, 1975.....61,500,000
Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974.....+4,114,000
Estimate, 1975.....+2,500,000

Funds provided under this appropriation account are for the continuation of the accelerated development program in the fields of education, health, public works, and resource management of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The total appropriation recommended in the bill will provide \$1,112,100 in direct appropriations for the High Commissioner, the Judiciary, and the Federal Comptroller, \$49,730,900 for grants for operations, \$9,157,000 for grants for capital improvements, and \$1,000,000 for the economic development loan fund. This allocation corresponds to the budget estimate. In addition, the committee recommends an appropriation of up to \$2,500,000 to replace categorical grant programs which have been phased out in recent years.

Micronesian claims fund

Appropriation, 1974.....\$1,400,000
Estimate, 1975.....1,400,000
Recommended, 1975.....1,400,000
Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974.....+1,400,000
Estimate, 1975.....

Public Law 92-39 authorizes ex gratia payments to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages arising out of the hostilities of the Second World War and prior to July 1, 1951. Title II of that act provides \$20,000,000 for post secure claims to personal or real property that arose prior to July 1, 1951.

The \$1,400,000 provided in this bill is the first portion of title II moneys needed to settle post secure claims. The Micronesian Claims Commission estimates it will adjudicate 300 title II cases in fiscal year 1975.

SECRETARIAL OFFICES

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974.....\$9,089,000
Estimate, 1975.....11,870,000
Recommended, 1975.....11,790,000
Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974.....+2,701,000
Estimate, 1975.....-80,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$11,790,000 a decrease of \$80,000 below the budget estimate. The reduction consists of \$12,000 for the Word Processing Center and \$68,000 for GSA space.

At this point I think I should emphasize—CXX—1574—Part 19

size to the Committee of the Whole House, the importance of what a committee action taken several years ago, during the initial discussion of the proposed Alaska pipeline, means to the people of the United States. The committee appealed to the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior for a ruling relative to the reimbursement of additional costs superimposed upon the taxpayers by the proposed Alaska pipeline.

In the record of that supplemental hearing you will find, detailed, the Solicitor's opinion that the oil companies or consortiums, who are responsible for removing the oil and constructing the pipeline, are also responsible for reimbursing the taxpayers for the costs incurred by the Federal Government as a result of the pipeline constructions. Probably no more significant ruling was brought to a committee than this one.

I have always felt that the Solicitors of the Department of the Interior were rather the watchdogs for you, the people. I want to express my appreciation to the Solicitors with whom I have had the privilege of working while chairman. They have been competent, dedicated men with an extremely keen perception of the ramifications of the law of this land. They are all underpaid and overworked, and I cannot resist giving them this salute.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974.....\$17,225,000
Estimate, 1975.....20,047,000
Recommended, 1975.....19,629,000
Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974.....+2,404,000
Estimate, 1975.....-418,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$19,629,000, a reduction of \$418,000 below the budget estimate, for the operating expenses of the Office of the Secretary. The reduction consists of \$40,000 for international activities; \$40,000 for communications; \$27,000 for Assistant Secretary, congressional and legislative affairs; \$19,000 for Assistant Secretary, land and water resources; \$20,000 for personnel management; \$172,000 for GSA space; and \$100,000 for general services.

Departmental operations

Appropriation, 1974.....\$6,620,000
Estimate, 1975.....10,954,000
Recommended, 1975.....10,954,000
Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974.....+4,334,000
Estimate, 1975.....

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$10,954,000, the budget estimate. The amount provided includes \$5,255,800 for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, \$1,794,500 for the Natural Resources Library, \$253,700 for the Johnny Horizon program, \$250,000 for the International Geothermal Symposium, \$2,000,000 for the Office of Research and Development, and \$1,400,000 for the Office of Minerals Policy Development.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Special foreign currency program

Appropriation, 1974.....\$670,000
Estimate, 1975.....522,000
Recommended, 1975.....192,000
Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974.....-478,000
Estimate, 1975.....-330,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$192,000, a reduction of \$330,000 below the budget estimate. The amount recommended will provide for research in Poland on coal gasification and liquefaction, and geology.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

The bill includes under this heading a total appropriation of \$416,403,000, a decrease of \$53,303,000 below the 1974 appropriation and an increase of \$24,996,000 above the budget estimate. The committee has noted earlier in this report the basis and justification for these and other increases in the budget of the Federal Service.

The following is a summary of actions taken on the programs included under this appropriation:

Forest land management

Appropriation, 1974.....\$377,884,000
Estimate, 1975.....291,136,000
Recommended, 1975.....306,278,000
Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974.....-71,606,000
Estimate, 1975.....+15,142,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT

(In thousands)

Activity	Commit- tee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate, 1975
National forest protection and management:			
Timber resource management:			
Sales administration and management.....	\$81,437	+\$1,974	
Reforestation and stand improvement.....	48,289	+14,958	+\$15,000
Recreation use.....	45,422	+819	+739
Wildlife and fish habitat management.....	8,903	+209	
Rangeland management.....	16,809	+996	+1,000
Soil and water management.....	15,583	+246	+900
Minerals management.....	3,436	-1,000	-1,000
Forest fire protection.....	34,345	-2,014	
General land management activities.....	25,421	+680	
Subtotal.....	279,645	+16,868	+16,639
Amount advanced from co-operative range improvements.....	-700		
Subtotal, national forest protection and management.....	278,945	+16,868	+16,639
Water resource development related activities.....		-159	
Fighting forest fires.....	4,275	-90,800	
Forest insect and disease control.....	10,969	-6,463	
Cooperative law enforcement program.....	1,575	-1,007	
GSA space costs.....	8,214	+7,655	-1,343
Pay cost increases.....	2,300	+2,300	-154
Total, forest land management.....	306,278	-71,606	+15,142

The net increase of \$15,142,000 above the budget estimate consists of reductions of \$154,000 for pay costs, \$1,343,000 for GSA space and \$1 million for Project SEAM—which has been transferred to "Forest research"—and the following increases:

Reforestation and stand improvement	+\$15,000,000
Recreation use, including \$150,000 for operation of campgrounds in the White Mountain National Forest, N.H.	+739,000
Rangeland management	+1,000,000
Soil and water management	+900,000

Forest research

Appropriation, 1974	\$63,800,000
Estimate, 1975	70,525,000
Recommended, 1975	75,487,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+11,687,000
Estimate, 1975	+4,962,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	1975 estimate
Trees and timber management research	13,447	+360	+360
Forest watershed management research	8,760	+1,800	+2,000
Wildlife, range, and fish habitat research	4,467	-15	+760
Forest recreation research	1,176	-150	
Fire and atmospheric sciences research	7,847		
Forest insects and disease research	17,011	+6,250	+570
Forest products utilization research	9,723		
Forest engineering research	1,547		
Forest resources evaluation	3,649		
Forest economics and marketing research	3,653		
Project SEAM	2,200	+1,450	+1,500
GSA space costs	1,487	+1,472	-169
Pay cost increases	520	+520	-59
Total, forest research	75,487	+11,087	+4,962

The net increase of \$4,962,000 above the budget estimate consists of decreases of \$59,000 for pay costs and \$169,000 for GSA space and the following increases:

Maximum fiber yield research, Rhinelander, Wis.	+\$360,000
Soils and reforestation research, Wenatchee, Wash.	+300,000
Strip mining research (Project SEAM), Berea, Ky.	+500,000
New England forest environment research, Durham, N.H.	+100,000
Project SEAM (transferred from "forest land management")	+1,000,000
Western environment forestry research (Eisenhower consortium)	+700,000
Urban forestry research, Northeast Pennsylvania	+450,000
Urban forestry research, Syracuse, N.Y.	+450,000
Shrub research, Provo, Utah	+100,000
Wildlife habitat research, Stoneville, Miss.	+100,000
Wildlife habitat research, Orono, Maine	+50,000
Wildlife habitat research, Olympia, Wash.	+100,000
Wildlife habitat research, Fresno, Calif.	+50,000
Management of upland wildlife, St. Paul, Minn.	+100,000
Research on acute bovine pulmonary emphysema, La Grande, Oreg.	+60,000
Forest research in the Idaho Batholith, Boise, Idaho	+100,000
Trout habitat research, Blacksburg, Va. and Franklin, N.C.	+100,000

Black walnut research, Carbon-dale, Ill.	+\$120,000
Air pollution research, Delaware, Ohio	+450,000

Within the funds available for forest recreation research, the committee directs that \$100,000 be provided for recreation research in the North Central Region. Within the funds available for forest resources evaluation, the committee directs that \$100,000 be available for forest survey, North Central Region.

State and private forestry cooperation

Appropriation, 1974	\$28,022,000
Estimate, 1975	29,746,000
Recommended, 1975	34,638,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+6,616,000
Estimate, 1975	+4,892,000

This program, carried out in cooperation with the States, encourages private timber management.

The net increase of \$4,892,000 above the budget estimate consists of decreases of \$9,000 for pay costs and \$20,000 for GSA space and an increase of \$4,921,000 for cooperation in forest fire control.

Construction and land acquisition

Appropriation, 1974	\$27,093,000
Estimate, 1975	24,147,000
Recommended, 1975	31,459,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974	+4,366,000
Estimate, 1975	+7,312,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate, 1975
Forest land management construction:			
Development of recreation—public use areas	4,866	+3,791	+3,075
Water resources development construction	2,118	+1,949	
Construction for fire, administration, and other purposes	1,643	+540	
Research construction	4,355	-1,353	+4,355
Water pollution abatement	15,704	-2,034	
Land acquisition, Weeks Act	1,560	+260	
GSA space costs	393	+393	-66
Pay cost increases	820	+820	-52
Total, construction and land acquisition	31,459	+4,366	+7,312

The net increase of \$7,312,000 above the budget estimate consists of decreases of \$52,000 for pay costs and \$66,000 for GSA space and the following increases:

Recreation construction, Council Bluffs Project, Clark National Forest, Missouri	+\$1,325,000
Visitors facilities, Blanchard Springs Caverns, Arkansas	+900,000
Laboratory construction, Auburn University, Alabama	+816,000
Laboratory construction, Arcata, Calif.	+564,000
Public facilities, Kerr Aboretum, Okla.	+450,000
Laboratory construction (west wing), Corvallis, Oreg.	+2,800,000
Planning and design, Forest Research Laboratory, Fresno, Calif.	+175,000

Recreation construction, Mueller Park, Cache NF, Utah	+\$100,000
Water systems and sanitation facilities for group-type camping area at Jackson Flat, Angeles National Forest, Calif.	+300,000

*FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS**Liquidation of contract authority*

Appropriation, 1974	\$97,700,000
Estimate, 1975	121,000,000
Recommended, 1975	120,464,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+22,764,000
Estimate, 1975	-536,000

These funds are required to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authority contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act. The reduction of \$536,000 below the budget estimate is for GSA space. Within the funds provided, the committee directs that \$175,000 be used for construction of access roads for a group-type camping area at Jackson Flat in the Angeles National Forest, Calif.

The committee reemphasizes its strong opposition to the road policy which is currently in effect for the Forest Service. Requiring timber purchasers to construct timber access roads has the effect of reducing total receipts to the Federal Government and, therefore, to the State and county governments which also share the revenues. Furthermore, it encourages construction of roads whose quality is not consistent with the multiple use of objectives of Forest Service lands. In addition, it discourages the small timber operator from competing for timber contracts and depletes the fine engineering staff presently employed by the Forest Service. The committee expects the appropriate authorizing committees to address this policy and recommend to the Congress necessary changes.

The committee is concerned that the entire road program for fiscal year 1975 relates to timber harvesting needs. There are substantial additional needs for recreation and general purpose roads and the committee is aware that approximately \$7 million could be used for this purpose in fiscal year 1975. The committee directs that, using contract authority currently available, the Forest Service increase its road program to provide for recreation and general purpose needs. Liquidating cash for the increased program can be provided in future years.

Acquisition of lands for national forest, special acts

Appropriation, 1974	\$94,000
Estimate, 1975	161,000
Recommended, 1975	161,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+67,000
Estimate, 1975	

Congress has enacted several special laws which authorize appropriations from the receipts of specified national forests for the purchase of lands to minimize erosion and flood damage.

Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges

Appropriation, 1974	\$55,300
Estimate, 1975	39,310
Recommended, 1975	39,310

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1974..... —\$15,990
Estimate, 1975.....

The act of December 4, 1967 (16 USC 484a) stipulates that deposits made by public school districts or public school authorities to provide for cash equalization of certain land exchanges can be appropriated to acquire similar lands suitable for national forest system purposes in the same State as the national forest lands conveyed in the exchanges.

Acquisition of lands, Klamath Indians

Appropriation, 1974.....
Estimate, 1975..... \$49,000,000
Recommended, 1975..... 49,000,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1974..... +49,000,000
Estimate, 1975.....

Public Law 93-102, August 16, 1973, authorized the acquisition of the remaining Klamath Indian forest lands in Oregon. These lands constitute about 134,961 acres and are to become part of the Winema National Forest. The committee recommendation provides the estimated cost of the acquisition of these lands.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

Special fund, indefinite

Appropriation, 1974..... \$700,000
Estimate, 1975..... 700,000
Recommended, 1975..... 700,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1974.....
Estimate, 1975.....

Part of the grazing fees from the national forests, when appropriated, are used for revegetation of depleted range lands, construction and maintenance of range improvements, rodent control, and eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds.

Assistance to States for tree planting

Appropriation, 1974..... \$1,013,000
Estimate, 1975..... 1,346,000
Recommended, 1975..... 1,344,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1974..... +331,000
Estimate, 1975..... —2,000

These funds are used to provide advice, technical assistance, and financial contributions under section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, to carry out increased tree planting and reforestation work on non-Federal forest lands.

Grants are matched by the States, and work is conducted in accordance with the plans submitted by the States, and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The reduction of \$2,000 below the budget estimate is for GSA space.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF RECREATION FACILITIES

Indefinite, special fund

Appropriation, 1974..... \$3,278,000
Estimate, 1975..... 1,260,000
Recommended, 1975..... 1,260,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1974..... —2,018,000
Estimate, 1975.....

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,260,000, the budget estimate. Authority for this program originates from Public Law 92-347, approved July 11, 1972, whereby admission fees and user charges collected by the U.S. Forest Service at certain recreation areas

are made available for appropriation for recreation-related activities.

The recommendation will provide for repair of facilities at fee-designated sites and increased enforcement of laws and regulations on Forest Service lands in order to reduce vandalism.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Appropriation, 1974..... \$153,000
Estimate, 1975..... 176,000
Recommended, 1975..... 174,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1974..... +21,000
Estimate, 1975..... —2,000

The Commission of Fine Arts is a permanent advisory agency created to give advice concerning esthetic standards and matters of civic design involved in the orderly development of the city of Washington; and to furnish expert opinion on questions of art to the President, to the Congress and its committees, and to the heads of various departments and agencies of the Federal and District governments. The committee commends the Commission for the excellent work it has done.

The reduction of \$2,000 below the budget estimate is for GSA space.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Indian health services

Appropriation, 1974..... \$200,284,000
Estimate, 1975..... 226,043,000
Recommended, 1975..... 225,352,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1974..... +25,068,000
Estimate, 1975..... —691,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation (thousands)	Estimate, 1975 (thousands)
Patient care.....	\$148,696,101	+\$12,233	+\$100
Field health services.....	69,816,000	—9,103	—696
Program management.....	3,111,000	—121	—
GSA space costs.....	1,928,899	+1,811	—1,484
Pay cost increases.....	1,800,000	—1,800	—3
Total, Indian health services.....	225,352,000	+25,068	—691

The net reduction of \$691,000 below the budget estimate consists of decreases of \$1,484,000 for GSA space and \$3,000 for pay costs and the following increases:

Medical care program, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Colorado.....	+\$100,000
Study of the unmet health needs of the Indians served by the Small Tribes Organization of Western Washington who do not come within the current scope of the Indian Health Service program to determine how to best serve the needs.....	+100,000
Dental care, including programs for the Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Montana.....	+50,000
Health education.....	+21,000
Community health medics, including 20 additional positions.....	+250,000
Health clinic, White Eagle, Okla., including 24 additional positions.....	+275,000

The committee wishes to commend the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the administration for finally recognizing in this budget the urgent need for expanded programs in Indian health. In terms of the improvements made in the overall status of Indian health, the Indian Health Service is one of the real success stories in the Government. But there is still much to be accomplished, as the following items indicate:

The mortality rate from various causes for Indians is considerably higher than the general population.

Twenty Indian hospitals need replacement and thirteen additional hospitals require major modernization. The estimated cost of this work is more than \$400 million.

Only 16 out of 51 Indian hospitals fully meet fire and safety codes; only 22 of the 51 Indian hospitals are accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals.

An estimated 22,150 Indian homes need running water and adequate waste disposal facilities; an estimated 15,847 Indian homes need upgrading of existing sanitation facilities.

The committee expects that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Administration will continue to give high priority to the important programs of the Indian Health Service.

Indian health facilities

Appropriation, 1974..... \$49,927,000
Estimate, 1975..... 54,956,000
Recommended, 1975..... 55,406,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1974..... +5,479,000
Estimate, 1975..... +450,000

The recommended increase of \$450,000 over the budget estimate will provide for planning for a replacement hospital in Parker, Ariz.

The committee is aware of the large unmet needs in the construction of Indian hospitals. Budget constraints have prevented the committee from further increasing this budget request to help meet some of these needs. The committee expects that future budgets from the administration will reflect the maintenance and construction needs in this area.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Indian education

Appropriation, 1974..... \$40,000,000
Estimate, 1975..... 42,000,000
Recommended, 1975..... 42,000,000
Comparison:
Appropriation, 1974..... +2,000,000
Estimate, 1975.....

[In thousands]

Activity	Committee bill, 1975	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate, 1975
Part A—Entitlement.....	\$25,000	—	+\$25,000
Part B—Special projects for Indian children.....	12,000	—	—20,000
Part C—Special projects for Indian adults.....	3,000	—	—5,000
Administration.....	2,000	+\$2,000	—
Total, Indian education.....	42,000	+2,000	—

The committee believes that the policy proposed by the administration of

requesting no funding for part A of this program would result in disappointment by many school systems which have just begun to build special programs for Indian education under appropriations made for this program in 1973 and 1974. The committee has therefore made adjustments in the total appropriation requested to return the allocations for parts A, B, and C to the levels at which they were funded in fiscal year 1974.

May I suggest that no school board in the United States use the Indian population in their school as an excuse to add to their financial ability for programs for which the non-Indian children are provided at the expense of Indian funding.

It is unconscionable to make Indian education grants, provided to upgrade total Indian education and knowledge, a part of a school district budget meaningless to Indian children.

In addition may I add the following:

INDIAN EDUCATION ACT

First. The administration requested no funding for part A of the act. In order to avoid disruption in an on-going program, the committee has recommended a level of \$25 million, the same as fiscal year 1974. It should also be noted that the committee recommended, and the Congress approved, a special provision in the current continuing resolution to keep the part A program going. Otherwise it would have fallen to zero on June 30, 1974. Anyone who is familiar with the committee recommendations for Indian education in recent years knows that the committee has not been skimpy with, nor negligent of, the needs in Indian education.

Second. In addition to the \$42 million recommended for the Indian Education Act in this bill, HEW estimates that \$145 million will be available to assist Indian students under the various authorities of the Office of Education.

In addition to this \$187 million total, the bill provides, under the BIA Johnson-O'Malley program \$27,952,000 for assistance to public schools near Indian reservations. This comes to a total of more than \$210 million for assistance to Indians in non-BIA schools.

In addition to this \$210 million, there is almost \$140 million provided in the BIA budget for operation of BIA schools or schools funded by BIA but operated by the tribes on a contract basis.

Third. The committee is again concerned that the proliferation of education programs which affect Indian children has resulted in serious inequities in the way the funds are distributed. While some students receive double or triple "dips," others receive little or nothing. The committee has requested a joint HEW-Interior study to determine ways to more equitably distribute these funds. Until the findings of this study are known, the committee does not believe it is wise to pour more money into the part A program of the Indian Education Act.

Also, in response to a letter from me to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a letter was forwarded me on June 7 which said:

This is in response to your request for data on the number of Indian children en-

rolled in Public schools participating in the Federal programs funded under the legislative authorities; Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I, PL-874 Federal Impact Aid, the Johnson-O'Malley Act, and Title IV the Indian Education Acts.

The following data represents our best estimate of the number of Indian children participating in the Federal program mentioned above, during school year 1973-74. These figures are estimates and should be treated as such; however, we feel they are reasonable.

Federal programs:

Number of Indians participating, school year 1973-74

ESEA title I.....	70,500
Public Law 874.....	68,875
Title IV, Indian Education Act.....	35,000
Johnson-O'Malley program.....	51,150

NOTE.—Total number of Indian children enrolled in Public school during school year 73-74 is 230,000.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs indicates that approximately 93,000 Indians in public schools are receiving funds under the Johnson-O'Malley program; however, 41,850 of the 93,000 are participating in terms of general aid, whereas, 51,150 are participating in terms of special programs. The 68,875 shown for PL-874 is all in terms of general aid to the school district enrolling children from Federal lands.

It is not possible to estimate the number of Indian children who are receiving support from more than one federal program, but it is safe to assume that: the children receiving support from PL-874 and the General Aid category of Johnson-O'Malley are also participating in one of the other federal programs shown above.

May I urge that this whole program of joint participation of funding for Indian young people be investigated by the authorizing Committee of Education and that the committee call the BIA and the Office of Education, HEW, into a review session and provide, as a result of the discussion, a simple structure enabling each Indian child to have a total entitlement payment without overlap.

The taxpayers of the United States are interested in efficiency, and I do not believe that we can talk of achievements when we have an overlap in three ways in Indian education: First, through elementary and secondary moneys, second, through Johnson-O'Malley moneys, and third, through Indian Education moneys.

There are too many underprivileged children to have nothing if we do not figure out a responsible base.

May I again urge the Labor, Health, Education and Welfare Committee to hold oversight hearings and continue the prodding which the Appropriations Subcommittee has given and come up with a formula which reflects not only Indian needs but needs for all underprivileged children.

It is a sad and tragic fact that many young people today do not have a job because they cannot read. It is also a sad and tragic fact that young people who are parents cannot give the proper health and nutrition background to their children because they cannot read or understand the depth of programs which exist for their benefit.

I happen to believe that all minorities should be treated with equal dignity and financing so that we make a total American majority and that we make Amer-

ica responsible and responsive to the needs of every American youngster and every American family. It is not a matter of Indian, black, or chicano, but it is a matter of total excellence for everyone. We can afford to do no less, and we will destroy ourselves if we do not provide the opportunities for every young person in the United States to become part of the American majority.

It is unconscionable to believe that in 1974 our young Indian people have not received the programs which will guarantee them, the young people who are descendants of the possessors of America itself, an opportunity to fully participate in the affairs of the United States.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974	\$1,164,000
Estimate, 1975	1,333,000
Recommended, 1975	1,324,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+160,000
Estimate, 1975	-9,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,324,000, a reduction of \$9,000 below the budget estimate. The reduction below the budget estimate is for GSA space.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974	\$1,559,000
Estimate, 1975	1,840,000
Recommended, 1975	1,777,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+218,000
Estimate, 1975	-63,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,777,000, a reduction of \$63,000 below the budget estimate. The reduction consists of \$47,000 for four additional positions and \$16,000 for GSA space.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974	\$105,275,000
Estimate, 1975	155,000,000
Recommended, 1975	145,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974	+39,725,000
Estimate, 1975	-10,000,000

The committee recommends a total appropriation of \$145,000,000 for activities under this account, a decrease of \$10,000,000 below the budget estimate and an increase of \$39,725,000 over the fiscal year 1974 appropriation.

The following tabulation reflects the distribution of funds as provided in the bill:

[In thousands]

Activity	1974 appropri- ation	1975 budget estimate	Commit- tee bill, 1975	Increase or decrease
National Endowment for the Arts:				
Grants-in-aid to groups or individuals.....	\$46,025	\$57,650	\$53,850	-\$3,800
Grants-in-aid to States.....	8,250	14,350	13,400	-950
National Endowment for the Human- ities:				
Grants-in-aid to groups and individuals.....	35,750	57,000	53,850	-3,150
State-based programs.....	8,750	15,000	13,400	-1,600

Activity	1974 appropriation	1975 budget estimate	Commit- tee bill, 1975	Increase or decrease
Administrative expenses.....	\$6,326	\$10,333	\$9,900	-\$433
GSA space costs.....	174	667	600	-67
Total, national foundation on the arts and the humanities.....	105,275	155,000	145,000	-10,000

The committee is aware of the increasing interest and support by the public for the activities funded in this appropriation. The National Endowment for the Arts estimates that about 40,000 individual grantees or participants were directly affected by the endowments programs in fiscal year 1974 and the programs provided about 550 million contacts with the American public. The National Endowment for the Humanities estimates that about 10 million contacts were made with the American public in just one segment of its program.

Matching grants

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$13,000,000
Estimate, 1975.....	20,000,000
Recommended, 1975.....	14,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+1,000,000
Estimate, 1975.....	-6,000,000

Funds provided under this appropriation account are available for matching in an amount equal to the total amount of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received by each endowment during the current and preceding fiscal years, for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

The \$14,000,000 recommended by the committee in this appropriation will provide \$7,500,000 for the National Endowment for the Arts and \$6,500,000 for the National Endowment for the Humanities. The committee believes that these budget levels reflect realistic programs, given the state of the economy and overall budget priorities.

Relative to the expenditure of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, the committee should recommend an investigation relative to the total level of expenditures which are used in the arts and those in the humanities for it has been suggested that the expenses as an integral part of the humanities are much less than those of the arts programs due to the number of people involved.

For example, if groups of students use humanities grants what relationship in cost is it to the costs of ballet, theatre, or opera productions? Until we have a better analysis, it is difficult to determine the absolute propriety of the relationship of these funds.

First. Should they be equal; if not what difference should there be for the operating arts as against the scholastic humanities?

Second. If there should be no difference, let us have the complete report of the evaluation.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$57,642,000
Estimate, 1975.....	68,789,000
Recommended, 1975.....	67,789,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+10,147,000
Estimate, 1975.....	-1,000,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

[In thousands]

Activity	Commit- tee bill, 1975	Bill compared with— 1974 appropriation	Estimate, 1975
Science.....	\$23,944	+2,146	-\$295
History and art.....	9,021	+333	-63
Public service.....	2,253	+139	-30
Museum programs.....	4,332	+726	-100
Special programs.....	5,429	+2,319	-165
Administration and support activities.....	20,278	+2,206	-120
GSA space costs.....	790	+536	-188
Pay cost increases.....	1,742	+1,742	-39
Total, salaries and expenses.....	67,789	+10,147	-1,000

The committee directs that within the funds provided for the Center for the Study of Man, \$50,000 be included for archeological studies relating to the culture of American Indians.

Science Information Exchange

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$1,695,000
Estimate, 1975.....	1,770,000
Recommended, 1975.....	1,755,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+60,000
Estimate, 1975.....	-15,000

The Science Information Exchange receives, organizes, and disseminates information about research in progress in the life, physical, and social sciences. Its mission is to assist the planning and management of research activities supported by Government and nongovernment agencies and institutions by promoting the exchange of information that concerns subject matter, distribution, level of effort, and other data pertaining to current research in the prepublication stage.

The reduction of \$15,000 below the budget estimate is for pay costs.

Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program)

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$4,500,000
Estimate, 1975.....	4,500,000
Recommended, 1975.....	2,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	-2,500,000
Estimate, 1975.....	-2,500,000

This appropriation item is to provide for the special foreign currency program of awarding grants to American universities, museums, or other institutions of higher learning, interested in conducting research in foreign countries. The committee urges that these funds be used only for projects of the highest possible priority.

The committee recommendation in-

cludes \$1,000,000, the budget estimate, for the salvage of archeological sites on the island of Philae, Egypt.

Restoration and renovation of buildings

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$1,070,000
Estimate, 1975.....	1,325,000
Recommended, 1975.....	1,490,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+420,000
Estimate, 1975.....	+165,000

The increase of \$165,000 above the budget estimate is for the installation of an escalator in the National Museum of Natural History. This item was included in the budget estimate under "Salaries and expenses" and the committee has recommended a corresponding reduction in that account.

Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$3,790,000
Estimate, 1975.....	10,000,000
Recommended, 1975.....	9,420,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+5,630,000
Estimate, 1975.....	-580,000

The amount recommended will provide for the following:

Elephant house and bird house environs.....	\$2,970,000
Planning and initial construction—service and parking facilities.....	2,700,000
Construction of education and administration building.....	2,500,000
Planning.....	600,000
Renovation and repair.....	650,000
Total.....	9,420,000

The committee has recommended a reduction of \$500,000 in the budget estimate for construction of the Education and Administration Building. The committee favors the construction of this building and urges that every effort be made to secure additional funding from non-Federal sources.

Construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$17,000,000
Estimate, 1975.....	10,000,000
Recommended, 1975.....	7,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	-10,000,000
Estimate, 1975.....	-3,000,000

This appropriation provides liquidating cash requirements for contract authority previously authorized for construction of the National Air and Space Museum. Testimony from the Smithsonian Institution indicated that only \$7,000,000 is actually needed to liquidate obligations in fiscal year 1975.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$6,202,000
Estimate, 1975.....	6,673,000
Recommended, 1975.....	6,673,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+471,000
Estimate, 1975.....	

The bill provides \$6,673,000, the budget estimate, for salaries and expenses of the National Gallery of Art.

The National Gallery of Art receives,

holds, and administers works of art acquired for the Nation by the Gallery's Board of Trustees; maintains and administers the Gallery building so as to give maximum care and protection to art treasures and to enable these works of art to be exhibited regularly to the public without charge.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$800,000
Estimate, 1975.....	1,010,000
Recommended, 1975.....	954,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	+154,000
Estimate, 1975.....	-56,000

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was authorized by Public Law 90-637, approved October 24, 1968, as the Nation's official living memorial to the 28th President. It sponsors a continuous advanced scholar, international fellowship program on various social and scientific subjects of special interest in the world of today.

The committee recommendation will provide \$685,000 for the fellowship program and \$269,000 for administrative expenses.

The decrease of \$56,000 below the budget estimate is in the Public Service program. The committee recommendation will provide \$100,000 for this program.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$19,605,000
Estimate, 1975.....	9,719,000

Recommended, 1975.....	\$9,686,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	-9,919,000
Estimate, 1975.....	-33,000

The amount recommended by the committee compared with the 1974 appropriation and the 1975 budget estimate by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1975 (thousands)	Bill compared with—	
		1974 appropriation	Estimate, 1975 (thousands)
Program review and development.....	\$600	-\$234,000	-----
Program coordination.....	2,150	+550,000	-----
Scheduling and facilitation.....	400	-5,500	-----
Bicentennial information network (BINET).....	800	+400,000	-----
Communications.....	1,300	+284,000	-----
International activities.....	200	+150,000	-----
Exhibitions.....	1,900	-11,500	-----
Office support.....	657	-139,000	-----
Direct grants to the States.....	1,375	-----	-----
Matching grants.....	-----	-11,000,000	-----
GSA space costs.....	304	+87,000	-\$33
Total, American revolution bicentennial administration.....	9,686	-9,919,000	-33

The committee urges that all Federal agencies cooperate with State bicentennial commissions and historical societies to the maximum extent possible so that the celebration of the Nation's Bicentennial may be a truly national and coordinated undertaking.

FEDERAL METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$60,000
Estimate, 1975.....	63,000

Recommended, 1975.....	\$60,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1974.....	-----
Estimate, 1975.....	-3,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$60,000, a reduction of \$3,000 below the budget estimate, for the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review which was established by section 10 of the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act (30 U.S.C. 721-740).

The adjudicative duties of the Board, in docketed cases, involve the hearing and determination of applications filed by mine operators seeking annulment or revision of, and temporary relief from, orders issued by the Secretary of the Interior under sections 8 and 9 of the act.

Testimony before the committee revealed that to date, no appeals have been made to the Board for hearing.

JOINT FEDERAL-STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1974.....	\$694,400
Estimate, 1975.....	694,400
Recommended, 1975.....	644,000
Appropriation, 1974.....	-50,400
Estimate, 1975.....	-50,400

The Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission for Alaska was established by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act—Public Law 92-203. Under the act the Federal Government will pay 50 percent of the Commission's expenses and the State government will pay 50 percent.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1974 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1975

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1974 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1975 ¹ (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, 1974 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1975 (6)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Land and Water Resources					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources.....	\$116,682,000	\$142,469,000	\$140,696,000	+\$24,014,000	—\$1,773,000
Construction and maintenance.....	6,800,000	6,655,000	6,655,000	—145,000	
Public lands development roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(4,000,000)	(4,070,000)	(4,070,000)	(-70,000)	
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite, appropriation of receipts).....	28,750,000	28,750,000	28,750,000		
Range improvements (indefinite, appropriation of receipts).....	3,242,000	4,503,000	4,503,000	+1,261,000	
Recreation development and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund).....	165,000	242,000	242,000	+77,000	
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	155,639,000	182,619,000	180,846,000	+25,207,000	—1,773,000
Office of Water Resources Research					
Salaries and expenses.....	13,769,000	12,700,000	13,795,000	+26,000	+1,095,000
Total, Land and Water Resources.....	169,408,000	195,319,000	194,641,000	+25,233,000	—678,000
Fish and Wildlife and Parks					
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation					
Salaries and expenses.....	4,969,000	5,040,000	5,010,000	+314,000	—30,000
Land and Water Conservation Fund					
Appropriation of receipts (indefinite).....	76,223,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	+223,777,000	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service					
Resource management.....	86,537,000	101,095,000	100,666,000	+14,129,000	—429,000
Construction and anadromous fish.....	8,126,500	8,597,000	13,447,000	+5,320,500	+4,850,000
Migratory bird conservation account (definite, repayable advance).....	3,500,000		1,000,000	—2,500,000	+1,000,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service.....	98,163,500	109,692,000	115,113,000	+16,949,500	+5,421,000

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1974 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1975 ¹ (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, 1974 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1975 (6)
National Park Service					
Operation of the National Park System.....	\$193,752,000	\$210,058,000	\$209,437,000	+\$15,685,000	—\$621,000
Planning and construction.....	20,012,000	57,303,000	53,466,000	+33,454,000	-3,837,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(35,000,000)	(23,000,000)	(24,126,000)	(-10,874,000)	(+1,126,000)
Preservation of historic properties.....	15,842,000	24,375,000	24,375,000	+8,533,000
Planning, development and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund).....	30,378,000	11,900,000	11,900,000	-18,478,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	2,400,000	2,420,000	2,420,000	+20,000
Total, National Park Service.....	262,384,000	306,056,000	301,598,000	+39,214,000	-4,458,000
Total, Fish and Wildlife and Parks.....	441,466,500	720,788,000	721,721,000	+280,254,500	+933,000
Energy and Minerals					
Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	160,240,000	205,576,000	203,195,000	+42,955,000	-2,381,000
Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	59,040,000	68,146,000	67,803,000	+8,763,000	-343,000
Bureau of Mines					
Mines and minerals.....	71,989,000	75,539,000	77,703,000	+5,714,000	+2,164,000
Total, Energy and Minerals.....	291,269,000	349,261,000	348,701,000	+57,432,000	-560,000
Indian Affairs					
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Operation of Indian programs.....	414,478,000	464,107,000	467,096,000	+52,618,000	+2,989,000
Education and welfare services (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(793,000)	(-793,000)
Construction.....	54,723,000	51,875,000	66,571,000	+11,848,000	+14,696,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(43,000,000)	(59,000,000)	(59,000,000)	(+16,000,000)
Indian loan guaranty and insurance fund.....	20,000,000	20,000,000	+20,000,000
Revolving fund for loans.....	900,000	50,000,000	38,000,000	+37,100,000	-12,000,000
Alaska Native fund.....	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (definite).....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite).....	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	558,601,000	674,482,000	680,167,000	+121,566,000	+5,685,000
Territorial Affairs					
Office of Territorial Affairs					
Administration of territories.....	15,500,000	15,000,000	14,950,000	+450,000	-50,000
Permanent appropriation (special fund).....	(420,000)	(625,000)	(625,000)	(+205,000)
Transferred from other accounts (special fund).....	(645,000)	(875,000)	(875,000)	(+230,000)
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	59,386,000	61,000,000	63,500,000	+4,114,000	+2,500,000
Micronesian claims fund, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	1,400,000	1,400,000	+1,400,000
Total, Office of Territorial Affairs.....	73,886,000	77,400,000	79,850,000	+5,964,000	+2,450,000
Secretarial Offices					
Office of the Solicitor					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,089,000	11,870,000	11,790,000	+2,701,000	-80,000
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses.....	17,225,000	20,047,000	19,629,000	+2,404,000	-418,000
Departmental operations.....	6,620,000	10,954,000	10,954,000	+4,334,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program).....	670,000	522,000	192,000	-478,000	-330,000
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	24,515,000	31,523,000	30,775,000	+6,260,000	-748,000
Total, Secretarial Offices.....	33,604,000	43,393,000	42,565,000	+8,961,000	-828,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of the Interior.....	1,568,234,500	2,060,643,000	2,067,645,000	+499,410,500	+7,002,000
Consisting of—					
Appropriations.....	1,568,234,500	2,060,643,000	2,067,645,000	+499,410,500	+7,002,000
Definite appropriations.....	(1,413,976,500)	(1,699,748,000)	(1,706,750,000)	(+292,773,500)	(+7,002,000)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(154,258,000)	(360,895,000)	(360,895,000)	(+206,637,000)
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(82,793,000)	(86,070,000)	(87,196,000)	(+4,403,000)	(+1,126,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(1,651,027,500)	(2,146,713,000)	(2,154,841,000)	(+503,813,500)	(+8,128,000)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES					
Department of Agriculture					
Forest Service					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management.....	377,884,000	291,136,000	306,278,000	-71,606,000	+15,142,000
Forest research.....	63,800,000	70,525,000	75,487,000	+11,887,000	+4,962,000
State and private forestry cooperation.....	28,022,000	29,746,000	34,638,000	+6,616,000	+4,892,000
Total, forest protection and utilization.....	469,706,000	391,407,000	416,403,000	-53,303,000	+24,996,000
Construction and land acquisition.....	27,093,000	24,147,000	31,459,000	+4,366,000	+7,312,000
Forest roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(97,700,000)	(121,000,000)	(120,464,000)	(+22,764,000)	(-536,000)
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Special acts (special fund, indefinite).....	94,000	161,000	161,000	+67,000
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges.....	55,300	39,310	39,310	-15,990
Acquisition of lands, Klamath Indians.....	700,000	49,000,000	49,000,000	+49,000,000
Cooperative range improvements (special fund, indefinite).....	700,000	700,000	700,000
Assistance to States for tree planting.....	1,013,000	1,346,000	1,344,000	+331,000	-2,000
Construction and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund).....	3,278,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	-2,018,000
Total, Forest Service.....	501,939,300	468,060,310	500,366,310	-1,572,990	+32,306,000
Commission of Fine Arts					
Salaries and expenses.....	153,000	176,000	174,000	+21,000	-2,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1974 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1975—Continued

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1974 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1975 ¹ (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, 1974 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1975 (6)
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare					
Health Services Administration					
Indian health services	\$200,284,000	\$226,043,000	\$225,352,000	\$+25,068,000	—\$691,000
Indian health facilities	49,927,000	54,956,000	55,406,000	+5,479,000	+450,000
Total, Indian Health	250,211,000	280,999,000	280,758,000	+30,547,000	—241,000
Office of Education					
Indian education	40,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	+2,000,000	
Indian Claims Commission					
Salaries and expenses	1,164,000	1,333,000	1,324,000	+160,000	—9,000
National Capital Planning Commission					
Salaries and expenses	1,559,000	1,840,000	1,777,000	+218,000	—63,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities					
Salaries and Expenses					
Endowment for the arts	54,275,000	72,000,000	67,250,000	+12,975,000	—4,750,000
Endowment for the humanities	44,500,000	72,000,000	67,250,000	+22,750,000	—4,750,000
Administrative expenses	6,500,000	11,000,000	10,500,000	+4,000,000	—500,000
Subtotal, salaries and expenses	105,275,000	155,000,000	145,000,000	+39,725,000	—10,000,000
Matching Grants					
Endowment for the arts (indefinite)	6,500,000	10,000,000	7,500,000	+1,000,000	—2,500,000
Endowment for the humanities (indefinite)	6,500,000	10,000,000	6,500,000		—3,500,000
Subtotal, matching grants	13,000,000	20,000,000	14,000,000	+1,000,000	—6,000,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	118,275,000	175,000,000	159,000,000	+40,725,000	—16,000,000
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses	57,642,000	68,789,000	67,789,000	+10,147,000	—1,000,000
Science information exchange	1,695,000	1,770,000	1,755,000	+60,000	—15,000
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program)	4,500,000	4,500,000	2,000,000	—2,500,000	—2,500,000
Restoration and renovation of buildings	1,070,000	1,325,000	1,490,000	+420,000	+165,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	3,790,000	10,000,000	9,420,000	+5,630,000	—580,000
Construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)	(17,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(—10,000,000)	(—3,000,000)
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	6,202,000	6,673,000	6,673,000	+471,000	
Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	800,000	1,010,000	954,000	+154,000	—56,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	75,699,000	94,067,000	90,081,000	+14,382,000	—3,986,000
Historical and Memorial Commissions					
American Revolution Bicentennial Administration					
Salaries and expenses	19,605,000	9,719,000	9,686,000	—9,919,000	—33,000
National Council on Indian Opportunity					
Salaries and expenses	282,000	(^c)		—282,000	
Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review					
Salaries and expenses	60,000	63,000	60,000		—3,000
Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission for Alaska					
Salaries and expenses	694,400	694,400	644,000	—50,400	—50,400
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Related Agencies	1,009,641,700	1,073,951,710	1,085,870,310	+76,228,610	+11,918,600
Consisting of—					
Appropriations	1,009,641,700	1,073,951,710	1,085,870,310	+76,228,610	+11,918,600
Definite appropriations	(992,569,700)	(1,051,830,710)	(1,069,749,310)	(+77,179,610)	(+17,918,600)
Indefinite appropriations	(17,072,000)	(22,121,000)	(16,121,000)	(—951,000)	(—6,000,000)
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(114,700,000)	(131,000,000)	(127,464,000)	(+12,764,000)	(—3,536,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(1,124,341,700)	(1,204,951,710)	(1,213,334,310)	(+88,992,610)	(+8,382,600)
RECAPITULATION					
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles	2,577,876,200	3,134,594,710	3,153,515,310	+575,639,110	+18,920,600
Consisting of—					
Appropriations	2,577,876,200	3,134,594,710	3,153,515,310	+575,639,110	+18,920,600
Definite appropriations	(2,406,546,200)	(2,751,578,710)	(2,776,499,310)	(+369,953,110)	(+24,920,600)
Indefinite appropriations	(171,330,000)	(383,016,000)	(377,016,000)	(+205,686,000)	(—6,000,000)
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(197,493,000)	(217,070,000)	(214,660,000)	(+17,167,000)	(—2,410,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(2,775,369,200)	(3,351,664,710)	(3,368,175,310)	(+592,806,110)	(+16,510,600)
Special Energy Research and Development bill (Interior portion)	(230,083,000)	(561,633,000)	(543,166,000)	(+313,083,000)	(—18,467,000)
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(3,005,452,200)	(3,913,297,710)	(3,911,341,310)	(+905,889,110)	(—1,956,400)

Footnotes at end of table.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Includes budget amendments as follows:

H. Doc. 93-209	
Bureau of Land Management: Management of lands and resources	\$9,700,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service: Resource management	800,000
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	25,300,000
Bureau of Mines: Mines and minerals	103,500,000
Office of Coal Research: Salaries and expenses	148,400,000
Office of the Secretary: Energy conservation and analysis	12,900,000
Total, H. Doc. 93-209	300,600,000
H. Doc. 93-286	
Bureau of Land Management: Management of lands and resources	12,325,000
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	2,625,000
Bureau of Mines: Mines and minerals	300,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs: Operation of Indian programs	300,000
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses	350,000
Office of the Secretary: Departmental operations	1,400,000
Total, H. Doc. 93-286	17,300,000
H. Doc. 93-291	
Forest Service: Acquisition of lands, Klamath Indians	49,000,000

H. Doc. 93-307	
Bureau of Land Management: Management of lands and resources	\$1,110,000
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	15,205,000
Total, H. Doc. 93-307	16,315,000
H. Doc. 93-310	
Bureau of Indian Affairs:	
Operation of Indian Programs	10,000,000
Indian Revolving fund for loans	50,000,000
Indian Loan Guaranty and Insurance fund	20,000,000
Total, H. Doc. 93-310	80,000,000
H. Doc. 93-317	
Forest Service: Forest Research	6,040,000
Total, budget amendments	469,255,000

* Budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 93-286 withdrew the request of \$300,000 for appropriations for the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, we have presented in detail this bill. We have also presented in detail through our volumes of hearings the factual problems of America. I have one final word. If you believe in this country and your country's sense of commitment to destiny, then you should vote for this bill. If you believe that the American society deserves less than we give to foreign nations around the world, vote "No."

The committee firmly believes that we would be less than responsible and responsive to the needs of this Nation, if we do not support this bill.

The usual and standard quote at this point in our proceedings is to say, "This is a good bill, you should support it." I am not going to repeat those words, because it is the best bill we could do under the fiscal system. I am, however, going to say that if you believe that Americans deserve good management of their natural and human resources, and if you believe that the United States is going to last much longer than impeachment proceedings, you will support the bill.

It is a bill for you—a bill for the future of that America which will last long after we have celebrated our bicentennial. It is a meaningful contribution to the tricentennial and to the society of nations with whom we associate.

Frankly, I believe that this bill is a small downpayment on what we owe our inheritors. It is a small downpayment that we make for having had the privilege of living on the American earth, and it is a commitment to the American future.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee for its vigilance in assuring that the public interest is protected under the proposed expansion of leasing on the Continental Shelf. I am troubled with talk about a 10-million-acre leasing program which may exceed the capacity for development.

Can the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the committee, give me some assurance that this leasing will not be beyond the capacity of development?

Right now there is a shortage of development equipment. Can the gentle-

woman, the chairman of the committee, assure me that there will be some vigilance over the leasing program in order to assure it keeps pace with the availability or is related to the availability of production equipment?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Ohio that this subject has received more care and more scrutiny in the committee discussions and in our hearings than any other. That is the reason why on page 7 and page 8 of the report the Members will find a thorough discussion of the responsibility that we felt the Department of the Interior should have in the matter of leasing.

Project Independence provides for a target program—and I use the word, "target," advisedly—of 10 million acres, expanding the program from 3 million acres.

The committee is well aware of the problems of greatly expanding OCS leasing particularly because of the environmental considerations. We have very fragile terrain offshore. We think that the Department of the Interior should not only report its environmental findings, but that it should discuss the problems with the States involved, because there are some States which have complete restrictions against exploration, against drilling, and so forth.

On the other hand, as the gentleman knows, the United States is faced with developing additional sources of energy to be able to meet the ever-expanding needs. However, the committee felt that there should be very careful review at each step of the OCS leasing program. Vast amounts of knowledge are necessary and that is why the special energy research and development appropriation bill and this bill have provided additional funds which we felt are necessary.

The Members are well aware, I am sure, that this committee has increased funding for the Geological Survey year after year. The committee was extremely disturbed several years ago to discover that the oil companies and the business enterprises knew far more about the terrain and about the characteristics of the land and the problems concerning these matters than did the Government. The Government did not have the money to develop the knowledge, and the commit-

tee has been continually struggling with this problem.

We think that we are building a far sounder structure.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentlewoman, the chairman of the committee, and the committee for this action they have taken.

Mr. Chairman, leasing of Federal lands for energy development should not be permitted beyond the capacity for reasonable development. It appears that the Department of Interior, in proposing an expansion of OCS leasing to 10 million acres a year, apparently has forgotten this principle of equity and good sense. In exploring for a justification for the accelerated leasing schedule, I have found almost no hard facts. Some Interior representatives claim, in fact, that the 10-million-acre target is only an approximate goal meant to spur additional drilling in some vague hope of achieving energy self-sufficiency by 1980.

The Council on Environmental Quality recently released its report on leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf. One of the major facts stressed by CEQ in its report was that the presence of commercially recoverable oil and gas reserves in the Atlantic and Alaskan OCS—areas targeted under the accelerated leasing program—is only speculative. In short, if we lease these areas now, we will not even be sure what we are giving away.

Another factor that must be considered is the extent to which the Department of Interior is capable of regulating this development. Currently, DOI's program for supervising OCS leasing relies on a great deal of coordination between the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey. This program has proven itself barely adequate to handle the relatively low levels of leasing activity in the past. There is good reason to believe that this tenuous organizational arrangement will crumble under the additional pressure of a 10-million-acre program. Already there are indications that the Geological Survey is not performing an adequate job of regulating drilling activities on existing leases in the OCS.

In sum, it appears to me that there are ample reasons why the OCS program should not go forward. The accelerated leasing of the OCS at this stage is premature and quite apparently a reflex action to the energy shortages of this

winter. The potential for abuse of the public interest is high. For these reasons, I hope the committee will continue to demonstrate a high degree of vigilance over the Department of Interior's activities in this area.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Before the gentleman from Pennsylvania delivers the main text of his address, I think we ought to take a moment to talk about the subcommittee chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. JULIA HANSEN). She has done such a marvelous job for the Congress, for the Committee on Appropriations, for her constituents, and for the country that I know that Members of the House on both sides of the aisle would like to pay special tribute to this remarkably capable person at this time.

Many committee chairmen, many subcommittee chairmen, and all Members of the House of Representatives have heavy responsibilities. When I survey our House membership I must say that there is no more dedicated, devoted, and effective person in the House than the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. JULIA HANSEN). I think it is a great loss that she is not going to be with us next year. She does her homework; she knows her bill; she works with her colleagues and others; and she serves the country eminently well. Future generations will owe a debt of gratitude to the foresight that JULIA HANSEN has demonstrated in providing for our precious national resources.

Mr. Chairman, our losses are furthered by the departure of WENDELL WYATT. The distinguished gentleman from Oregon has repeatedly made valuable contributions in his work on the Interior Subcommittee and in the committee and the House otherwise. His sound, level-headed judgment has always been apparent in our deliberations in the committee. He will be greatly missed.

As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to offer special recognition to these two distinguished and outstanding Americans.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas, in paying my respects and regrets to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) who will not be with us next year.

Those of us who have served with this delightful lady recognize that she has made a tremendous contribution. Not only has she handled this bill with great efficiency and great concern for the items covered in the bill, but also in all of the

other things that she has done while she has served with us here in the Congress. I have always found every time that I have discussed anything with the gentlewoman that she has always had an understanding and a receptive ear. She does not always say, "Yes." We do not want a chairman who always says, "Yes." She is a delightful person, and we are going to miss the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. JULIA HANSEN, a great deal. Not only are we going to miss the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, but as well our colleague, the gentleman from the neighboring State of Oregon, Mr. WENDELL WYATT, who is going to leave us. He will not be here either next year.

As they go to whatever they plan to do after this session of Congress, we wish them well and want them to know that we are grateful for the contributions that they have made during their service here.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am no longer a member of this subcommittee but for 3 years I was a member and for at least a year and a half I served as the ranking Democratic member on the subcommittee with the gentlewoman from Washington, (Mrs. HANSEN) and also with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT). I just want to add my words at this point to indicate there are very few people in the House who have been more pleasurable to work with than have been the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT). I think both of them have shown a decency and a concern about the subject at hand and I am pleased to have served during my career in the House with such outstanding members.

Mr. McDADE. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the dedicated public service of the distinguished chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

She has established a highly respected leadership in the vital areas of conservation and energy development. She has been forceful in preserving and protecting the national domain. She has always been graciously cooperative. These policies and her contributions deserve the eternal gratitude of the American people.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to say to my very distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan as well as my other colleagues who have commented briefly today that I wish to join them in expressing regret at the

decision of the gentlewoman from Washington to retire. This is indeed the last appropriation bill that we will pass that will bear her hallmark. I think it is worthy of note that in the years she has been here every single appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies has borne the stamp in no uncertain terms of the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN).

I think it is important for us to remember however that the work she has done in the past will go on, that millions of Americans enjoy a better usage of the national parks because of her interest in them, that millions of Americans will derive benefits from our national forests because of the tremendous interest she has taken, and that countless thousands of young Indian children will be given better educations and better health care because the gentlewoman from Washington has taken the time and effort and made the hard decisions to make that possible.

So we wish her well in her retirement and thank her for so many years of dedicated public service.

Likewise I want to pay tribute to my dear friend, the gentleman from the State of Oregon (Mr. WENDELL WYATT) who is making his last trip around today on this appropriation bill. I have been privileged as a Member of the minority side of the aisle to be the beneficiary of the wise counsel of my friend from Oregon on numerous occasions. Somebody once made the comment that one man who is right constitutes a majority, and if that phrase ever had applicability I think it has applicability in the case of my dear friend, the gentleman from Oregon.

Nobody, and I say this just as forcefully as I can, has spent more time and more hours looking at the problems that face the national forests of our Nation than the gentleman from Oregon. He is in my judgment the most knowledgeable Member of the House of Representatives with respect to this tremendously important resource and he has done so much to make these bills better vehicles for all Americans for all time.

We wish the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WENDELL WYATT) Godspeed in his retirement and thank him for the tremendous public service he has performed so unselfishly and without a great desire to take the credit but with a desire to get the job done on so many important issues on so many different occasions.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. From the comments just made about our colleague from Oregon and his willingness to dig in to find the facts, of course, his position without actively seeking a lot of publicity or seeking to aggrandize himself, is well taken. I have had a chance on many occasions to work with the gentleman in the well and our good colleague, the gentleman from Oregon. In both cases they

have been willing to make sure that the appropriation with which we were dealing was very thoughtfully considered and yet they were both pretty hard-nosed trying to stay within the budgetary requirements, and especially the gentleman from Oregon in his tremendous efforts to make sure that our National Parks and Forests in the West are adequately protected. He has been exceptionally good and effective in making sure we have adequate funds for this type of activity.

So I thank the gentleman for bringing out the point that our colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, has been so conscientious in his work on appropriations and trying to provide for what is really needed and not trying to take all the credit when many other Members of Congress are taking all the credit; so I appreciate the gentleman bringing out this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDADE. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to rise today to urge support for this important appropriation bill. It has been a great pleasure taking note of the tremendous contributions of the gentle lady from Washington and gentleman from Oregon as we brought this bill to the floor; but make no mistake about it, this bill is the work product of a group of men and women who have worked together trying to produce a major resource bill to Congress and do it in a way that makes it capable of support by every Member of the House.

I hope that when we get beyond the 5-minute rule it will get the strong endorsement of the House, because I believe it merits it.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I notice on page 2 of the report, the second table on the page, that there is \$354,079,972 of additional spending. I assume for the same general purposes as those in 1974. Now, irrespective of the budget, this is an increase of \$354 million over the appropriations for the same general purposes of last year.

Mr. McDADE. I would point out to the gentleman concerning that table that it includes, in addition to the regular budget request, permanent appropriations that exist within this bill, those that are essentially earmarked appropriations over which we have very little control. To try to present a full picture of what is being expended, those permanent appropriations are included along with the roughly \$3.1 billion which is the first column for fiscal year 1975 for Interior and related agencies appropriation bill—\$3.1 billion.

The items below that, I say to my able colleague from Iowa, are permanent funds over which we have very little discretion, but we wanted the gentleman to know the total amount of expenditures that are to apply, and therefore

they are included, and indeed they do reflect increases in expenditures.

Mr. GROSS. So it can be accurately said that the bill is \$354 million over expenditures for the same general purposes as last year?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleague that there is no doubt that there are additional expenditures. I do want to point out to my colleague, if I may, however, that the table above it indicates the amount of new obligatory authority that was requested of our subcommittee in both bills.

The gentleman will recall that the sum of \$500 million which was in this bill was taken out of it and put into the energy appropriation which we passed some time ago. If the gentleman takes into consideration all the requests which we got as a committee of the House for new obligatory authority, I say to the gentleman that we exceed those requests by \$400 million, looking at the total package.

Mr. GROSS. Well, somehow or other I still cannot relate—but the gentleman is saying that this table, the second table on page 2 of the report, is \$354 million above spending for the same general purposes as last year—we cannot very well fight inflation on that basis, can we?

Mr. McDADE. There are increases in expenditures, I say to my colleague, but a lot of that money the gentleman sees reflected in that table is presented to give him and other Members of the House a total picture of what is involved here, but it is important to know that we have very little control over those permanent accounts. They do impact on Federal spending, but not in new obligation authority.

What we had before us is more accurately reflected above in the summary of the bill showing what the requests for new obligatory authority were; new spending authority were, and how we dealt with those.

I say to my colleague from Iowa that we did make a very strong effort to keep this bill within the bounds of the recommended budget. As I indicated, we had to consider about a billion dollars of requests in excess of the budget. We worked very diligently not to get into that position and to bring to the House a bill today which would not force the Members to have to decide what they would be for or against—a budget buster like that or this important resource bill. We have not done that.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the real test not how much we spend above what we spent last year?

If you and I are in financial trouble, we must cut our rate of spending, cannot we agree on that?

Mr. McDADE. I think that is certainly one test people ought to apply, but I do not think it is the full test. For example, may I say to my colleague that in this bill, and in the energy bill we passed some

time ago, was a great deal of money to try to develop our resources—if you will, the peoples' resources—to solve the energy crisis.

That did reflect increases in spending that will occur in fiscal year 1975.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I think it is important, I say to my able colleague from Iowa, to recognize some of these things. We have to examine the Outer Continental Shelf to see whether or not we ought not to be bringing in more production of oil. We have to examine whether or not we cannot take coal and put it into a more presentable form, either through liquefaction or gasification, to try to help us solve the energy crisis.

Some of these expenditures that we are making in this bill I think will help us through the energy crisis and will assist us, it seems to me, in bringing in additional revenue to the Treasury, something like \$9 million, by activities generated within this bill.

I think this is a good investment in helping us to use our resources. This bill does more than a few worthwhile things. I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. Yes, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that in the budget this year there is an item we have not carried before, and that is GSA space costs which amounts to a substantial amount of money.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, looking at all these factors and recognizing what it is we are making these expenditures for today, I think we can support this bill with a resounding vote. I hope that we do. I hope that we recognize that the investment that we are making in this bill in our national forests and in our national resources and that we will do much in assisting our native Americans to get better education, to get better health care, and indeed, in trying to make cultural opportunities available to a wider segment of the American people.

All of these factors merit our support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 16072 is in my judgment, one of the most important bills brought before this House each year. It is a resource bill where investments are made in renewable resources, energy resources, recreational resources, and, most importantly, in human resources. The dividends from these investments are realized in better education for Indian children, improved health care for Indian families, cultural and recreational opportunities for millions of American families and effective environmental management policies for our public lands.

The total new obligatory authority contained in this bill amounts to \$3,153,515,310. This is \$450,630 above the budget

estimates, and quite close to the amounts requested. However, a more meaningful comparison in my judgment, is to look at the funds we are appropriating today in terms of how much revenue they will generate. The total revenues generated in this bill will amount to an estimated \$9,162,525,310 for the coming fiscal year. This means we are investing \$3 billion and we are generating \$9 billion. This by anyone's standards, is a tremendous investment of tax dollars.

However, we must look at the total picture. The actions of the committee in funding items in this bill will yield benefits to our Nation for many years to come and those benefits will not only be measured in terms of dollars and cents. The vast acreage of public lands managed by the Interior Department and the Forest Service represent a proprietary relationship between the people of this Nation and their Government. At the present time, 1,897 billion acres, both onshore and offshore, containing huge amounts of resources are funded through the activities in this bill. These lands will yield an abundance of national and natural resources now and for many years to come.

Our national forests yield a harvest of 12.6 billion board feet of timber, one-half of the water resources of the West, grazing for 6 million head of livestock. The Bureau of Land Management administers the sale of over 1.3 billion board feet of timber annually with receipts accruing to the Treasury of \$16 million. In addition the BLM administers lands where 9 million head of livestock graze and habitat for millions of animals. The BLM is also charged with the important task of administering the mining and mineral leasing activities on 1.3 billion acres of offshore and onshore Outer Continental Shelf Lands.

Programs of the Fish and Wildlife Service produce 7.6 million pounds of fish each year. Their activities also include the support of 44 million annual fishing days and about 1.6 million waterfowl days, as well as 6.3 million hunting and fishing use days.

Earlier this session the Appropriations Committee produced a Special Energy Appropriations bill in an attempt to expedite and accelerate this Nation's new energy supplies. Our subcommittee produced one title of that bill including more than \$543 million dollars in direct energy research aimed at producing those new energy sources. Many of the activities in this bill are closely related to our energy crisis but are not directly involved in energy research. Over \$122 million in energy related activities are contained in this bill, including such programs as energy leasing activity by the Bureau of Land Management, trans-Alaska pipeline inspections to insure that environmental considerations are being met, health and safety research in the Nation's deep coal mines and research by the Forest Service into proper surface mine reclamation techniques.

There are numerous programs contained in this bill that meet the many needs of the American Indians. This bill contains over \$1 billion in funds for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, and for educational as-

sistance to Indian youth. The accomplishments of the Indian Health Service have been tremendous over the past decade. Infant death rates are down 67 percent, tuberculosis is down 85 percent, gastritis is down 81 percent, influenza and pneumonia are down 58 percent. While these statistics are impressive, they are only the beginning of a long effort to improve the health and welfare of Indian families. The funds in this bill will allow for the education of nearly 150,000 Indian children in Federal boarding schools and in public schools.

But the American Indians are not the only beneficiaries of this bill. The funds for the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities have been increased by 25 percent, the largest increase in the bill. We have provided funds for construction, additional land acquisition, and other improvements to our National Park System. Each year over 200 million visitations are made to our national parks, where all America can enjoy unlimited recreational opportunity. Our national parks are one of our finest investments.

We have also taken action to increase funds for the activities of the U.S. Forest Service. The total Forest Service budget has now passed the \$500 million mark. Increases of \$15 million coupled with another \$35 million in this bill should be sufficient to launch the Forest Service proposed 10-year reforestation and timber stand program. These funds will provide planting for an additional 30,000 acres and at this level the entire present 3.3 million acres of backlog can be completely reforested.

Also included in this bill is approximately \$4.2 million for additional land acquisition at the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. This vitally important national recreational area has languished far too long a time. Thanks to the cooperation of the members of the subcommittee, we have been able to greatly increase available funding for this park. We must do so for many reasons.

First, the threat of condemnation has hung over the citizens of this area for almost a decade, working innumerable hardships upon them. They have a right to expect speedy justice in the resolution of their cases. This large infusion of money will help meet that end. Secondly, previous land owned by the Federal Government in this area has presented us with a checkerboard type of ownership, the result of which has been an administrative nightmare. Past superintendents of the park have found it extremely difficult to manage this national asset in a way that would enable it to achieve its full potential for the people of our Nation. We have needed this large infusion of money to try to meet this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken with knowledgeable people in the National Park Service who tell me that if all goes well, this should be the last request for funds for land acquisition for the Delaware Water Gap Recreation Area. As one who has spent countless hours getting this park reauthorized, attending to the needs of those whose land was tied up

awaiting condemnation awards, attempting to assure that the various park superintendents had the various staff and other assets necessary to perform their tasks with the excellence that we have come to expect of them, I am deeply pleased that we may well be at the end of this particular road. The National Parks have been described as "windows of the past," and this great resource, when it is completed, will protect for future generations of Americans one of our Nation's most magnificent land areas.

Mr. Chairman, the people of several of our States have been plagued by an infestation of gypsy moths for some time now. Some time ago, as a result of a legislative effort which I undertook, this committee directed the Forest Service to engage in maximum transferability of all accounts so that there would be sufficient funding to have effective control programs operated by the affected State, the Forest Service, and the appropriate local governments. The Forest Service reports to us that there are in inventory several chemicals that do provide an effective control mechanism for this pest. It should be noted that the control chemicals contain none of the damaging chemical effects that are often associated with DDT. The Forest Service is to be commended for its work in developing these chemicals. Nevertheless, I have constantly pointed out to them that much more remains to be done if we are to insure that our vital timber stands are protected against this infestation. Therefore, I am most pleased to report to the members of the committee that this bill contains a new and important research initiative designed to provide us with even more effective measures.

The bill contains \$3.4 million in this fiscal year for this research project and that is important. Even more important is the fact that we have received assurance from the appropriate executive groups that this represents the first fiscal year funding of a multiyear research project designed to bring this problem under control. Indeed, the Office of Management and Budget has agreed to spend at least \$22.2 million in the fiscal years ahead in trying to nail down a solution to this problem. Our committee shall in the meantime continue to monitor the department to make certain that its control programs are responsive, appropriately funded, and meaningful in this continuing struggle to protect our timber stands and control the gypsy moth. We look forward to the day when the dollars that we appropriate today, together with those that will come in future fiscal years, will place us in an even stronger position.

Funds contained in this bill will also provide \$2 million to enable the Bureau of Mines to continue its demonstration projects utilizing the single bore hole injection method. This method, which was developed by the Dowell Division of the Dow Chemical Co., is in my judgment, the most important break-through made in the area of subsidence control in the past 50 years. The process has been initially tested both in Wyoming and Pennsylvania, and the principles inherent in the method have proven themselves

workable. Most importantly, such work, when fully demonstrated, has the potential to provide us with a new weapon in the battle to improve our environment by restoring subsurface conditions in previously inaccessible and often abandoned underground mine workings.

As we know, such mine workings over a period of time are certain to deteriorate and as they do, they create an inevitable surface disturbance. Too often, the tragic circumstances of that surface disturbance are innocent people who see their homes or their businesses destroyed, as the subsurface support gives way. This new method of subsurface stabilization enables the Bureau of Mines to gain access to those deteriorating and abandoned workings where access never was possible before; and access, in this case, enables us to bring relief to those who would otherwise face the loss of their homes or their businesses.

I am hopeful as well that this process, as it moves through the demonstration phase, will prove itself a reliable and dependable weapon in all cases of subsurface disturbance. When it does, it will contain within it the capacity to offer a far more effective cost-benefit ratio to these projects. Great credit is owed to the Bureau of Mines for their willingness to innovate in this critical field, and with the new \$2 million in this bill, we will be able to move closer to the day when the process will be totally perfected. In the interim, let us never forget that we will be providing protection to people who see their homes or businesses threatened.

Some time ago, we were contacted by officials of the borough of Tunkhannock in my congressional district who cooperated with the State government in acquiring several tracts of land with homes thereon. That acquisition was essential because of the devastating effects of Hurricane Agnes. Officials of the borough were advised by the State government that the proper way for the acquisition to occur was through funding provided by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Appropriate steps were taken by the local government, and long after the horrible events of 1972, they were advised of a legal problem that existed as a result of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's solicitor's opinion. Mr. Chairman, it is essential that this problem be resolved and to that end, I am pleased to report that we have worked with officials of the BOR and developed appropriate language contained in the committee report we are passing today which will remove the legal impediment and permit the BOR to acquire these properties at preflood values at the earliest possible moment. I want to express my deep appreciation to Mr. Watt, the Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and his solicitor, and Mr. Hulett, for the wonderful spirit of cooperation they displayed in reaching an equitable solution to this problem.

In summary, this bill is a product of many months of deliberation over how to best meet the numerous and varied programs which contribute to the development of our renewable and depletable resources; our cultural and human re-

sources; and the prudent management of our public lands. It is a series of what I believe to be wise investments in America and I urge its adoption by the House of Representatives.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentlemen from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I first join those of my colleagues who have commended the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

The bill is, of course, a special tribute to the excellence of her representation and of her superior personality this afternoon; but it is more than that. It is a program for the progress and advancement of our Nation. I want to express the admiration and respect that I have for the gentlewoman. I have sat in committee with her through weeks and months of hearings, and, I have watched the manner in which she conducted the hearings and the manner in which she analyzed the requests for appropriations of the various Government agencies which receive their funds in this bill.

Her knowledge of the details of the various programs is matched only by her ability to comprehend their meaning in the full context of the bill.

The distinguished chairman, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, knows the reality behind all the testimony with which the committee was presented.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Washington grew up in the great logging camps of the Northwest. She knows the timber industry. She has been in the coal mines. She has visited the game preserves. She has been on the oil rigs. She has been in the great national parks, and she has been in the art centers. She is a poet and author in her own right. She is sensitive to the visual arts and to literature. Mr. Chairman, Mrs. HANSEN knows the people who have a vital interest in these programs, people whom she loves, and who in turn love her.

I do not say that lightly. I have seen it in the eyes of the American Indians, in those of the Samoan Natives and in the eyes of people from Micronesia, who have visited our committee. I have heard the words they have spoken to her, and I have heard the words they have spoken about her. They were not obsequious words or words uttered because of the appropriations that were involved in this bill. These were people who were simply and honestly trying to express the special kind of feeling that they have for one who they know is a very good friend of theirs.

All of us have the highest respect for Mrs. HANSEN, a feeling that we all have for her beyond that of a colleague.

She is our dear friend, and it is with real sadness that we contemplate her leaving.

My good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) mentioned that this was the last time that Mrs. HANSEN would leave her hallmark on this bill. I do not think he really meant that. This is the last time Mrs. HANSEN will leave her name on this bill, but her hallmark will stay on this bill not only for this year but for the next year and

for years to come, because the mark that she has placed on these appropriations for all the activities that make up the Department of the Interior will stay with us for generations to come. Such has been her vision, her insight, and her remarkable acumen.

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

Mr. YATES. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for the remarks he is making. I know they are 2,000 percent true.

I would like to join in the sentiments the gentleman has expressed, even though I cannot match him in the details of his knowledge. My knowledge runs in other directions and in other subjects.

The House of Representatives of the United States is losing a great lady when the gentlewoman, the leader of my delegation, leaves at this time, and I am certainly grateful that the gentleman from Illinois is spreading this discussion on the Record.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to echo the sentiments of both the gentleman in the well and my colleague, the gentleman from Washington, with regard to the leader of our delegation. We will miss her very much. I think this House will, too.

We are pleased to be on the floor with her here today as she is bringing her last bill to us.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind comments which he has made for the head of our delegation and wish JULIA the best for the future.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well and reaffirm what he has already said.

My experience is brief on this committee, being a 1-year, junior member of the committee. However, my experience has been long enough, in association with JULIA HANSEN, since I have been here to cause me to reaffirm what has already been said, and that is that she is a tough deliberate legislator, and she will not be dissuaded by sophistry of any kind. Yet, in the midst of that toughness and deliberateness and tenaciousness, she has a compassionate side which tempers that toughness to a reasonableness that is necessary in a democracy of our type in order to take care of the needs of all as nearly as is possible and as nearly as is practical under the limitations of the budget and the concerns of our country.

The gentlewoman's compassion for the Indians, as has been stated, is well known and is strongly felt. Her name is talked about, and she is as nearly a legendary figure as one can find among the Indian tribes across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have been out in

Samoa, and I find that in the trust territories her compassion and her knowledge are well received out there.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to mention a word concerning my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT), who has been very able in the fields of forestry and western problems, just as has the gentlewoman from Washington been most knowledgeable about the affairs of the West, which deal primarily with our public lands. JULIA HANSEN and WENDELL WYATT have been bastions in support of our forest resources and other public resource needs.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oregon has acted with very great insight. I would like to commend him also at this time. We are losing two fine Members from the House of Representatives, in the fields of natural resources and the protection of our natural resources, which still remains the key to the future of our Nation. This Nation needs more of the stature of JULIA HANSEN and WENDELL WYATT.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks made in regard to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 16027, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill, 1975 and, at the outset, I want to join my colleagues in commendation and appreciation of the capable and dedicated performance of my colleague from Washington, the very able chairwoman (Mrs. HANSEN) and my distinguished colleague from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) since they will soon be retiring from the Congress.

In their respective roles, both Mrs. HANSEN and Mr. WYATT have truly acted in the best interests of the American public by prudently apportioning funds for the protection, enhancement, and wise utilization of our vast wealth of natural resources. Through their efforts, they have demonstrated a genuine understanding of our concerns and needs, not only in the Pacific Northwest, but throughout our Nation, and I want to take this opportunity to thank them for a job well done.

At the same time, I want to commend the ranking minority member (Mr. McDade) and the other members of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee for the fine job they have done, in the face of the many competing demands for funding, in recommending realistic, responsive and responsible funding levels sufficient to deal with some of our most pressing national priorities.

With this in mind, I am pleased to note that, in recognition of our serious energy problems and the need to move as rapidly as possible toward energy "independence," the committee has seen fit to recommend increased funding levels for the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey. These

funding increases will allow a greater expansion of BLM's Outer Continental Shelf leasing program and the Geological Survey's mineral lease management and resource evaluation and classification activities which, as I see it, are absolutely vital if we are to successfully advance toward energy self-sufficiency.

The committee's funding recommendation of \$300 million for the Land and Water Conservation Fund will allow continued acquisition of lands for parks and recreation to meet the public's growing demand for recreational opportunity. I am particularly pleased to note that the recommended funding level includes \$15 million for land acquisition in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the establishment of which I cosponsored as a member of the authorizing committee.

The committee bill also includes significant and, in my judgment, necessary increases in funding for Indian programs, both through the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Indian Education. Of particular importance is the \$20 billion in funding requested for implementation of the Indian Financing Act which, in my judgment, will contribute significantly to the goal of Indian self-determination.

As the ranking minority member of the Territorial and Insular Affairs Subcommittee of the authorizing committee, I am pleased that the committee has recommended a funding level of \$63.5 million for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This funding will allow the trust territory to continue its important efforts to upgrade and expand vitally-needed public services and facilities.

In representing an area in which the lumber industry plays a key economic role, I am well aware of the important contributions of the Forest Service to the effective utilization and conservation of our timber resources. For this reason, I am pleased that the committee has recommended additional funding for the Forest Service to initiate a 10-year reforestation and timber stand improvement program, as well as funding for watershed management, forest fire control, and forestry research. A portion of this funding will be used to meet increased costs of forestry research laboratory construction at various locations, including the Redwood Research Laboratory at Arcata, Calif.

In a related matter, I am particularly pleased to note that the committee has once again included a restriction on use of funds included in this bill for sales of unprocessed timber from Federal lands where timber will be sold for export or used as a substitute for timber from private lands sold for export. As some of my colleagues know all too well, log exports have been a major concern of the forest products industry in northern California and throughout the Pacific Northwest, and I am pleased that the committee saw fit to address this problem.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington is not only a great lady for all the personal qualities that she possesses, but she is a great American, one who has

the ideals and traditions of our Founding Fathers perpetually in mind, one who loves her country. She loves America, and she has done everything in this bill to make America the great Nation that it is.

Mr. Chairman, I wish, too, to address my remarks in farewell tribute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) and to tell him how much of a joy and a pleasure it was to serve with him on the committee, to work with him, to hear his suggestions, and to be associated in his progressive contributions which he has made in the Congress. We will miss him very much, and we hope he and JULIA HANSEN will come back and visit with us often.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great attributes of the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington is her foresight. She recognizes that one of our greatest challenges as a Nation is the effective management of our national resources. We no longer live in a world where questions of resource development can be resolved by band-aids, suggested by a remote bureaucracy. The varied character of our many resources poses an equally varied task of management. For example, the national forests which provide the lumber for construction and the fiber for papermaking, are a uniquely renewable resource. They are a crop, and for them good management means good husbandry, recognizing the years it takes for trees to grow.

This year, in this bill, the committee recommends that the Forest Service meet its responsibilities. In a series of unprecedented discussions, the Forest Service and the committee identified a largely neglected area of its responsibility and together produced a program to meet those needs.

It is proposed in this bill that every acre of a 3.3 million acre backlog be planted with trees in a period of 10 years. With this money an additional 30,000 acres will be replanted. The committee would have liked to go even further, but the Forest Service assured us that this was all the money that could be used in this year.

This is more than the start of a new program. It is a commitment to the future, to future generations, that they will continue to be able to enjoy the great forests that have been a part of our national heritage, and which will remain a part of their national heritage as well. The results and the benefits may not be obvious next year, nor the year after that, but in the years to come when trees will have grown on acres that would otherwise have been barren, we will be able to look back with pride upon this day, and justifiably so, because this committee and this Congress will have replaced irreplaceable resources through programs of exploration and good management.

We have only the beginning of a technology, Mr. Chairman, that we will need to become more efficient in the use of our resources. Industry has many more instruments that are available which provide it with information than the Government possesses. As a result, Govern-

ment decisions have frequently been made in the dark for lack of adequate information. We have provided in this bill the beginnings to obtain the source information which will permit a greater management of the resources that belong to the people of this country.

The bill before us responds in a comprehensive, thoughtful and creative way, and places great emphasis on the management and development of our fossil fuels. The fuel shortage of last summer and mid-winter was shocking to most Americans, but its lesson can be helpful if we can learn from it to practice conservation of our resources.

The Federal Government is the owner and the lessor of some of the Nation's largest reserves of oil sand, oil shale, on-shore and offshore oil deposits. In his Project Independence the President proposed to make a substantial commitment to offshore oil exploration and exploitation. Government leases for such drilling are proposed to cover millions of acres. Nowhere else is the need for management so vital, and nowhere else could the lack of management cause more damage.

The President has proposed that 10 million acres in the Outer Continental Shelf be leased within the next year. The committee considered that request, and concluded that in the interest of good management that the leasing program should be limited during next year to 3 million acres, and again our committee report says:

The committee directs the Department to appear expeditiously before the Committee and justify the leasing of additional acreage before further calls are made for nominations of tracts which would lead to leasing in excess of 3 million acres.

Mr. Chairman, why did the committee do that? The evidence before the committee showed that there is a shortage of oil rigs, oil pipe, and that there is a shortage of the expert manpower needed to carry out the leasing of 10 million acres.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the committee had before it the example of what has happened in the coal-leasing program in the West.

I am sure that some of the Members may wish to read our hearings in volume 6 in which we go into the question of the leasing of the people's resources.

On page 105 of part 6 of the committee hearings, I asked the representatives of the Department of the Interior this question:

May I turn your attention to the coal leasing program. I don't know whether you have read the report put out by the Council on Economic Priorities on the Study of the Public and Indian Coal-Leasing Lands.

Mr. Hastey replied:

I have not read it. I have seen a copy. Mr. Yates, I read from it:

And I quote:

C&P found, because of weakness in the original leasing and mismanagement on the part of Interior, the public coal leasing program for the last 54 years has not operated in the public interest, it has failed to encourage resource development, failed to provide fair market value to the public and to

the Indian treasuries and saddled the Nation with a huge block of leased, but unmined coal that may well frustrate energy resources planning for decades to come.

I asked Mr. Hastey if he would please comment on that. He said:

That is a tough one.

Mr. Yates, I don't know that it's your fault. I think it may be the fault of some of your predecessors, but the point is correct, isn't it?

Mr. Hastey said:

It's correct. I can't argue that it's not. This is why we have proposed changes in the 1920 Mineral Leasing Act, to bring about more diligent development of coal and also to restrict offerings to competitive leasing.

Under the Coal Leasing Act, Mr. Chairman, we find that the major 15 leaseholders of the coal leasing programs have already obtained leases to almost 70 percent of the public coal lands, certainly a very monopolistic picture. That, Mr. Chairman, was one of the reasons that the committee decided that we ought to have great care that we would follow very carefully the question of leasing the acreage in the Outer Continental Shelf so that the repetition of the evils of the coal leasing program is avoided.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McCADDE) and the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) have discussed other aspects of the committee bill, and I will not go into them at this time.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very good bill. I support it wholeheartedly. A great deal of time, thought, and attention have been given to it. I should like to express my deep sense of appreciation to the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington, for her many years of devoted attention to the subjects contained in our annual appropriations bill. I have served on several subcommittees. I am acquainted with most of the Members of the House. I do not know anyone who knows the subject matter of his or her committee more thoroughly than does the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN). I am always amazed as we get into various little crevices and details of almost every subject matter at the width and breadth of the knowledge that the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) has—and has at the tip of her fingers—in connection with this bill. The Nation owes her a debt of very great magnitude for her service, for her acquisition of this knowledge, and for her constructive use of the knowledge over the years. I shall not miss her as much as many Members of the House since I represent the congressional district across the Columbia River from the gentlewoman's district, so I anticipate we will see each other from time to time.

I should also like to express my personal appreciation to my colleagues in the House who have said kind things about my service during my service in the House.

One aspect of the bill that I should like to point to in particular is the section on reforestation that has been referred to by several of the speakers. I was delighted to hear the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) on this matter because, while all Members were very interested in it, he was particularly interested in taking this resource that we have, the 3.3 million acres of unreforested land and making them productive, putting them into production so that our children will have wood fiber, so that they will have the houses, so that those of us who represent large cities will know that their constituents can have housing.

But we have an ever shrinking base for wood fiber in this country because of additional wilderness studies and designations and uses of the forests other than growing commercial timber. This base has been shrinking. We have now at the present time a pent-up demand, a compressed demand for housing. Everyone knows that housing starts are down, but because of the fact that housing starts are down, when the interest rates come down and the economy starts moving in this area again the demands are going to radically increase for wood fiber, and it simply is not going to be there. With supplies down and demands up, the prices we are going to be facing for soft wood lumber and plywood are going to be astronomical and are going to inflate further the cost of homes.

So unless we start a program, as we are going to do this year, we will be in more serious trouble. We should not wait for the crisis to occur before we act. We cannot plant a tree today and harvest it tomorrow. It simply will not work that way.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman agree that this is one process in our Government where the saying of Amos in the Good Book says that "where there is no vision the people perish," because this is an area, as the gentleman indicated, where unless we look down the road for 10 or 20 or 30 or even 50 years and start the operation today, there will be no hope for those future years.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

If there is any legacy the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and I would like to leave, it would be to ask the House to consider the reforestation program we have started. It will take 9 more years and a great deal more money than has been invested in the program so far, but the taxpayers will receive in return a great deal more than will be invested by the Government. As an investment, it is a very sound program for the Government, and in addition it would provide the needed wood fiber. And this is a renewable resource, a continuing natural resource if well managed. It is unlike oil and coal, when once exhausted, they are gone forever.

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

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

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman in the well my colleague from Oregon, for his untiring efforts to achieve better forest management. I would also especially like to commend my dear friend, the gentleman from Washington, for her distinguished service as chairman of this important subcommittee on appropriations and for all her many years of meaningful contributions to the House of Representatives. I want the gentleman in the well (Mr. WYATT) and the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) to know how much they are going to be missed in the deliberations of this body.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Oregon this question. I understand that sound forestry requires that in many parts of the national forest system there be an acceleration in the rate of making commercial thinning sales in overstocked young stands of timber in order to promote the growth of the residual timber stand. I understand that the program of the Forest Service encompasses some commercial thinning sales. I would like to ask the gentleman whether in his opinion the bill includes sufficient funds to bring this commercial thinning sale program to an acceptable level.

Mr. WYATT. I certainly agree with the gentleman's statement that sound forestry practice on the national forests requires the making of commercial thinning sales as he has stated. The committee has understood Public Law 86-517 as a substantive direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to employ every good forestry practice that is conducive to sustained yield as defined in that act. Certainly, this includes the making of commercial thinning sales to achieve proper levels of stocking in the residual timber stand. Both the budget and the bill include funds for preparing, making, and administering such commercial thinning sales. Unfortunately, there are still not enough funds for a total, complete job for this essential and salutary forestry practice. We continue to urge that adequate funds, which are really in the nature of a profitable investment, be included for this purpose in future budgets submitted to Congress.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS), a member of the committee.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the comments that have just been made by other members of the committee as they relate to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and our distinguished committee member, the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. WENDELL WYATT. I cannot add very much to what others have said about these two distinguished Members of the House, but I would like

to say one thing. At this time when the Congress of the United States has about the worst reputation it has ever enjoyed, I wish all of us had reputations similar to those of the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Oregon. I cannot think of any two more outstanding Members of the House. We shall miss their friendship. We shall miss their expertise. We shall miss their leadership in the House. I want them both to know how very proud I am to have been able to associate with them for just these brief few years on this committee.

I am deeply concerned about the present laws and past policies of the Interior Department in the leasing of federally owned resources, especially the coal leasing program.

While it is true that the Department has a moratorium on the issuance of any new coal leases, the Interior Department has published a draft environmental impact statement on the coal leasing program and is considering lifting the moratorium. A Federal Energy Administration background paper on Project Independence advocates a "major leasing program for mineral rights to Federal lands involving 10 million acres per year by 1978."

A recent report on Federal coal leasing by the Council on Economic Priorities has described many of the problems with the coal program. I shall summarize some of the findings of this Council:

Currently, there are 15 billion tons of coal under lease on the public lands. This represents 35 times the total U.S. coal production in 1973. In addition, there are 5 billion tons of coal on Indian lands, which are held in trust for the Indians and administered through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

There is a great concentration of lease holdings among corporations. Fifteen out of a total of 144 leaseholders control 70 percent of the leases. This group includes 5 oil companies, 7 out of the top 15 coal producers in the Nation, and 3 electrical utilities.

Speculation has been rampant. Despite diligence requirements in the leases, only 11 percent of the leases are producing coal; 321 leases out of a total of 474 have never produced a ton of coal. In its 54 years, the leasing program has contributed less than 1 percent of the Nation's coal production.

The largest leaseholders speculate the most. The 15 major leaseholders have rights to 70 percent of the public coal lands, but this land has produced only 48 percent of the coal from all leases. Five of those major leaseholders—El Paso Natural Gas, Westmoreland Resources, Shell Oil Co., Sun Oil, and Richard Bass—have never produced a ton of coal from their leases.

Rather than being guided by any concept of the public interest, the public's resources have been leased at industry initiative. Two hundred twenty-seven out of 474 leases on public lands were granted on a noncompetitive basis. Over 90 percent of the leases issued on a competitive basis, however, drew one or no bidders. In fact, then, only 56 out of 474 leases were issued on a truly competitive basis.

Only one-half of the 6,515 acres of Federal lands strip mined to date have been reclaimed.

Coal leases on public lands are issued for 20-year terms, and for 10-year terms on Indian lands. Because of their automatic renewal, they have been issued, in effect, forever. Not one has been cancelled for any reason such as nonproduction or failure to reclaim stripped lands.

It is my sincere hope that the Interior Department will not lift the current moratorium on Federal coal leasing until the necessary changes can be made in the law, regulations, and leases to deal with these problems. Enough Federal coal has already been leased—35 times the 1973 production. We should have the time to correct these problems and operate an effective and efficient program in the public interest. Additional leasing should wait and can wait.

Though I have concentrated on the coal leasing program in my remarks today, I fear that we have the similar problems with some of the other Federal leasing programs. More than 10 percent of the public lands are papered over with noncompetitive onshore oil and gas leases, which are issued on a first-come, first-served basis or by use of a lottery system. Only 5 percent of these oil and gas leases are issued competitively.

The overall problem is quite sweeping: Extensive leasing with insufficient competition, and an inadequate understanding of the value of the resources being leased, combined with no assurance of development, encourages this speculative situation. The public does not receive the energy from its leased resources, and the Public Treasury does not receive a fair market return from its resources.

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend my colleague on the comments he is making, and to indicate that this is an area, indeed, of concern to all of us. We certainly hope the Department does not rush pellmell into new leasing arrangements.

We have had some conversations on both sides of the Capitol about changing the original act. We certainly do not want to get caught in the old system where we find public lands held up in a nonproductive way for long periods of time.

The gentleman's statement is very much appreciated.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I hope it will be seen by the Department that we have enough leases in existence now. Those now outstanding should be required to produce before new leasing is started.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the bill brought to the floor this afternoon by the distinguished lady

from Washington, our friend, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, and her fine Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies. One of the fallout benefits of the present energy crisis is an awakening of interest in our resources. There is a growing awareness among the people of this great Nation of ours as to the importance of our natural resources. Over the years, however, there has been one among us here in Congress who long has recognized this need and labored diligently so that the Nation could meet the challenges which face it.

Under the leadership of JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, we have advanced tremendously in the conservation and wise utilization of our natural resources.

This year, the Congress faces a situation much the same as we have experienced in the past few years, in that the recommended level of appropriations for the Department of Interior, the U.S. Forest Service, and related agencies, to say the least are at the absolute minimum. In fact, I believe that the recommendations were below minimum levels required and I am pleased that the committee has taken positive action to correct some of the serious deficiencies which were contained in the budget submitted to us in January of this year.

One of the most serious deficiencies was in the area of reforestation of our national forest lands. Recent estimates estimated that 3.3 million acres of lands under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service are in desperate need of reforestation as the result of fire, windstorms, insects, and disease attacks and other reasons. During the past 5 years the Forest Service has replanted some 600,000 acres and nature has replanted a third as much again. It would appear that the reforestation or some 800,000 acres would be something to crow about, but during the same period, natural causes such as fire, insects, and disease, have resulted in the deforestation of some 812,000 acres. We are not making any headway.

This is recognized in a very fine statement of the committee and I would call to the attention of my colleagues, page 9 of House Report No. 93-1209 which accompanied the appropriation bill before us, as it is an excellent statement as to the need for realism in funding the programs of the U.S. Forest Service. I would like to quote one section, however, to emphasize the importance of the situation which faces us:

Broad, bold comprehensive action is required now if we are to prevent an acceleration of the softwood lumber and plywood prices, and if in fact we are to provide fiber at any cost to meet the housing needs of the Nation in the years ahead.

With this warning, the committee has recommended that the Nation embark upon a 10-year reforestation and timber stand improvement program. I would endorse this call wholeheartedly.

Over and above the reforestation efforts, I would also call to your attention the more realistic funding of the other program of the Forest Service, of the overall programs of the Bureau of In-

dian Affairs, of the Fish and Wildlife Service, of the Bureau of Mines, and the Office of Water Research Resources Research. All of these are areas in which we have been deficient in our activities over the years and I think all are concerned with the preservation of our human and natural resources upon which we will depend for decades to come.

In addition to general support of these efforts, I would like to mention briefly one item in particular and that is the land and water resource conservation funds earmarked for the acquisition of lands at Lake Tahoe Basin. As you well know, we have in Lake Tahoe a bistate scenic natural area of national significance. We have invested heavily at the local, State, and Federal levels in a variety of programs designed to preserve the beauty and the purity of the lake and the stability of the land areas in the basin immediately surrounding the lake. The soils on these land areas are extremely fragile and every effort must be made to protect them as well as the lake itself. Congress has recognized this in the past, both through the approval of the bistate regional planning agency compact, and also through the appropriation of funds with which to buy significant parcels of land which will play major roles in the preservation of the basin.

We have once again in the appropriations bill before us another acquisition proposal which I believe is crucial to the area.

Before concluding Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to your attention one factor. We have here what really is a money-making appropriation. New obligatory authority proposed for fiscal year 1975 is slightly over \$3 billion. It is anticipated that the Forest Service, and the Department of Interior will generate revenues to the Federal Treasury of approximately three times these amounts through the solid, wise management of our natural resources. The fact that we are utilizing these natural resources with the wisdom and efficiency with which the Nation has operated over the years, can be attributed largely to one person in this Congress, our good friend from Washington, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN. Her wise stewardship of the funding of these programs over the years has contributed tremendously to their success.

Let me take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation, both personally, and on behalf of the people of the Second District of California, and of the people of all of the State of California, for the outstanding service to the Nation which has been performed by Mrs. Hansen as Chairman of the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and for those members of the committee who have served with her. Under very difficult and extremely tight fiscal conditions, she has accomplished much for adequate conservation and wise utilization of natural resources which are so important to us in this day and age.

This as we all know, is her swan song, as far as the appropriations for these

agencies are concerned. I want to say here and now to you, JULIA, that as you enter retirement, you will do so with the confidence that the Nation and especially our natural resource program is far better off for your service here in the House of Representatives over the years.

Congratulations, best wishes for much happiness in the years ahead. May you have the time to enjoy some of the forests, public lands, and other resources which the people of this Nation have been enjoying over the years because of your wisdom and foresight.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY).

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, as we consider today the appropriation of funds for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1975, as a member of the Interior subcommittee, I can attest to the many hours of hearings and to the careful drafting of this bill before it was reported out to the full committee.

However, before proceeding further to mention some of the items in the bill, I want to express my sincerest regrets at the departure of two of my subcommittee colleagues, our distinguished chairwoman, the gentlewoman from Washington, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, and the gentleman from Oregon, WENDELL WYATT.

Throughout my service under the distinguished chairwoman, I have come to have a deep appreciation for the keen insight and exceptional leadership abilities which were so ably demonstrated here today, and so frequently in our committee work. I shall miss her, but I know that she will be happy in the enjoyment of the quiet solitude of the Pacific Northwest.

I have been impressed many times at the qualities of patience which she has demonstrated, not only with members of the committee, but with witnesses before the committee; the dedication which she has shown to the subject matter in this appropriation bill, and the most remarkable memory which is for her a fearsome weapon. She is a master of the subject matter coming before the committee, drawing on her many years of legislative experience, both in her State and here in the Congress.

The gentleman from Oregon will be leaving many friends who admire and respect him as a legislator. I also want to be included among these friends and as an admirer.

Oregon will be losing a fine statesman and gaining a very capable attorney, and I shall miss his counsel and his advice. I hope he will continue to counsel with us from time to time in the future.

The Department of the Interior has become one of the vital departments in the preservation of our natural environment.

Because of the greater public awareness for conservation, the Department of the Interior has now become the focal point of Federal responsibility in maintaining the public domain. In addition, the energy crisis has made the activities

of the Department of the Interior in energy-related fields more urgent and vital than ever before.

The Forest Service has begun an ambitious 10-year reforestation and timber-stand improvement program which I strongly support. This will reach out to reclaim over 3.3 million acres of land now needing attention.

The fiscal year 1975 appropriation of \$50 million, which is an increase of \$15 million from the budget request, will fund the first step to reforest 30,000 acres. This is a small step, but a very important first one.

This appropriation reflects the committee's interest not only in the production of lumber but also in the benefits which trees provide to watersheds and to the protection of wildlife and recreation.

The demand for wood products is at an all-time high, and I believe this program will result in future generations having an adequate supply of timber. It is time that we start to rebuild this great renewable resource.

During the past year, almost 180,000 acres of Forest Service-protected lands were burned. Not all of this was highly productive timberland, I am glad to say, some being brushland, but it is nonetheless a tragedy in terms of the timber lost, the water resources lost, and the recreation lost and the flood hazard created.

The committee, in recognizing the critical need to protect our forest lands, has provided additional funds over and above the Forest Service budget request of \$4,921,000 for cooperation in forest fire control.

Chief McGuire of the Forest Service has informed me only today that they are about to acquire the second of the modular airborne firefighting system units which the committee very wisely appropriated money for in the first supplemental appropriation of last year. This will increase the Forest Services' capability to stop fires at a very early time before they become large conflagrations.

Some of these units will be delivered too late to be fully effective in the 1974 fire season, but the importance of this investment, I think, must be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me additional time. This investment in forest fire control must be considered in light of the \$95 million that was spent in forest firefighting last year. I think the wisdom of this appropriation can easily be judged.

In addition, during subcommittee hearings, testimony was given which related that fuel modification and fire-break work did, in fact, stop large fires that developed in the Angeles National Forest in my own congressional district.

I applaud the efforts of the committees in recognizing the need for better fire control, especially in light of the ever-increasing demand for recreational access to Forest Service lands.

A major portion of the energy

activities, \$543 million, from the Department of the Interior was incorporated into the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act. But approximately \$122.5 million in energy-related money is included in this bill, which is an increase of \$52.5 million over the earlier fiscal year.

An important but small appropriation of \$250,000 is included for the United Nations-United States International Geothermal Symposium to be held next spring in San Francisco.

This will bring together 1,500 scientists from throughout the world who have developed the latest technology in the science of locating and using our geothermal resources. They will thus open up an important access to this new and desirable source of energy.

I should further report that planning for the symposium, led by the Geological Survey, and coordinated by an organizing committee, is proceeding well. Cooperation and other funding is assured from the United Nations, the Department of Interior, AEC, National Science Foundation, the State of California, University of California, and the rapidly growing private sector.

If we are to reach the goal of energy self-sufficiency by the early 1980's we must move to increase geothermal, shale, and coal leasing activities. The committee proposes accelerated leasing activities, particularly on the petroleum-rich Outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the increase for the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, which receives a \$145 million appropriation, which is about \$45 million above the budget for 1974 but represents a decrease of \$10 million from the requested amount for this year.

In my district, I can attest that the Claremont College Graduate School, which recently has received a grant of \$150,000 from the Foundation for the Humanities for a graduate study program in European history, is using this money well.

I heartily support this appropriation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, this is, I believe, a well-balanced appropriation bill, and I earnestly solicit the support of my colleagues for it.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. McSPADEN).

Mr. McSPADEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Washington and her subcommittee for a series of hearings which have well documented this entire budget. Certainly, this is the budget for America and for American people. There undoubtedly should be many important activities funded; but this report and this bill are well conceived and spending here is wise.

I was most impressed with the understanding of needs for American Indian people which this budget reflects and the gentlewoman always has displayed. Under her leadership, funding for Indian health services has grown from \$75 million in 1967 to \$225 million this year. At

the same time, we have seen fewer deaths of Indian babies and better health among all Indian people. This is a wise and needed investment of our Nation's resources into our own people.

In the Interior Subcommittee hearings, I noted that when the chairman asked Dr. Johnson about unmet medical needs of American Indians, that he answered that—

The IHS is not providing approximately one-third of the needs of the 498,000 Indian people. These unmet needs are largely surgery, adult dental care, mental health and preventive services.

The Director of the Indian Health Service added a note of optimism, however, in saying:

For the first time in several years (the IHS would) be able to make a significant impact on reducing that backlog.

In another area, I noted that the Indian Health Service testified that it has a \$370 million backlog in construction projects. At that point, the gentlewoman from Washington said:

When we are confronted with employment crises at various times and rather than makework proposals it would be more sensible to build some of these Indian hospitals.

That makes sense. Certainly, there are needed hospitals and other facilities which should be planned and ready for construction when the economy of an area needs a boost.

The people of Oklahoma are very pleased that, within this budget, \$8,560,000 is included for a new hospital at Claremore, Okla. This is a most worthy and needed replacement. This hospital serves a 12-county area where some 35,000 Cherokee, Creek, Osage, Ouapaw, Miami, Seneca, Wyandotte and other Indians reside.

This new facility will replace an old hospital which was built in two phases during 1928 and 1935. Frankly, it simply is no longer capable of responding to the health needs of the area.

The new hospital will contain a gross area of 92,000 square feet with a 60-bed inpatient area and a 20-bed multipurpose unit, an outpatient department, areas for supportive services and space for field health activities.

The Indian Health Service anticipates average daily census of about 54 patients and the annual outpatient visits eventually will reach 48,000.

The people of Oklahoma—and Indians everywhere—are pleased that this important new hospital has been budgeted and so ably presented here today.

Indians also are pleased with the continued emphasis on education which is again reflected in this budget. I note that when the gentlewoman from Washington became chairman of this committee, there were 2,359 Indian students enjoying higher education under the BIA grant program. That number grew to 17,471 Indian youths gaining that help for a college education last year.

As a representative and a descendant of Indians, I wanted to make these points clear and to thank the gentlewoman for her concern about Indians

and her support for programs and activities which are improving Indian lives.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the action of the Committee on Appropriations on the Forest Service funding activities. I certainly wish to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington and the other members of the subcommittee for their understanding and for their action on the problems that face the Forest Service.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Appropriation Committee action on Forest Service funding for its activities. Budget requests and constraints for many years have resulted in inadequate budget resources for the Forest Service. While the increases in funding were not to the level as developed for the "environmental program for the future," a multi-year budget and management plan, nor to the level of funding I had anticipated, these increases are steps in bringing the management of the 187 million acres up to a standard consistent with multiuse objectives.

The increase of \$15 million for reforestation and timber stand improvement is a wise investment for the people of the United States. Future demands for wood and wood fiber are going to increase. Only by investing in reforestation and timber stand improvement now can we assure ourselves of meeting the increasing demands of future generations. An aggressive reforestation program is needed for the more than 3 million acres of deforested national forest lands. This job must be done and it will help solve the inflationary prices of lumber, plywood, and homebuilding we are now experiencing.

The small increases for recreation use, rangeland management, and soil and water management will help to more adequately provide for the visitor use of the national forests, for increased beef production, and for protection of our soil and water so vitally needed for environment betterment.

The increase of \$4,962,000 for research activities will accelerate finding answers to some of the most critical environmental problems facing our land managers and our Nation. The energy shortage has everyone searching for new sources of energy. Vast deposits of coal and oil shale underlie much of the surface of the land surface of this Nation. Disturbing the surface and mining for these deposits are of great concern and critical to our environment.

I was most happy to see the \$4,921,000 increase for cooperative fire control. It will assist the States in providing additional fire protection for those products and services needed to meet future demands.

The increase in the construction and land acquisition appropriation will provide for recreation facilities so sorely needed for healthful outdoor recreation and the needed research laboratories for

efficient and effective research on forest environmental problems.

The committee direction that the Forest Service increase its road program to provide for recreation and general purpose road needs was gratifying. Better balance in road and trail construction is needed. Timber purchasers should not be required to construct roads as a condition of sale. All roads and trails should be constructed from appropriated funds so that quality of construction is consistent with the multiple use objectives of Forest Service lands. I hope the Forest Service will move in this direction.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and the other members of her subcommittee for taking this action to protect and preserve our national forest lands.

Mrs. HANSEN, who for many years has been a national leader in forestry affairs, has chosen to retire at the end of this Congress. It has been my distinct pleasure to work with her on forestry matters and I know that she will be missed, both by her colleagues here in the House and all parties interested in forestry legislation.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO), a member of the full committee.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, and especially to concur in the remarks and the praise concerning our retiring Members, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT), who is my neighbor, and the beloved gentlewoman from Washington, the great chairman of the subcommittee, JULIA HANSEN.

On behalf of the people of New York State and New York City, and especially my district, I take this opportunity to thank the lovely lady for the wonderful help she has given to us, for her help in giving life to a great national park, the Gateway National Park, and to have included in this appropriation bill an amount close to \$6 million, so that the people of Queens and the people of all of New York City can enjoy the benefits of Gateway. I know the people of New York City will always keep a place in their hearts for the lovely lady, who, on her own time, visited New York City and walked the beaches of Gateway and visited many of the national monuments. Through her efforts and her personal knowledge, we were able to achieve great things for the city of New York, and it was through these efforts we were able to preserve great monuments and beautiful works of art and the natural resources of New York. I know this dedication has been the byword of all the endeavors and undertaking of this great and knowledgeable lady.

So, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of the State of New York and the people of my city, the gentlewoman will always have an open invitation from me and from the people of New York to visit

our great State and our wonderful city as an honorary and beloved adopted citizen of the city of New York.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with my other colleagues, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO). I thank him for his remarks, and I appreciate the other remarks that have been made in regard to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), and for my friend, the gentleman from Oregon, WENDELL WYATT.

Let me say here on behalf of the State of California that we are going to miss these two very fine Members. I do not know what California would have done without the graciousness of the gentlewoman from Washington.

We have a vast interest in connection with the appropriations over which she has presided through the years, and certainly, on behalf of my constituents and my colleagues from States other than California, we wish her well. We are going to miss her.

We want to take this opportunity to express our deep and sincere appreciation for all the things she has done through the years.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) who is a member of the full committee.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, today a great lady and an accomplished legislator is offering to the House, for the final time in her distinguished career, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill.

I am sorry that JULIA BUTLER HANSEN is leaving the House. I believe this same regret is felt by every Member of the House. She is a delightful person to know and, happily, she is also a careful and constructive thinker. For almost 14 years, she has given sound advice and outstanding leadership to the Congress and the Nation.

When she became the first of her sex to be named chairman of an Appropriations Subcommittee, there may have been some who had misgivings. But if this were so, the skeptics became true believers. Those of us who knew Mrs. HANSEN never had any doubt that she would distinguish herself in her duties as chairman.

Through the years, she has helped to mold the American resolve to protect the land and forests, which are such a precious heritage of our country, in a proper and meaningful way. Her contributions have been sound and constructive and they will live on long after she has left the Halls of Congress.

JULIA brought with her valuable experience gained in years of service in the Washington State Legislature. She also brought with her the ability to make

friends and to offer responsible service in the lawmaking processes in the Nation's Capital.

And she brought with her a love for her country; a dedication to protect it from enemies, foreign and domestic; and a will to undertake, without reserve, the manifold and exacting tasks which are associated with membership in the Congress. She has done all things well. We can all be proud that we have been privileged to work with JULIA and fortunate in having enjoyed her warm friendship.

Today's Hansen bill is another forward step in improving America and America's resources. She has not hesitated to add funds where they are needed, as in forestry. She has had the courage to delete items for which a justification has not been fully shown. She is indeed an outstanding legislator. The people of America are grateful for her services.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to my able colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, but first I would like to offer my sincere gratitude and my heartiest compliments to the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.

It has been my distinct privilege to serve and work with Mrs. HANSEN since her election to Congress in 1960. It is difficult to identify a major problem that has faced this Nation since 1960 that Mrs. HANSEN has not worked diligently and effectively to solve. Her achievements on the Appropriations Committee are well known, but it should also be noted that she served with distinction on other important committees, such as Education and Labor, Veterans' Affairs, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

It is often noted that Mrs. HANSEN is the first woman to serve as a chairman of an Appropriations Subcommittee. It should also be noted that she is and has been one of the best subcommittee chairmen ever to have served on the Appropriations Committee. The bill that is before us today is ample evidence of her abilities and her dedication.

I do not want to leave the impression that the benefits of her talents have accrued only to the jurisdiction of the Interior Subcommittee. I have served with her on the Subcommittee on Transportation and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. I have seen her in action during full committee deliberations on the bills reported by other subcommittees.

I believe that every member of the Appropriations Committee will agree with me that she is a true stalwart among her colleagues. She embodies the finest principles of responsive and responsible lawmaking.

It was with deep regret that I received the news of her retirement. She will leave a vacancy in the Halls of Congress that will never really be filled. The people of this country owe her a debt of gratitude, as do the future generations that will benefit from her public service.

Also it is with great regret that I see our good friend on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. WENDELL WYATT, leaving the Congress. He has been a highly dedicated public servant. He has worked tirelessly to protect our natural resources and undoubtedly is one of the most knowledgeable Members of the House when it comes to the U.S. Forest Service. I think that one of the finest things that could be said about a man is that he is a good man, and in my book WENDELL WYATT is a good man.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill under consideration, and I would like to place emphasis on two of its specific recommendations. The first is the proposed funding for the third phase of the Bethel, Vt., salmon fish hatchery. This whole project owes a great deal of its success to the hardworking Congresswoman from Washington and the ranking Republican Congressman JOE McDADE—three times in the past year she has made sure that the hatchery in Vermont was not overlooked in the budget.

It has been a real pleasure for me to work with Mrs. HANSEN and JOE McDADE. Their efforts from the beginning have been crucial in establishing the hatchery.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to say the gentleman from Massachusetts accurately pointed out the state of facts with reference to the budget in the bill. I do think it is important to note that there is not any way that the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. HANSEN and I could have ignored the hatchery, with all of the comments and with all of the approaches that had been made for its support by the gentleman from Massachusetts. In fact, they should have named it after the gentleman from Massachusetts. He is assuredly the most ardent and eloquent advocate and without question the father of this important national facility.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for those kind remarks. I hope this will help to make the return of that Atlantic salmon to the Connecticut River a reality. I hope Mrs. HANSEN and members of her committee will be able to do some fishing on the Connecticut River with me very soon; although given the Congresswoman's talent and persistence, I am sure she will go home with bigger and better salmon.

The entire project of saving the international scope. As a result of an agreement with Denmark in 1972, high seas fishing for salmon will be phased out by 1976. The United States has negotiated a similar contract with Canada that prevents their netting fish at the mouths of rivers, which had virtually wiped out our supply of salmon. With the Danish and Canadian threats gone, an almost certain road to extinction for the Atlantic salmon has been reversed. Interstate cooperation of environmental and sportsmen's groups has helped to

clean up the river, so, provided the fish have a chance to swim up the river, they can actually live and spawn there. We have been working for fish ladders at the dams along the salmon runs so the fish can make their way upstream, because several States are involved in the welfare of the Connecticut River.

Last year with the assistance of Chairman JULIA HANSEN, JOE McDADE, and the House Interior Appropriations Committee, initial funding for planning and acquisition for a salmon hatchery at Bethel, Vt., was established after a careful study to determine the best site for the project. After the first appropriation of \$125,000, an additional \$600,000 was appropriated for complete plans and the water supply system. The officials of the Fish and Wildlife Service inform me that full operation, including smolt purchases and salaries can be maintained with a total appropriation of \$4,995,000. The appropriation recommended by the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee will go a long way in getting the fish back into the river.

The support for this project is broad in Congress as well as among the residents of the Connecticut River Valley. If we proceed on schedule, including this appropriation for fiscal year 1975, by 1980 there should be some significant runs of Atlantic salmon in the Connecticut River, based on using 500,000 smolts in the river each year. Continuity in these proceedings is essential to insure success—the importance of the ongoing project has been my reason for continued efforts to carry it through. To halt the project now, I believe, would be a step backwards for conservation, a big disappointment for New England fishermen, and negligence in restoring the natural beauty of the Connecticut River. If we go ahead with the project, we may even begin to hear some good fish stories again, something we have missed in the Connecticut Valley for a long time.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I would also like to voice my support for the committee's recommendation providing for \$1 million to the migratory bird conservation account. Under the provision of the wetland legislation, this appropriation will be added to the fund used to acquire lands for national wildlife refuges and waterfowl production areas. These areas serve as the breeding grounds and resting areas for waterfowl, and without them many species would face extinction. Since 1962 the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission has approved the acquisition of over 1,752,000 acres of land at a cost of \$161,700,000. The moneys for these purchases were arrived at from congressional loans such as the one recommended, combined with revenues from "duck stamp" purchases. Revenues from the stamps over the past 12 years have come close to matching the appropriations from the Congress. Those in this country interested in sportsmanship and conservation cannot bear the whole financial burden—if we maintain our part of the cost, we can continue to provide

for the land purchases and conservation measures to prevent extinction of our precious wildlife.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16027, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill, 1975. However, I want to call my colleagues' attention to page 7 of the committee report which speaks of the Outer Continental Shelf leasing program. As is pointed out in the report, the administration has proposed a target program of leasing 10 million acres in 1975. The committee has stated that it—

... Does not want the United States to find itself in a situation, similar to the previous leasing program, where millions of acres are leased to companies which defer development in order to reap greater profits from future price increases.

And the committee has asked for assurance that the environmental impact of the proposed OCS leasing actions be fully assessed before the leasings are made. I want to commend the members of the committee for their foresight and associate myself with this request. I also want to point out that what we are talking about here is the leasing of part of that which we hold in trust for all American citizens—a nonrenewable natural capital resource. And I want to suggest to my colleagues that we exercise similar foresight in reinvesting the fungible proceeds received from these leases.

During fiscal year 1972, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, two major revenue earners, collected approximately \$900.3 million in receipts from the use or lease of Federal lands and resources which they administered. Of this total about 35 percent was deposited to the general fund account of the Treasury; 19 percent was deposited in special fund accounts for distribution to States and their subdivisions; and 46 percent was deposited in special Treasury accounts to finance various Federal programs relating to outdoor recreation, public land improvements, and natural forest maintenance. A small amount was deposited in a special holding account pending determination of the rights to land and timber of the Tongass Natural Forest in Alaska.

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the gentleman also for the information he has given the House today. I would like to join the gentleman in his commendation to the committee for their recognition of the necessity of good management of the public lands, and I would like also to point out the fact that we could do even better than we do with our national forestlands with respect to timber cutting and timber sales if we had a little more access and a little more reforestation.

I think this is a point often misunderstood by this body, that the Govern-

ment owns vast acreages, 37 million acres in my State, and oftentimes they are not funded well enough to develop those natural resources to the best of the ability of U.S. Forest Service and Department of Interior.

I appreciate the gentleman pointing this out. I commend again the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and the members of the committee for recognizing this, also in particular my colleague WENDELL WYATT from Oregon. I am sorry we have to have the arts and humanities in this same bill, as I oppose these nonessential items.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for his comments and I support the gentleman for his comments and I support the gentleman's statements. I think we overlook really what a tremendous national resource our forests are and we fail to realize that any moneys spent to develop the national forests are an investment in the future. As one representing a portion of the "landowners", the people in Ohio, I think this is a good investment of our tax money.

Mr. SYMMS. Some of the money in this bill will go for forest research, for example. In my State alone the Forest Service figures there are 100 million board feet of white pine timber in the State dying each year that should be cut and sold but they have not been able to accomplish this. I think the committee has made great steps in this respect in this year. The gentleman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) has made great progress in this throughout her career and so has the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT). We can rest assured that money spent for developing the national forests will be a good long-range investment for the country.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

I noted a story recently reporting that 56 percent of all cuttable timber in the Nation is on public lands, so national forest lands are an important resource for housing and for other types of building.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, Department of the Interior revenues earned from the use or lease of minerals, fees, concessions, grazing, lands, power, timber, and water will be in excess of its appropriations, exclusive of trust funds, by an estimated \$2,665,217,000 in fiscal year 1975. The Forest Service estimates it will receive \$458,785,000 from timber sales, grazing, power, recreation, and land use during fiscal year 1975. Estimated combined receipts from the Departments of Interior and Forest Service, will amount to \$6,374,841,000—Interior, \$5,916,056,000; Forest Service, \$458,785,000—in fiscal year 1975. An additional \$3 billion could be realized from increased outercontinental shelf leasing during fiscal year 1975 as a result of intensified energy development efforts.

Although these Federal lands and resources are not distributed proportionally throughout the Nation, they belong to all of the people of the United States.

I believe that the revenue earned from such lands and resources should be used in a manner that will result in preservation and enhancement of the resource from which it emanated and to the maximum net public benefit.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to first commend the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior for their dedicated efforts in bringing forth this legislation. In addressing myself to the funding for the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park, I would like to take particular note of the special attention which the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) has given to this project. The Members well know of this distinguished lady's tireless efforts on behalf of the entire National Park System, and I would like to call particular attention to her efforts on behalf of the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park—efforts which are much appreciated by all who have ever had occasion to visit the canal and enjoy its many beauties. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) has proven himself a friend of the C. & O. Canal Park.

Included in this appropriations bill, beyond the \$1 million for park operations, is a total of \$3 million to be used to help repair and restore the enormous damage done to the canal by Hurricane Agnes. This is the full amount which the Department of the Interior requested for this work for fiscal 1975.

Of course, the work which remains to be done on the canal, only to bring it back into the condition it was in prior to the hurricane, is considerable. Many of the beautiful and historic aqueducts were severely damaged, and they continue to deteriorate rapidly. The original clay liner remains damaged in parts. The towpath remains in need of further repair. The list, I am sorry to say, is lengthy.

I regret that the Park Service, in its original budget request, did not ask for additional funding. Secretary Morton, in response to the pleas of myself, Congressman BYRON, and Senators MATHIAS and BEALL, toured the canal several days ago. He now has made known that Interior recognizes funding needs beyond its original budget request. He now supports an additional \$5 million. With this new support, I believe we have an opportunity to obtain additional funding.

My concern that we obtain this funding stems from both a long and deep interest in the condition and care of this magnificent park and an awareness that the cost of repairs will only continue to escalate as time goes by. This escalation, certainly, will be in part due to normal inflationary processes. However, it additionally will be due to the further deterioration in the condition of the structures along the canal. Some may well simply cease to exist if attention is not given them in the near future.

I will continue to work with Congressman BYRON, and Senators BEALL and

MATHIAS to have Interior's new request included in the bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I rise in support of this legislation; however, I do have some questions for the gentlewoman. As I understand it, there is in the present legislation a continuing authorization to spend some \$300 million a year for the Land and Water Conservation Fund; is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield? Mr. WOLFF. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This bill provides \$300 million for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. May I say to the gentleman that last year it was only \$76 million and that was \$21 million above the budget estimate.

Mr. WOLFF. The point is, there was authorization to spend \$300 million last year, but we only appropriated \$76 million; is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, that is correct, because the budget request was very low. There were large unobligated balances at that point.

Mr. WOLFF. On that score, I ask the gentlewoman, has she seen this report on the Nation's recreational needs, which according to a recent Anderson column, has been suppressed by the administration, even though the report was prepared in 1970 by Mr. Hickel and started by Mr. Udall?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No. I have not seen it; however, I am familiar with the details of the input that went into it.

Mr. WOLFF. There are two very significant factors, I think, in this report. First, it states that only 25 percent of the existing public recreational facilities and only 3 percent of the public land base are situated so as to be close to the people's need for recreation. Second, the report recommends that there should have been expended at least \$6.3 billion for the Land and Water Conservation Fund over the last 5 years to take care of urban recreation deficiencies alone.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, this is what this committee has been concerned about for the last several years. The committee has been tremendously aware of the problems of the large cities and the urban population, and is trying to provide recreation in adjacent areas.

The Gateway National Recreation Area is an example, and this serves a large area in the Northeast and Atlantic States. I think that recreation for populated urban areas is going to be increasingly important in the future and a source of great pride to the country.

Mr. WOLFF. I just want to add to the statements made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) in congratulating the gentlewoman for her work on the National Gateway Recreational Park. There is, however, one area we have had great difficulty in trying to fund,

and that is the Udalls Cove preserve in New York.

We have tried to obtain funds for this land which was declared a nature sanctuary, and have been unable to get the funds, because there were not the funds in the pipeline or in unobligated funds for the State of New York. In fact, 25 States now have run out of funds in the way of obligated funds.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This was one of the problems with State funding last year. There are States which have run out of funds and some which have not.

As of May 31, 1973, there was a total unobligated balance in the State program of \$170,203,290, of which New York's share was \$11,639,673. This year, with the additional funds provided in the bill, the State of New York will receive \$11,231,996.

This is the largest amount for any State with the exception of the State of California. So there should be plenty of money in the State's program to be able to go ahead and purchase necessary recreation land.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentlewoman. I must say I was intending to offer an amendment to this bill to increase the funding. Actually, it would not even be an increase, but a carrying over of funds that were authorized but not expended last year.

I am, however, sympathetic with the views and needs of the Nation in terms of cutting back expenditures in order to combat inflation. The principal concern behind the amendment I intended to offer was that adequate funding would be available this year for the States to preserve and protect valuable resources such as Udalls Cove. I feel reassured that I can count on the support of the gentlewoman that the \$300 million we are appropriating will be expended so that we can protect invaluable areas like Udalls Cove and its adjacent uplands which are vital to its ecosystem.

I do feel, however, that we must push ahead on the legislation which is currently pending before the Interior Committee to increase funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is my understanding that hearings will begin on this vital legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, next week. This legislation will give us the authority we need to increase the authorization for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We must move ahead in this direction if we are to preserve the invaluable resources with which we have been blessed. Again, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her assurances regarding funding for the pristine areas in my district especially, in particular Udalls Cove and its adjacent uplands.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I assure the people of New York that there is no one more interested in their program of recreation land acquisition than I am, particularly in this area.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. 103 Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 2, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. MALLARY).

Mr. MALLARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. I wish to join the other Members in commending the subcommittee for its careful balancing of the national needs. I am particularly happy to recognize the skill with which the gentlewoman from Washington and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the subcommittee have dealt with the problems they face in this bill.

I particularly want to commend them on two projects that are funded in this bill with which I am very familiar and which I strongly support.

One of them is the additional allocation from the land and water conservation fund for the additional acquisition of land in the Green Mountain National Forest. This is a vitally needed program.

There are sizable inholdings within the national forest that need to be acquired. We need to acquire a great deal of land in order to reach the demarcation boundaries. We need to get this land soon, while it is still available at reasonable prices, so that we will be able to preserve for the people of this Nation this precious natural resource.

Mr. Chairman, I note that funding is also provided in this bill for the Salmon Hatchery at Bethel, Vt., the Green Mountain National Hatchery. All of New England and all the Northeast are looking forward to the day when the salmon will run again in the Connecticut River. This project will bring that time much closer.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly commend the committee for its activities, and I wish to express my full support of the bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

WE CAN SOLVE OUR ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, today the Democratic caucus adopted a resolution on the economy calling for a number of positive steps.

Mr. Chairman, we can solve our economic troubles and this resolution points the way to many important steps. In fact, none of the problems which are before us today are really new—they are things that we have been able to deal with successfully as a nation in the past

and there is no reason why it cannot be done again.

Without question, there is a great deal of pessimism across the country today and there is no doubt that we have serious economic problems. But the important thing is for the Congress, the administration, and the American people to realize that these problems are solvable. We need to take positive steps rather than just lamenting our troubles.

Much of our current economic trouble stems from poor monetary policy and the highest interest rates in the history of the United States. These are unnecessary conditions which have placed heavy burdens on the plain people and have all but closed the housing market and deprived millions of good hardworking Americans of an opportunity for decent shelter.

We must correct this situation and find a means of delivering credit on reasonable terms to the people and the businesses which really need it. There are several ways in which this could be done. First of all, the Federal Reserve could use its many powers to allocate credit to housing and other areas in the economy which have suffered the most from this long period of high interest rates. The discount window, the reserve requirements, the open market purchases, are all available to the Federal Reserve to allocate credit to areas starved for credit under today's monetary conditions.

Secondly, the Congress should move ahead with the establishment of a National Development Bank which would be a lender of last resort for housing and community needs across the land. We used to have the Reconstruction Finance Corporations, RFC, that was killed early in the Eisenhower administration. This was a mistake because the RFC was a source of credit—large credit—for many important needs during the 1930's and 1940's. And this concept should be revived today under National Development Bank legislation.

As I have proposed for several years, a National Development Bank should be capitalized at a billion dollars with the power to lend 20 times its capital. In other words, we would have a \$20 billion bank which would be available to make loans on reasonable terms for housing, businesses, and community projects which could not obtain funds on reasonable terms in the private market. Mr. Chairman, I can think of nothing more important to the economic health of the Nation than the establishment of a National Development Bank with broad powers to meet credit needs of the people.

The administration should also take another look at Public Law 91-151 which the Congress passed in December of 1969 to provide standby control over credit. This power, when triggered by the President, would allow controls to be placed on all aspects of credit transactions—including interest rates, maturities, downpayments, and similar items. This authority, if used properly, could allocate credit to the areas of greatest need and away from those endeavors which are causing inflationary pressures.

Public Law 91-151 is something that the President has had on the books for almost 5 years and it has not been used despite severe credit dislocations during this period. I hope the President will take another look.

Mr. Chairman, once again let me emphasize that our problems in the economy can be solved. We have had problems in the past and it is time that we face these situations in an optimistic manner with the resolve to get something done. The Congress and the administration and the American people can work together and we can move legislation and new approaches to get us out of this economic mess. It is a difficult situation, but it is far from impossible.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, there is much in this particular report on which we can soundly comment. I would like to confine my comments, however, to two portions of the report, because I think they are sufficiently significant that they deserve special comment.

Those portions are, first, the matter of programs of the U.S. Forest Service and, second, the matter of log exports. These appear in the committee report on pages 9, 10, and 11. I emphasize the value of reading these particular pages and assimilating the significant actions which the subcommittee has proposed here and which, of course, the full Committee on Appropriations has backed up.

There is not any question but that this tremendous asset, our national forests, has an almost unique status so far as it being an asset of the United States is concerned. That uniqueness lies in the fact that it is a resource that is a renewable resource. So many of the natural resources of this country are nonrenewable and, because of this, we must husband carefully the use of our minerals and the use of certain other resources which, once used, will not be available again.

This is not true of the product of our national forests. In the action of the committee, as spelled out on the pages to which I have alluded in the committee report, they establish not only action for this year but the blueprint for intensified action in the years which lie immediately ahead.

Earlier there were remarks made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), and my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT), looking particularly at these important points, and I would commend the reading of those remarks to the Members, and I personally would like to join in what has been said therein.

However, I call the attention of those of us who will be here next year that the blueprint which is laid out in this section for going forward beyond this year with additional funding for the Forest Service is something which can and needs to be done in the way of reforestation and timbering, and I repeat this improvement can and will be done.

Second, on the matter of log exports,

the figures, when one looks at them, are frightening, showing the increasing amount of this particular asset which has been exported. We do not dare permit the continuing rise in this particular type of action. And there again the action of the committee in making clear that everything which can be done will be done to see that the timber coming from our national forests will not be exported or used as a substitute for timber that is exported, is an extremely important action on their part.

It is my personal feeling, quite frankly, that the language set forth at the bottom of page 10 should be even tighter than it is so far as being sure that there is no substitution. But I join in support of that which has been said here, and commend the committee and the subcommittee and the individual members upon what they have done in this particular regard.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by not only commending and expressing our concern about the departure of the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) which will be indeed a loss to this Congress, but to also say a few words about the departure of my close friend, the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. WENDELL WYATT.

I think that the contributions the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) has made to the Congress in general are material. I think the gentleman has been for many of us, as the gentleman has for me since I first came to the Congress, a source of sound advice and a source of invaluable judgment. There is no question but that the gentleman's absence from the Congress next year will be a loss to those of us in the State of Oregon but, beyond that, his loss is going to be felt by everyone who cares about the work of this particular committee.

The gentleman has been a leading light, and has been a forward thinker. The gentleman has been a creative force in cajoling, urging, browbeating and persuading those who deal with the products of our forests into believing that this is an asset which cannot be wasted, and which must be enhanced. I believe that the loss of his sound counsel and effective work within the Congress and within the Government is going to be a very material loss so far as our going forward from this point on is concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, I write into the record my deep regret over the departure of the dedicated and very able gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time at this moment.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I would like to thank the chairman and the members of the subcommittee for consideration of additional funds for the completion of the Natchez Trace.

I thank Mrs. HANSEN for her great interest in the Indian tribes. She visited

my district several years ago and met with the Choctaw Indians, one of the largest tribes east of the Mississippi River. We are going to miss Mrs. HANSEN, and also the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. WENDELL WYATT.

Mr. Chairman, sitting on the same side of the aisle as Mrs. HANSEN, sometimes I have gotten off the track and she has brought me back on the main line, and she has done so with firmness, if that was necessary. I thank her for giving me this opportunity to have worked with her over these 8 years that I have been in the Congress.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, in recent years a former Secretary of the Department of Interior who was new in town, was preparing to present committee testimony "on the Hill," and his friend asked him if he was prepared to answer questions before JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, and he asked, "Who is JULIA BUTLER HANSEN?" His friend said, "Never mind; you will find out."

He did find out, as hundreds and hundreds of other governmental officials and Congressmen have found out over the years that when appearing before JULIA BUTLER HANSEN's committee, they had better done their homework and they had better have been prepared to advance their recommendation with facts and figures that will be in the public interest. "Tough" is the way to describe her. Tough but extremely able and fair.

The gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, is one of the most delightful persons who has ever served in the Congress. She has the combination of a Carrie Nation, a Joan of Arc, a Florence Nightingale, a Susan B. Anthony, with just the right mixture of a Molly Brown of more recent vintage. All of these strong characteristics of these people rolled into one end up as the personification that we see today in Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.

Many of us are personally indebted to her for many considerations she has given us over the years. What is more important, however, is that the United States of America is indebted to her for her great interest and contributions in the legislative field. We have no more qualified person in all the United States than Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, and today, during this consideration of one of the final bills that she has handled, I think we all owe our highest regards to her.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the ranking member of the full committee (Mr. WHITTEN).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to subscribe to the many fine statements that have been made about our good friend, the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN. It has been my privilege to sit on the Appropriations Committee with Mrs. HANSEN for a long time. I agree with all the wonderful words that have been said today. I speak off the cuff, but from the heart.

The many places in various sections of the United States which have been mentioned today are just a few of thousands that have benefitted by the actions of JULIA and her subcommittee. The projects are physical monuments and evidence of the interest and love for the United States on the part of JULIA and members of her subcommittee. They will always constitute physical proof of the outstanding job she has done in preserving this great country for future generations.

An example of this physical evidence is, as my colleague from Mississippi mentioned, the Natchez Trace Parkway which is in my State; a parkway to which this subcommittee has contributed greatly, without budget recommendation.

Before she came here, Mrs. HANSEN had wonderful success as a member of her State legislature. A few years ago the State Legislature of Mississippi, my State, invited Mrs. HANSEN to speak to a joint session of the body. I was privileged to hear her and to see her in action. If the Members of this body had seen her in action that day, they would have seen how she had the members in the palm of her hand. You would have seen how she has handled the people back home.

Mr. Chairman, these are physical monuments that we have been discussing, the forests, the parkways, the many historic monuments, and the many, many programs and environmental improvements to which she and her subcommittee have contributed, now and for posterity. But her record goes far beyond the annals of the Congress, the history as written in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that Mrs. HANSEN has done so many other things for the benefit of our country. JULIA has been a tower of strength in the operation of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, in the retirement of the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, we lose one of the kindest, one of the ablest and one of the greatest Members we have ever had in this Congress. No Member ever left a higher mark of excellence.

JULIA, we love you, we wish for you

many happy and eventful years. You have earned them.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, today as in the recent past, I would have liked to have provided an analysis of where the dollars go in as many of the funding categories in this bill as possible. But, as in the past, I have found it difficult to locate data which makes that possible.

The problem stems directly from the failure of the Congress and the various agencies of the executive branch to use the same titles in their various budget and appropriations documents. This makes comparisons of the data available difficult at best, and in many cases almost impossible.

My principal concern with the analysis which I have been providing on appropriations bills coming before the House thus far has been to identify the percentage of funds which have been going, or can be expected to go, to non-metropolitan areas and to metropolitan areas.

The bill which we deal with today, H.R. 16027, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies is one of those bills which are best described as everybody's bill. This is so because the work of the Fine Arts Commission, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation perform activities which protect and enhance our natural or cultural heritage. And these agencies are all funded under the proposal we are voting on today.

These functions which we underwrite with these funds are of immense value to our people as a nation and society.

But, there are only three items for which sufficient information has been available to me in a form which would allow a projection to be made of what funds might be spent in nonmetropolitan areas from these appropriations. This projection is based on the percentage of 1973 fiscal year outlays spent in non-metropolitan areas. The results of the study appear in the chart below:

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Program	1975 committee recommendation	1975 estimate going to nonmetro- politan counties	1974 appropriation	Fiscal year 1973 percentage going to nonmetro- politan counties
Department of agriculture, forest service:				
Forest protection and utilization	\$416.4	\$257.3	\$469.7	61.8
Forest roads and trails	120.4	90.8	97.7	75.4
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:				
Health Services Administration Indian health facilities	55.4	45.9	49.9	82.9
Total	592.2	394.0		

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support for, and call to attention of the House, the provision in H.R. 16027 which institutes a 10-year reforestation and timber stand improvement program for our national forests.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended a \$15 million a year increase to the \$35 million requested by the administration for reforestation and tim-

ber stand improvement, a recommendation which I feel is of critical importance and should be supported by the full House. Though the \$48,289,000 in this years appropriation falls short of a previously unfulfilled commitment of \$65 million made in 1972 under H.R. 13089, the Accelerated Reforestation of National Forests Act, it does represent a concerted effort at correcting an eco-

conomic and environmental disaster in the production and the management of our nation's forests.

We have faced a continual rise in the price of wood as supply has been unable to meet the demands of the public. Housing has been a primary factor in the increased demand.

A timber supply problem was predicted by the Forest Service as early as 1952 and 1962, though no legislative action was effected until 1969-70. The first real signs of the wood supply crunch were evident in 1968 and 1969. During those years, lumber and plywood prices rose nearly 50 percent. From 1971 to 1973, a similar supply/demand problem occurred, adding further evidence to the assertion that poor forest management had a crippling effect in meeting the Nation's needs at prices the public could reasonably afford.

Today there remains no question as to the grave economic situation of the lumber industry. Price increases for 1972-73 reportedly ranged from 24.3 to 36.9 percent. Though the problem has been identified, production levels declined in each region during the fourth quarter of 1973 by 5.8 percent.

The wood stock economic crisis is a tragic irony in light of the full growth potential that exists on land that now lies wasting away due to clear cutting, no growth, or poor management. Potential growth rates for fully stocked natural stands would increase the present actual growth rate by 39 percent in our national forests. The greater significance of vigorous implementation of reforestation in natural forests is its effect on other ownership classes of production. The 92 million acres of national forests' commercial timberlands produces 982 billion board feet, or 51 percent of the total softwood sawtimber inventory, both public and private. It is contended by the American Enterprise Institute, that since the market impact is so great, the policies of the national forest would strongly influence the policies followed for other types of public timber ownership. This could amount to a potential growth increase, in all public production, of 45 percent.

The present bill will finance the reforestation of 3.3 million backlog acres, which now exists in our national forests. Our record to date in effectively gaining ground in our reforestation program has been poor. The \$35 million per year base figure has, at best, left our recovery capabilities at a standstill. The administration's efforts in carrying out the program has been a dubious success, at best, amounting to only a 23-percent reduction of the backlog in the last 5 years. The administration's commitment to the project has been less than helpful as evidenced by the fact that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit, and properly so, to increase the amount allotted for the project, above administration recommendations.

Inflation has and will continue to have a significant role in the cost of reforestation. With a leadtime of 25 years before reforestation and with timber stand improvement measures developing trees of sawtimber size, and an inflation cost

factor of between 8 and 12 percent, it is imperative that the program begin, in full, now.

Skillful management of our forests and a reforestation program which is rigorously implemented serves not only economic considerations, but environmental ones as well. The protection of watersheds, wildlife, and the natural resources of the land have been placed in jeopardy by the logging and forest practices which have left the land clear cut. To prevent the reclamation of land from becoming prohibitive and to maintain the natural wildlife and water quality found in our national forests, planned reforestation and management has become critical for the present and future development of our forest resources.

In passing this provision, we must be aware of the fact that the \$50 million figure is only a satisfactory funding level for the reforestation of 30,000 acres this fiscal year.

According to the Forest Service, in a letter that is included at the end of my remarks, the bill's appropriation seems to be reasonably within the range projected in 1971, given an inflationary rate of over 20 percent in the last 3 years.

I would encourage the Forest Service and the Congress to continue to be responsive to the reforestation timetable in the interest of the public, both economically and governmentally. Further, that we continue to support the program with the necessary funds it will need in the coming years.

Proper economic and environmental policy concerning our national forests dictates that an intensive and comprehensive reforestation and management program be fully implemented immediately.

I include the following:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1971.

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LEGGETT: This is in further response to your letter of April 23 requesting an analysis of our program to reforest the five million acre backlog on the National Forests.

According to the latest Project Work Inventory there were 4.8 million acres of nonstocked and understocked commercial forest land in need of reforesting on the National Forests. We estimate the cost of doing this work at about 552 million dollars and that it would take about 13 years to complete the job. The time requirement of 13 years is based on the availability of labor and equipment, on the capacities of our tree nurseries to produce planting stock, and on the probabilities of being able to secure seed from the proper seed sources. It would take about four years to "gear up" because we would have to prepare additional seed beds, install irrigation systems, and expand facilities for handling and storing the trees at many of the nurseries. Some of the species of trees needed have to be grown three years in the nursery before they are ready for outplanting. Also, many species produce seed in collectible quantities at intervals of several years.

A tentative five-year program to begin accomplishing the needed reforestation efficiently and in the shortest reasonable time is as follows:

Fiscal year:	Acres	Cost (\$)
1973	190,000	24,800,000
1974	250,000	28,750,000

1975	350,000	40,250,000
1976	420,000	48,300,000
1977	420,000	48,300,000

Following the initial five years of the program, it would continue at the F.Y. 1977 level until it tapered off during the last several years. This tentative program assumes that it would be part of a coordinated program for development of all of the resources of the National Forests and that funding of other activities such as watershed, recreation and wildlife management, etc. would provide multidisciplinary support to assure protection of the environment.

Reforestation of land cut over on sale areas, funded with deposits by timber purchasers under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act, is expected to increase from about 200,000 acres to 250,000 acres annually during the period 1973-1977, inclusive.

We appreciate your continuing interest in the management of the National Forests.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. MCGUIRE,
Acting Chief.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies. The bill includes moneys to be appropriated for the Land and Water Conservation Fund—LWCF—program administered by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Next week, the House Interior Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation has scheduled hearings on various bills to amend the LWCF program. Among the bills to be considered is one I authored to increase the fund from \$300 to \$900 million.

With the pending Interior appropriations bill and the LWCF hearings, it is very timely for Members of the House to examine closely the fund to see if it is fulfilling its purpose and meeting the needs of our citizens.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was begun in 1965. It is used by State governments on a 50-50 matching basis to acquire and develop park and recreation lands and by Federal agencies like the National Park Service to acquire lands needed to satisfy national conservation goals. The fund is derived from entrance and user fees collected at a number of Federal recreation areas, receipts from the sale of surplus Federal property, Federal taxes on motorboat fuels, and royalties from offshore oil wells.

FEDERAL NEEDS

An average of 40 percent of the fund goes to Federal agencies. It is the only source of land acquisition moneys for the National Park Service. Estimates are that the Park Service needs around \$327 million to purchase private inholdings in 50 units of the park system and lands recently authorized in new national park areas. With the proposed additions of Big Cypress and Big Thicket, the total could be raised to well over \$600 million.

The Park Service share of the fund in the pending appropriations bill is only \$72.7 million. In fiscal year 1974, no moneys were appropriated from the fund for Federal land acquisition, and the Park Service was left with only carry-over funds appropriated in previous years.

At this erratic, low rate of funding, it will be many years before the Park Service can acquire the necessary lands au-

thorized by Congress. And, in the meantime, inflation is rapidly escalating land prices and many key parcels of land could be lost to development.

The heavy backlog in unacquired national park lands has had a further deleterious effect. The Department of the Interior and the Office of Management and Budget have continually opposed any new national park proposals. This is a deplorable situation as now, more than ever before, our country desperately needs more Federal parks and recreation areas, particularly near our major urban centers.

Between 1960 and 1970, 24 million people were added to the population of the United States. Seventy-three percent of the Nation's population now live in urban areas, on less than 2 percent of our country's land. Within our central cities, one family in two or three does not own a car. Yet most of our parks are located in remote areas, accessible only to families with automobiles, and then only on weekends or summer vacations.

Only 8 percent of all Federal recreation lands are located in urban areas. Most Federal parks are far removed from the urban masses or, where they are located in metropolitan areas, they are limited in purpose—such as national battlefields—or unsuitable for intensive recreation—such as national historic sites. The lack of Federal recreation and park lands is particularly acute in the Eastern, Midwestern, and Southern States.

If we are to expand our country's ability to provide outdoor recreational opportunities where they are most needed—and to preserve valuable open space before it is lost forever—more funds must be made available on the Federal level.

My bill, to increase the annual authorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund from \$300 to \$900 million would end the logjam that has stymied Federal acquisition. Moneys for the increased funding are already available in the U.S. Treasury. The Secretary of the Interior has announced plans to increase offshore oil drilling by tenfold, which would more than cover a threefold increase in the fund. Revenues from offshore oil leasing are expected to reach over \$8 billion in fiscal year 1975.

The purpose in using these oil revenues for the LWCF program has been to convert a natural public resource that is being depleted into a natural public resource that will not be depleted. As we increase the rate at which we deplete our oil resources, we should also increase the rate at which we fund parks, recreation, and conservation of land and water resources. Otherwise we would be allowing a substantial cut in the percentage of offshore oil revenues going into the fund.

STATE NEEDS

The need for additional funding for recreation purposes is equally acute on the State level. As the demand for recreation has grown nationally, pressures have grown on our State and local parks to help meet this demand.

Unfortunately, the funds available under the present program are falling far short of meeting the State needs for outdoor recreation land and facilities.

Traditionally, park programs have taken a back seat to other State and local priorities. Only in recent years, has outdoor recreation been recognized as an important and basic human need. At the same time, with the rapid disappearance of suitable open space, particularly around our central cities, fewer opportunities have been available for outdoor recreation. And the need grows more acute every year.

As of the end of fiscal year 1974, the States had obligated all but \$22 million of the moneys appropriated to them. Actually, the word "obligated" is a misnomer, a creation of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation that merely clouds the issue. Many of the States have committed their funds for specific projects and are simply waiting for BOR's formal approval of environmental impact statements and the like. Although the States have committed their funds, they must wait for BOR to officially state that the funds are obligated.

Earlier this year, I wrote to the Governors of each State asking for their views on the LWFC program—whether they have need for increased funding and what other changes they would like to see enacted. I received replies from 42 States.

The State officials unanimously endorsed my proposal to increase the fund from \$300 to \$900 million a year. They said their need greatly exceeds their allotment, and the need grows even greater every year. Many of them asked that the matching grant formula be changed to 75 percent Federal and 25 percent State or local. Several requested that the program provide funds for operation and maintenance of parks, as well as planning, acquisition, and development.

The following are excerpts of the replies I received from State officials concerning the land and water conservation fund. I think these will be helpful to the Members in evaluating the various proposals for amending the land and water conservation fund. I believe most Members will come to my conclusion—that the fund desperately needs to be increased, and that \$900 million is a reasonable figure to meet the growing State and Federal needs for outdoor recreation.

The following are a few excerpts from the replies I received to my informal survey of the States:

Alabama: "We concur with the recommendations of (the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers requesting \$480 million for FY/75 and increase in the annual fund to \$1 billion) as they do represent the states and they are the ones that have been selected to administer this program in their respective states or areas." (George C. Wallace, Governor)

Alaska: "We do recommend that Land and Water Conservation Funds be available to states or local governments for operation and maintenance costs, provided the general level of the fund can be increased." (William A. Egan, Governor)

Arizona: "The State of Arizona presently can spend more than twice the money available under the current matching program of 50 percent. Because of recently approved bonding programs in several communities and in the two largest counties in Arizona, it is very likely that units of government could use a threefold increase in the fund support as proposed by your bill. This means that even under the existing 50-50 matching program the local units of government will,

in all likelihood, be able to match additional funds which would be provided by your bill." (Jack Williams, Governor)

Arkansas: "Most of the small communities in the state of Arkansas are unable to provide 50% matching funds needed to acquire or develop recreational facilities. For this reason, I feel that a formula of 75-25 will be of great benefit to our small communities. . . . I feel that a thorough investigation should be made prior to granting money to be used for maintenance and operation of recreational facilities." (Dale Bumpers, Governor)

California: "Since the beginning of the Land and Water Conservation Fund program in 1965, California has received over \$66 million in grants. In this same period, we could have funded at least \$250 million in grants if federal funds had been available." (Ronald Reagan, Governor)

Colorado: ". . . we feel that the 50-50 matching grant formula is adequate for most of our programs in Colorado. We also feel that grants for operations and maintenance should not be provided with federal grants. We believe that this is a local responsibility. . . . Our requests for funding in FY-1974 totalled about \$10 million and our appropriation was only \$1¼ million. For FY-1975 our requests were about \$5 million, and we estimate an appropriation of about \$2.3 million. Historically, our requests have been about four or five to one over our apportionment." (T. W. Ten Eyck, Executive Director, Dept. of Natural Resources)

Delaware: "The need is apparent. Our state park program envisions expenditures of two to four million dollars annually. Local funds would far exceed this amount. Delaware's Federal appropriation for 1974 was \$579,570. Current state and local funds eligible for matching are estimated to be \$5,750,000. A change in the matching formula to 75% Federal-25% State and expansion of the program to include operations and maintenance would be beneficial to our programs." (Sherman W. Tribbitt, Governor)

Florida: "Florida has experienced a marked increase in local requests for Land and Water Conservation funds this year due to suspension of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Open Space Program. . . . The projected Fiscal Year 1975 apportionment of \$5,369,420 for Florida could be utilized easily if it were tripled as a result of your bill's passage. Such an additional allocation would be split evenly between local government and State-sponsored projects. There would be no difficulty in meeting the 50-50 matching requirement on either level." (Reubin Askew, Governor)

Georgia: "A total of 210 requests were submitted to the Department of Natural Resources requesting \$16,000,000 in LWCF monies. You can readily see that Georgia's anticipated FY 1975 apportionments of approximately \$3,400,000 falls far short of the demand for such funds." (Jimmy Carter, Governor)

Hawaii: ". . . the amount of Land and Water Conservation funds allotted to Hawaii is not enough to match State and local funds available for implementing recreation projects through the Capital Improvements Program. . . . Accordingly, we fully support this legislative proposal to increase the annual authorization for the LWCF." (George R. Ariyoshi, Acting Governor)

Idaho: "Under the existing allocation formula and level of funding, Idaho receives approximately 1.5 million annually. Since applications have always exceeded available funds, no real promotion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund program has been attempted. With a little encouragement given to the local project sponsors, we feel certain that Idaho could match several times the amount of the present allocation." (Cecil D. Andrus, Governor)

Indiana: ". . . financial assistance in larger amounts than in past years is imperative

if we are to keep pace with the ever increasing demands for leisure opportunities in our outdoor settings . . . As part of the ongoing planning program, it was recently determined that over \$300 million would be needed in the next fourteen years in our State for public outdoor recreation acquisition and development projects."

Iowa: "One of the problems experienced with the program in the past is a fluctuating level of appropriations to the Fund from year-to-year. This is somewhat disruptive to advance planning. Part of this problem apparently stems from an obsession of OMB, and perhaps by some members of Congress, for a rapid obligation rate whereby a dim view is taken if most funds appropriated during a particular fiscal year are not obligated by the States during that year. This resulted in a particularly drastic reduction in the appropriation for fiscal year 1974." (Robert D. Ray, Governor)

Kansas: "The Joint Council on Recreation advises me that Kansas and other states can very well commit all funds allocated under the \$900 million level. As our program has progressed in recent years, the Joint Council has a backlog of projects and with the present applications has an estimated fund requirement of \$5,139,000." (Robert Docking, Governor)

Kentucky: "At the current LWCF funding level, we can anticipate a maximum of two million dollars in the Department of Parks for the biennium. We could realistically use another ten million dollars in capital construction funds for the 1974-76 biennium." (Ewart W. Johnson, Commissioner, Department of Parks)

Louisiana: "An on-going, continuous process was instituted early in the program to qualify projects on the federal level far in excess of the availability of federal funds apportioned to the state in any one fiscal year. Qualification of projects does not obligate federal funds, but creates a backlog . . . It goes without saying that the program has been enthusiastically accepted and demanded in this state." (Gilbert C. Lagasse, Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission)

Maine: ". . . in conjunction with any increase in the authorized funding level, we would request Congressional consideration of . . . Passage of the pending amendment to allow a percentage of the funds to be used to enclose certain types of facilities . . . increasing the Fund's cost-sharing rate to more than 50%, say 75% . . . expanding the scope of the program to include reimbursement for operation and maintenance of these facilities. There is also a pending amendment to change the apportionment formula. In the past, we have been opposed to this as it would reduce Maine's annual funds considerably. We would not oppose this amendment if the funding level were increased at the same time to assure Maine \$2.5 to \$3 million annually." (Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor)

Maryland: "The Maryland Department of Natural Resources . . . is in favor of increasing the 50/50 matching grant formula to perhaps a 75/25. When we allocate State funds for local projects, the State already pays 100% for land acquisition to the local subdivision and in many cases 75% of the cost of development of the facility." (Marvin Mandel, Governor)

Michigan: "Expressed in terms of 1973 dollars, land acquisition and development will require at least \$550 million (for the period 1975-79). Our planners have also projected this need through 1989, the statutory limitation of the LWCF program, and have arrived at the staggering figure of \$2.25 billion. A second reason for our support is that the LWCF is now the only Federal Assistance available specifically for a wide range of public outdoor recreational facilities and areas . . . Finally, inflation has spurred an acceleration in land prices and

construction costs which few could have imagined when the present \$300 million figure was authorized." (William G. Milliken, Governor)

Missouri: "As off-shore oil drilling increases on federal lands, the Land and Water Conservation Fund also should increase for purchase of more public recreation land; this is the direct way for an inland state like Missouri to benefit from the increased leasing activity . . . clearly the Land and Water Conservation Fund must be increased just to keep pace with escalating land costs. In brief, an increase in the Fund for Missouri would be favorably received and immediately used." (Christopher S. Bond, Governor)

Montana: "The number of new acquisitions and new facilities plus inflation is creating a burden which all levels of government are facing. Any assistance in operations and maintenance would be quite helpful. Right now we have a number of projects amounting to over a million dollars which are waiting for the 1975 appropriation. An increase in the annual appropriation will aid our park and recreation program at all levels of government." (Wesley R. Woodgerd, State Fish and Game Director)

Nebraska: "Last year Nebraska communities submitted over \$10 million of proposed projects and we were able to fund only \$3 million based on available funds. This year communities submitted over \$14 million of proposed projects. Again we could only program for \$3 million of projects. Obviously, there is a great interest by Nebraska's political subdivisions in the program." (J. James Exon, Governor)

Nevada: "With increased funding available as proposed in your bill, we recommend that the formula be changed to provide 75% matching from the federal source. This would be a great assistance to the smaller communities which have a difficult time in raising the local share of the project proposal." (Mike O'Callaghan, Governor)

New Jersey: "At this moment, applications in hand and legitimate program inquiries could more than utilize New Jersey's allocation at the \$900 million level. . . . It is our feeling that the present 50-50 funding ratio is generally preferable . . . it is our strong conviction that project accountability is closely tied to the financial commitment of the project sponsor. The 50-50 ratio provides meaningful assistance without adversely affecting project accountability." (David J. Bardin, Commissioner, Department of Environmental Protection)

New Mexico: ". . . we have project proposals pending which total approximately \$4-million that would be funded if adequate funds were available . . . In 1973 the State Legislature passed the Outdoor Recreation Act which provided up to 25% State supplemental funds to assist the communities with their projects. However, the 1974 State Legislature failed to appropriate funds for this purpose. We therefore support a change in the formula from 50/50 matching grant." (Bruce King, Governor)

New York: "Federal funds over the past several years have been insufficient to meet the recreational needs of New York State. The State Office of Parks and Recreation estimates that \$3.0 billion in capital construction funds will be required over the next 20 years for state and municipal recreational projects. At present funding levels, it is estimated that there will be a \$1.6 billion cumulative gap by the year 1990. In regard to pending recreational projects, state appropriations presently in force amount to approximately \$118 million. . . . We have approximately \$20 million in municipal recreational projects that cannot be advanced because of lack of federal funds. In addition, the voters of New York State recently approved an environmental bond issue which includes \$175 million for the preservation of

land resources. Additional federal funds are needed to supplement these bond funds. It is our opinion that administration of the Fund should be revised to permit federal aid for indoor recreational facilities. We also support grants for operations and maintenance of recreational facilities." (Malcolm Wilson, Governor)

North Carolina: "We, in North Carolina concur with the 50/50 matching grant formula . . . We also prefer that the program continue to be only for acquisition, develop and planning. Local government must assume responsibility for management, operation and maintenance. . . . All of our apportionments from the LWCF program for this year and all previous years have been obligated . . . North Carolina could effectively utilize \$12.5 million in fiscal 1975. We, however, anticipate receiving only \$3.7 million, leaving a gap of \$8.8 million for fiscal 1975." (James E. Holshouser, Jr., Governor)

North Dakota: ". . . the State Outdoor Recreation Agency currently has in excess of \$2 million in requests for federal fund assistance from the Land and Water Conservation Fund . . . Additional demands will be made against North Dakota's allocation by an expanding state parks program, acquisition of additional state forest lands, and the development of badly needed water-based recreational facilities at state sites. In addition, our demand for urban recreational development expanded three-fold during the past two years with no increase in the funding level of the Land and Water Fund Program. We can expect these demands to continue in the years ahead." (Arthur A. Link, Governor)

Ohio: "I am pleased to learn of the action you have taken in the Congress by introducing an amendment to the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 bill to increase the Annual Authorization for the fund from \$300 to \$900 million. Your consideration and effort in this direction is appreciated." (William B. Nye, Director, Department of Natural Resources)

Oklahoma: "We feel this need strongly in Oklahoma, and can assure you that additional money would be greatly appreciated and well utilized here. At the present time we have approximately \$12,000,000 worth of projects upon which we cannot act due to a lack of LWCF matching funds. We are also interested in pursuing the idea of adjusting the matching formula." (David Hall, Governor)

Oregon: "I welcome the opportunity to work with you in your efforts to alleviate the problems of financing recreational projects. The small, rural cities and counties in Oregon have experienced great difficulty in raising matching funds, as the cost of parks is incredibly high per capita. At the least, these deserving small cities should receive an increase in federal matching funds." (Tom McCall, Governor)

Pennsylvania: "Your efforts to increase the authorized level of funding from \$400 million to \$900 million is appreciated. However, it would be rather difficult for State agencies and local governments to match their portion of that level of funding on a 50-50 basis. The cost sharing percentage ratio should be increased to 75% federal and 25% local." (Maurice K. Goddard, Secretary, Department of Environmental Resources)

Puerto Rico: "In recent years, we have had a consistent problem of matching the available federal funds with local funds. Certainly, a change in the law with regard to the matching formula from 50/50 to 75/25 would aid in the resolution of this problem." (Rafael Hernández-Colón, Governor)

South Dakota: "In our state, the federal cutback in fiscal year 1974 created a great deal of speculation on the future of the BOR program . . . Currently, we are anticipating that the fiscal year 1975 apportionment will gear up the program to the fiscal year 1973 level. Any larger increase in South Dakota's

apportionment is limited by the availability of local funds. A formula change to a 75/25 ratio would be helpful in this respect." (John Popowski, State Liaison Officer)

Tennessee: "The State is holding project applications from local governments for matching assistance totaling more than \$4 million. Only \$1.6 million will be available for FY '75. The State Legislature appropriated nearly \$10 million for Conservation capital improvement projects for FY '75. Only \$1.6 million from the Land and Water Conservation Fund is anticipated to match this amount." (Granville Hinton, Commissioner, Department of Conservation)

Utah: "Since the creation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the State has funded over 170 projects which have accounted for over \$24 million in outdoor recreation expenditures for land acquisition and development. In addition . . . approximately another 125 projects over the last seven years have been turned down for funding due to insufficient Federal matching . . . the need for additional outdoor recreation funds to meet the current recreation demand is great, for we anticipate well over \$10 million worth of projects this coming fiscal year, 1974-75, with an estimated apportionment of only \$2,147,180 for matching. The need for additional funds at the present time is critical." (Calvin L. Rampton, Governor)

West Virginia: ". . . it is necessary to consider the fluctuating nature of the annual apportionments. This program's annual apportionments have been so inconsistent that the development is practically impossible. If the fund could be stabilized over a period of years, I would support such changes as: 1. Increasing matching formula up to 75 percent . . . 2. Allowing states to utilize up to 25 percent of their annual apportionment to fund outdoor recreation facilities that can be enclosed during inclement weather in the off season. I recognize the desirability of financial assistance for operation and maintenance of recreation areas, but I would not support efforts to do so from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program. . . West Virginia could utilize three to five million dollars annually for pending and anticipated recreation projects. You can rest assured that I support raising the level of funding." (Arch A. Moore, Jr., Governor)

Wisconsin: "Recently we reviewed the needs for land acquisition and development of park and recreation areas for the next fifteen years. The estimates are as follows: Cost of land acquisition to 1989 \$483,000,000. Cost to develop parks to 1989 \$260,000,000. . . During 1971-72, Wisconsin's allocation was \$4.8 million and we had no trouble matching that amount. We feel that Wisconsin could fully use aids generated from a \$900 million appropriation. Wisconsin makes 25 percent state supplemental grants to local governments to purchase recreation land under any federal program. We would welcome 75 percent federal-25 percent local cost sharing for any program; however, we feel that it would be more important for land acquisition." (L. P. Voight, Secretary, Department of Natural Resources)

Vermont: "The 50/50 matching grant formula has been inadequate in Vermont because many of the cities and towns were unable to match it with local funds. We would support a move to change the formula to a 75/25 ratio or at least have it made more flexible . . . For a number of years the State Legislature in Vermont has appropriated a bond issue to partially match the Land and Water Conservation Funds up to 40% of the cost of the project. The average has been somewhere in the neighborhood of 30-35% leaving the local share at 15-20%." (Thomas P. Salmon, Governor)

Virginia: "The Commission of Outdoor Recreation, the agency in Virginia which administers the Land and Water Conserva-

tion Fund program, generally provides 75% of the cost of local projects . . . We have found little difficulty in finding localities to come up with 25% of the cost of a project. Our only difficulty is having sufficient Land and Water Conservation Funds to fully finance all of the projects we would like to undertake at the local level . . . during the 1972-74 biennium, the State of Virginia provided approximately \$8.2 million in State funds along with our apportionment of approximately \$4.5 million in Land and Water Conservation Funds for State and local park and recreation acquisitions and developments. So you can see we are doing a great deal at the State level; however, it would strengthen our program tremendously if we could receive additional Land and Water Conservation Funds." (Earl J. Shiflet, Secretary of Commerce and Resources)

Washington: "The needs identified in the Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan (SCORP) far exceed the existing financial resources available to the state . . . Local agency project grants-in-aid are approved on a 75/25 basis, with 50% LWCF, 25% State funds, and 25% local funds. An increased LWCF apportionment, coupled with a more flexible funding formula allowing up to 75% LWCF use would be most beneficial in extending the capabilities of Washington to meet both State and local project needs." (Daniel J. Evans, Governor)

Wyoming: "We welcome your suggestion of a 25/75 matching grant formula. It would ease a burden on all of our entities in their acquisition and development program . . . in the nationwide program we thought it expedient to first construct recreation areas and facilities for the public. . . The next phase should be implementation of the 'protection' portion of the Act, i.e. constructing headquarter areas and a State Park Superintendent's home and/or headquarters so that the total recreation area would be covered on a 24 hour basis. If this phase would be matchable, it, too, would alleviate the concern of all State Park Directors in managing park areas." (Paul H. Westedt, Director, Recreation Commission)

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the lady from Washington, Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman SIDNEY R. YATES, and the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman JOHN BRADEMANS, and in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman H. R. GROSS.

This Nation, even with its present serious fiscal problems, can and will find the means to support the Appropriations Committee's funding of the National Endowment of Arts and Humanities.

The National Endowment is endeavoring to bring various forms of culture to the people throughout the country, and like our own metropolitan government in Dade County with its effort to bring a municipal museum to south Florida, we can make an important contribution to raise the quality of life for our citizens.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation that a total of \$159,000,000 be appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and strongly urge my colleagues in defeating all amendments reducing the amounts so recommended.

The fine returns to this Nation from the programs of the National Endowment for the Arts and of the National Endowment for the Humanities amply justify the relatively moderate sums in-

vested by the Congress. Few Federal programs provide such value per tax dollar. I have supported various amendments to hold certain Federal programs to the fiscal year 1974 level of spending, as a means of curbing total Federal spending that feeds inflation, but I submit that any attempt to so hold the Arts and Humanities programs would not be true economy in Government.

Although H.R. 16027 as reported by the Appropriations Committee provides \$40,725,000 more than the level of new budget authority appropriated for the last fiscal year, 1974, for the foundation and its twin endowments the committee's recommendation already represents a cut of \$16 million from the budget request submitted by President Nixon. Rather than accept floor amendments further reducing this appropriation, I believe a strong case may be made for increasing it not only to the level requested by the administration but further to a level providing for full funding of the authorization for the National Foundation. If such an increase is not made by the House, I would urge that it be considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say "thank you" to my good friends and colleagues.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of the House for just a little over a month but I could not let this occasion go by without adding my personal thanks and best wishes to the distinguished chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies.

Because of her special concern and commitment, a project of great importance to my California district will proceed and the magnificence of the Golden Gate headlands in Marin and San Francisco counties will be preserved.

The Congress worked its will in creating the Golden Gate National Recreation Area but lands must be acquired, transportation projects tested, and, most importantly, funds must be available if this magnificent area is to be preserved in the manner that the Congress envisioned when it passed the original GGNRA legislation.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN has worked to see that funds are available and for that I, and the people of San Francisco and Marin County and all who share the concerns for the preservation of this beautiful open space, owe her a debt of gratitude.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in expressing admiration for the gentlewoman from Washington, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN. It has been my privilege to work with her as a member of the Hansen Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Democratic Caucus. Her achievements in the past 3 years as chairwoman of that committee have had a profound and significant effect on the workings of the House which will be felt for decades to come. She has worked tirelessly and patiently and she has always been considerate of the views of others as she has guided that committee toward conclu-

sions to improve the functioning of this body.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN has served the people of this Nation as chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies. She has fought for conservation and the preservation of our open spaces for future generations to enjoy. She has fought for the development of our resources; our land, water, minerals, wildlife, and parks and she has diligently and firmly stood against their exploitation by special interests. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN has had a special commitment to the principle that the land with all of its abundance and beauty belongs to all of us and that it is our responsibility to pass this heritage on intact to future generations.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN has been of invaluable help to me personally in the effort to preserve the beautiful Golden Gate and in securing necessary funds to develop the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

In my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, I always found JULIA BUTLER HANSEN to be understanding and sympathetic toward the needs of the people of the territories for which the United States has special responsibility.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN is a humane and compassionate woman, a tireless fighter for reform of House procedures, and a dedicated servant of the common good. It has been my special privilege and pleasure to have her as a friend. She will be missed in the Congress and I am sure that all who have served with her wish her the full enjoyment of her retirement and return to her home State of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$140,696,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois: Page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike "\$140,696,000" and insert therein "\$141,696,000".

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I almost hesitate to disturb the mirrorlike tranquility of these proceedings by offering an amendment to what is surely a most exemplary bill.

At the outset I want to join in the commendations that have so richly been paid and so deservedly paid to the distinguished chairperson of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington and also to my very dear friend and a senior Republican member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oregon. We will miss them not only for their service on this committee but also because of the great contributions that

they have made in the public interest through the many years of their combined service.

It is only my deep and overriding concern for my region of the country, which has already been predicted will be the victim of a shortage of fuel, of natural gas as early as this winter, a prediction that was made only a week ago by the head of the Federal Energy Administration, Mr. Sawhill, that leads me to offer an amendment.

The function of this amendment is to restore \$1 million to this measure for the purpose of expediting completion of the environmental studies on the Arctic gas pipeline projects. These studies constitute the first phase of the Federal approval process for such projects. The administration had requested a total of \$4.5 million for these studies which, with full funding, they would expect to complete by late spring, 1975. The committee's provision of \$3.5 million, however, threatens to significantly delay completion of these environmental impact statements. Moreover, since the Federal Power Commission cannot initiate its full-scale proceedings until such studies are filed, delaying the latter's completion inevitably prolongs the already lengthy FPC certification process.

Specifically, we expect that the \$1 million funding cut will adversely affect the already proposed and vital Arctic gas pipeline project. This project is a venture backed by a 27-member consortium consisting of United States and Canadian gas and oil companies which has already filed the appropriate applications with United States and Canadian authorities. The project is a vast undertaking which envisions a 2,600-mile pipeline complex to transport natural gas from Alaska's Prudhoe Bay and Canada's Mackenzie Delta to U.S. markets. The system will tap over 33 trillion cubic feet of proven gas reserves and is expected to deliver over 4 billion cubic feet of such gas daily—that is the equivalent of nearly 700,000 barrels of oil. It is estimated that the pipeline will cost over \$6 billion and the consortium plans to commence gas deliveries in 1979. Basic markets will be the Upper Plains States, the Great Lakes States, the west coast, and the Mid-Atlantic States.

The anticipated 1979 completion date, however, is contingent on many variables. Within this country, the consortium must receive a right-of-way permit from the Interior Department and a pipeline certification from the Federal Power Commission. In addition, certain permits must be obtained from the State of Alaska. Since the pipeline also traverses Canada, approval from its Ministry of Northern Development and Indian Affairs and the Canadian National Energy Board must be secured. Finally, because of the international nature of the project, it is expected that our State Department will negotiate an agreement with Canadians concerning ownership and gas shipment rights. Although each of these steps shall proceed concurrently, each may encounter unanticipated obstructions and seriously delay approval of the entire project. Let me stress, that all of these approval procedures must go

forward without delay if the 1979 completion is to be achieved.

The precise delay potential of the bill's \$1 million funding reduction is unknown. The Interior Department staff charged with the responsibility of preparing the impact statement estimates that the probable delay is approximately 3 months. This seemingly minimal delay, however, will be compounded because, as I noted earlier, the Federal Power Commission cannot begin its full scale proceedings until the pertinent environmental impact statements have been filed.

The pressing need to expedite these already lengthy approval procedures leads me to conclude that this \$1 million must be restored to the bill. By passage of this amendment, Congress can insure that at least one source of significant delay will be obviated. Moreover, this body shall have then helped facilitate delivery of this vital fuel to an energy hungry nation.

Let me add one final note: support of this amendment should not be construed as congressional approval of the Arctic Gas Consortium's particular venture. Indeed, it is expected that other groups will come forth with alternative schemes to transport gas from the far north to domestic markets. This amendment merely provides the additional funds necessary to insure that all permit approval procedures move ahead without delay. Additionally, the Interior Department's environmental assessment can be expected to furnish the type of information base necessary for a prudent determination of the particular route or project which is in the national interest.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. It was my understanding that the original plan within the Department of the Interior was that they wanted to spend \$9 million and take 2 years to do it; but by the time the request came over to the Congress it was cut both in money and in time. It was cut from \$9 million to \$4.5 million, cut from a 2-year study to a 1-year study. I think we are at the absolute bottom minimum right now.

A study, a comprehensive study, a thorough and complete study, is necessary for two things.

It is necessary, No. 1, to be able to pick the best route for this gas pipeline; No. 2, it is necessary in order to avoid court fights. We had a lot of trouble with the Alaska pipeline with court fights and with discussion of problems. If we do not have a proper study, if the complete provisions of the Environmental Protection Act is not followed, we end up with a court fight on this one, and we cannot afford it.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is absolutely correct, and I would like to go on record in support of it.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his very valuable contribution. He makes, I think, an addition-

al and a very valid argument for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman is saying in his amendment is that he is requiring an additional \$1 million for an environmental impact study on the Trans-Canadian-Mackenzie Valley route.

Is it his opinion that if we do vote on this affirmatively, would it in any way be interpreted as a congressional OK for the Trans-Canadian-Mackenzie route?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. As I said a moment ago—perhaps the gentleman was not in the Chamber—it ought to be emphasized that support of this amendment should not be construed as approval of any particular venture, be it the Arctic Gas Consortium or anyone else. It is to examine necessary and desirable routes that may be pursued.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

(On request of Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and by unanimous consent Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Is it my understanding, then, that some of this money possibly could be utilized in the other alternate routes, or is it to be specifically spent on the Trans-Canadian-Mackenzie route?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, it is a very important point, and it is an important point to emphasize, that part of these studies are the alternative routes. Clearly, the alternative to the Mackenzie Valley route is an Alaska route, and it is an important part of NEPA as the alternatives are studied.

If we cut the money, one of the things we do is to start impinging on the quality of the study, one of the very important parts of the study of alternative routes. I think it is in the best interests of the gentleman from Alaska to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois just for that very reason, that, in order to get a proper study of alternatives, we need to have the money for the study.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have one additional question. Is it my understanding that the FPC actually does not have to have an environmental impact statement prior to its ruling; that its decision is based upon the availability of gas, the availability of the marketplace, the price of consumption of that gas, and actually they are not requiring an environmental impact statement before they make their decision?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am informed by people in the Department of the Interior that this is not so. These studies have to be completed or there will be, inevitably, delay of the certification process by the Federal Power Commission. I am giving the gentleman the

benefit of the very best information I have been able to develop on this point.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. With all due respect, as the gentleman knows, we have a vested interest in my area in where this line goes, and I do not want to be caught in a box of considering that this is a trans-Canadian route.

Another alternative, as the gentleman well knows, and I think we should make it perfectly clear on the record, that a vote for this amendment would not be a vote for the Canadian route.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Let it therefore be made clear by the author of the amendment, the gentleman in the well, that this amendment is not a congressional endorsement or approval of any specific route. It does not rule out consideration of any alternate routes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the author of the amendment if it is not true that the purpose of the amendment is to expedite the environmental impact study, on the Arctic gas pipeline and to place the study before the Federal Power Commission for the final determination of that Commission.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman has correctly stated the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. RUPPE. And it certainly is true that it is the opinion of people in the Midwest that the route through Canada can support itself on its own merits. It is not a legislative attempt to make a decision, or foist a decision, on the Federal Power Commission, but rather to get a fair opportunity for the Midwestern States to get a Canadian pipeline considered as one of the proposals before the Federal Power Commission, we must recognize that the Midwest is definitely energy short, is a deficit area at the present time, and faces a worse energy shortage in future years.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUPPE. I certainly will.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Again, I will say that the gentleman from Michigan, a distinguished member of the Committee on the Interior, is knowledgeable in these matters and has stated very simply and better than I could myself the rationale of this particular amendment.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is always with regret that I rise in opposition to an amendment that is providing energy, even though not many seem to be concerned these days about conserving energy. I have found, as I drive on the highways, that there are very few people interested in saving energy. Cars going to the airports are going 70 miles an hour; people with air-conditioners are operating them at top speed.

Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that the committee had long, extensive hearings on this entire problem.

There are about six proposals which relate to a variety of routes. We have a map in our hearings, if the gentleman will turn to page 1043 of part 4. One route goes straight down toward Valdez, Alaska. One route comes down into Alberta, and there is one that goes into the midcontinent.

I would point out to the gentleman that the money will be spent for routes where the applications are actually made, and some of the applications have not yet been made.

May I point out that \$3,500,000 is in the budget for environmental impact statement preparation and for an economic and security analyses. In addition, there is \$130,000 in the Office of the Solicitor for legal work involved in this project.

I would also like to point out that there was a great deal of uncertainty expressed in the testimony of the Interior Department when they were before us relative to the proposals. During our hearings the committee learned that one of the companies, El Paso, had already filed an intervention suit against one of the other companies, Arctic Gas, and that there was talk that the Polar Gas people were going to file an intervention suit against the Arctic Gas people.

There is not at this point full, complete knowledge of where any Arctic gas lines will go. With a great deal of care and a great deal of caution, we looked at this entire picture and concluded that the \$3,630,000 provided in the bill is sufficient until we have more precise information.

The committee does try to act responsibly, and we have tried to bring to the floor of this House a responsible and a sensible bill. We have never at any time refused to entertain a supplemental request, and we never refused to discuss with the Senate in conference those items where further discussions or hearings have revealed additional information.

So this is the reason why I oppose this particular amendment.

Before concluding, I might remind the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that it was the efforts of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies which gave to the taxpayers a break by requiring reimbursement for the extraordinary costs that were involved in environmental impact studies relating to the trans-Alaska pipeline.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this alone has done a great deal to protect the people and the taxpayers of this Nation.

I would urge that the Senate carefully review this. Let us define exactly the steps we wish to take and when and how. If the requirements are greater than the funds we have provided, it can be considered in conference or in a future appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will take just a few minutes to indicate my regret that I must disagree with my able colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) and some of his associates on this issue.

I feel that I must point out to the House that this committee did give this particular item a great deal of scrutiny when the Bureau of Land Management came before us, and as a result of that hearing we provided \$3.5 million to begin looking at environmental impact statements in connection with applications that were not even filed at the time we held our hearings.

There are six different routes under consideration. We do not know today which one might be settled on. We gave 80 percent of the budget estimate that the Bureau of Land Management requested to begin with to get on with this work.

I say to my colleagues in the House, with all due respect to the position taken by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, that we do want to go slowly here. This committee has had a great deal of experience with respect to how we should try to handle the writing of environmental impact statements when we must develop an issue such as this one. We handled it on the trans-Alaska pipeline. There were millions of dollars spent on environmental impact statements on the trans-Alaska pipeline. We are still spending money on that.

However, we worked out a mechanism in this subcommittee to try to make sure the burden of writing those impact statements would not fall 100 percent on the taxpayer. We tried to make sure there would be some mechanism whereby the Federal tax dollars we would spend would be spent to come to an environmental decision on the pipeline, and we tried to make sure the companies would agree to a reimbursement. Indeed, we had the Department of the Interior set up a separate account so that we could make sure the burden of doing that necessary work was not to result in a 100-percent Federal obligation on the taxpayers of this Nation.

We think we ought to go a little bit prudently here. We think we ought to move in a way that is deliberate because 80 percent of this budget estimate is here.

I also want to remind my colleagues that this bill has yet to go to the U.S. Senate. We have yet to move the bill across this hall.

If the Department of the Interior feels that there are certain problems in our action they have the right of appeal to the other body. That is why we have the two Chambers. That is why this bill will go to conference.

We are trying to present the Members with a bill that does not just rip up the Federal budget. This bill, as I indicated in my general remarks, is \$400,000 above the budget. As I indicated, we think we have kept it pretty well down giving due concern to all of our priorities, and still trying to make sure that the resources of our Nation are protected.

I think the Members of the House can

feel comfortable when they understand that we did appropriate \$3.5 million, 80 percent, roughly, of the budget request, to begin this program.

I hope that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, whenever you have to have a data base for an environmental determination you have to have a very broad base and a very deep base.

The Members will recall that when we were working on the trans-Alaskan pipeline there was an enormous environmental hullabaloo. There were lawsuits filed all over the place about the alleged inadequacy of the environmental protection statement. This delayed the building of the line considerably. The line was delayed for 4 years, largely while additional data was being collected.

Now, if everything goes well, and Pollyanna does not get mugged, and pulled out of the game here, according to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), we might have this new gas line on stream by 1979.

It is important that we have it on the line by 1979, because prior to 1979, if we pass this strip mining bill in the form that we now have it before the Congress, the Nation is going to have an enormous short-range energy shortage based on the lack of coal. But, later, in the median range after 1979 and in the 1980's we are going to be confronted with another very serious type of fuel shortage.

I would call the attention of the Members to my remarks appearing at page 24794 of the RECORD of yesterday which came out today, which points out that, in connection with the reprocessing of nuclear fuel there is very likely to be a lack of facilities to do this adequately. This lack will leave a lot of plutonium locked up in unprocessed fuel elements. It will also leave a lot of enriched uranium fuel locked up in unprocessed fuel elements during the very period of the 1980s.

That simply means that we will have something like this gas line coming on to compensate for the possibility that we may not have adequate nuclear fuel in the mid-term.

The other thing I would like to say on this issue is that, although this is an allegation that is directed at bringing gas into the upper Middle West, certainly the data base will apply to all alternatives, whenever the gas may be delivered. In order to get a license for any one of these lines you have to have all the alternatives discussed in an environmental protection statement, anyway. So this is simply an assist in the timely provision of the information which is needed for all of this.

With particular reference to the Middle West, when we were discussing the legislation here on the floor about the trans-Alaskan pipeline, the gentleman from Illinois violently opposed the bill, wanting to have it built across Canada, because the gentleman wanted to bring this oil to the upper Middle West. The gentleman had a logical position insofar as his parochial interests are concerned.

This trans-Alaska pipeline will put oil and gas resources into tankers and bring them down to the west coast, and even to the gulf or even to the east coast. But it will not bring these energy resources to inland areas, the interior areas, the midwestern areas where there is need.

So I think it is about time that we make it possible at last for that kind of line, too, to be considered as an alternative, even though it may not in the end become the chosen alternative.

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

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

Mr. RUPPE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman mentioned 1979 as likely the earliest date that that gas pipeline from Alaska could become available to people in the United States. I might point out that at the present time we have been trying to negotiate natural gas imports from Algeria; but Algeria just turns the valve of that gas on and off at will. Their contracts have been hardly worth the paper they are written on; their contracts today are either ignored or renegotiated at ever escalating prices.

Mr. HOSMER. I would also caution the gentleman that so far as the Canadians are concerned, we are not entirely out of the woods with respect to interruption.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to have the record reflect at this point, is the gentleman in the well now in support of the amendment I have offered to the committee bill?

Mr. HOSMER. Not only am I in support of the amendment the gentleman has offered to the committee bill, but I wish to take issue with the gentleman who just argued that this would save money because it would be spending Government money now instead of waiting later for an applicant for a gas line to pay for such studies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOSMER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HOSMER. If we wait for such a pipeline applicant, they would have to pay for it, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) says tax money would be made. Let me tell the Members about this waiting business. It will take \$3 million later, the way inflation is going, to do this \$1 million's worth of work now. Another thing is, if this \$1 million which comes out of Uncle Sam's pocket speeds that line getting onstream a year earlier, or at least lets it get there on time, the tax revenues that the Government will get back from having that pipeline in profitable operation, and the tax revenues this Government will get back just because there is enough energy to operate in the Middle West, and wherever else the pipeline goes, will make

that \$1 million that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) is worried about look like 2 cents and a couple of peanuts.

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

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

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I suggest that when the gentleman talks about the price becoming higher because of inflation, I think the gentleman does not realize what the \$4½ million is for.

Mr. HOSMER. I know what the \$4½ million is for, and I decline to yield further.

Mr. YATES. I must say the gentleman does not know what it is for.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, has offered the House a chance to take action on this needed money. It is important in terms of the Midwest as well as the Nation as a whole. My hope is that the distinguished gentleman from Washington and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania notwithstanding, the House will in fact be able to find it in its heart to adopt this amendment as a way to try to insure that the country has at least a decent shot at getting the supply of natural gas it needs on a timely basis.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the gentleman for his support. I noted particularly in the remarks made a few minutes ago by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), that she was very open-minded, and I compliment her on that attitude, in saying that after all this is a matter that could be considered and would be considered in a supplemental appropriation bill. But I would submit for those Members who were not here to listen to my statement earlier, it is clear this money is going to be needed to complete these necessary environmental impact statements if we are to get on with the FPC's certification process and all of the other complicated steps involved in bringing this pipeline into reality, in bringing natural gas and energy to our country. So why wait for the vagaries of a supplemental appropriation bill? Let us do what we have the power to do now on the floor this afternoon. Put the money in there.

Again, I compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) for his support of the proposition and for his very sage observation that we are living in times of double-digit inflation, and to spend a million dollars now to complete those statements may save us several million dollars later on. I think we ought to get on with the very important business of completing this line by 1979 when

we in the Middle West are going to feel the very real impact of a serious shortage of natural gas and other fuels, if we have not done everything we could do and should do to bring those energy supplies to market.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his statement, and I support this amendment. I think one of the things that we have to seriously consider is trying to develop our energy resources. One of the problems that is delaying the rapid development of these resources, strangely enough, is the demand for environmental report and impact statements. Unless we get some leadtime on those reports we are not going to get our energy resources developed adequately when we need them.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Chair announces that he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 2, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASPIN) there were—ayes 19, noes 36.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS
For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent right-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on lands administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to

the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction on lands other than those administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reimbursable charge against the Oregon and California land grant fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the capable, competent and lovely chairperson of the Appropriation Subcommittee for all the help which she has given me over the years. It has been of inestimable help to me, and I am sure we—all citizens of Wyoming—will remember her for many, many years for her cooperation and her help here in Congress to all of us in my State.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly want to thank all the members of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. McKAY), and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) on the minority side, for the increase from \$89,000 to \$110,000 per State funding for water resource research institutes.

With the onslaught of the strip mining in my State, which legislation we are also now working on, together with this bill today, that becomes very important. This is not all requested, but it is very close to it and we are grateful. As for the funds for Surface Environment and Mining within the Forest Service, we were very pleased for the appropriation of \$2.2 million. In the form of grants for the \$700,000 for filling mine voids in Rock Springs caused by subsidence of old coal mines of certain companies, that \$700,000 can continue good work, which I hope will include the payments to a Mrs. Doak for a modest amount of money for damage to her home, even though it is not in the prime area designated for subsidence damage restitution. This Doak issue should certainly be settled from this subsidence appropriation, if not from HUD funds.

Included is the Eisenhower consortium, to conduct environmental research at nine western universities, including the University of Wyoming. This was of special interest to Bill Carlson, president of the University of Wyoming and to the entire university community at Laramie. We got all but \$100,000 we asked for, and we are grateful for that appropriation also.

We also appreciate the response to a letter from Mike May of Meeteetse dealing with the Forest Service area for receiving some help to combat noxious weeds in the national forests which are destroying grazing areas. The increase for the forest insect and disease research to help fight the mountain pine beetle is deeply appreciated. It is glaringly obvious in its destruction in northern Wyoming.

I might ask a question or two about the fact that I was disappointed to find

there were no additional funds for the National Park Visitor Center for Lovell, Wyo. We thought \$1.45 million would be forthcoming.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Yes, I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. May I say to the gentleman that it was a most difficult thing to apportion among all the various agencies in this bill the priorities we were faced with.

I would say to the gentleman that there is increased interest in all these areas, although I would point out that some of our western parks may be losing visitation as a result of fuel shortages.

May I say also to the gentleman that we had more than \$1 billion worth of requests above the budget and we had to make difficult choices so that we are not referred to as "big spenders."

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I appreciate the answer very much. I do hope that when the impact statement and the decision regarding the problems of environment are concluded, there may be something provided supplementally for the continuing growth of the National Park Visitor Center in Lovell, and particularly the next increment of the transport road.

I wonder whether the gentlewoman might comment on that.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, may I say I hope this will be settled too. There is a question of who is going to determine the future of that entire area and what the future will be. I hope that the parties involved will resolve their disputes so that we can get on with this project.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Fine. The people of Wyoming are very interested in the Shell Falls Overlook in Big Horn National Forest. That, too, is not funded in this legislation. It would appear as though they had been short-changed this year and I wanted to make sure that they had not.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's remarks, and I hope we can continue to fund these items in the supplemental appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman in the well and I have heard over and over and over—in fact, every Member of this House has—that not one penny of taxpayers' money should ever go into the construction or the maintenance of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

I think the record should show that today the committee is asking for an appropriation of \$2,400,000, and I quote:

These funds will provide for the maintenance, security, information, interpretation, janitorial, and all other services necessary to the nonperforming arts functions of the Center.

As usual, the overworked taxpayer always picks up the tab.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it is Christmas in July today for assorted professors and various so-called researchers who have become accustomed to lining up for the Federal dole to pay their various ways around the globe on almost numberless junkets that go under the nice sounding title of "cultural and scientific research."

The poor, suffering U.S. taxpayer, of course, will once again be gouged to pay for these sabbaticals. The committee is to be commended, in my opinion, for making a reduction of \$2.5 million in the request for professorial junket money, but I submit that the \$2 million recommended for it in this bill is precisely \$2 million too much at a time when this Nation is teetering on the brink of bankruptcy.

I have no illusions that the amount will not be approved but I believe that the American taxpayers should be made aware of what is involved here.

They are buying, for example, a project to provide, and I quote, "photographic documentation of painting and sculpture during India's golden age," which is defined as occurring between the fifth and eighth centuries, A.D. The researchers may be slightly mixed up because the present era of unbounded U.S. giveaway foreign aid programs is surely India's most golden age. Our foreign aid has been so enormous, in fact, that Mrs. Gandhi was able to build an atomic bomb with the money she would otherwise have had to spend to feed India's children suffering from malnutrition.

But photographing India's first golden age is only one project. There are many others. For example, U.S. taxpayers are going to finance a project in Poland titled, and I quote, "Interaction of Small Rodents With Human Beings." Meanwhile, they are also shelling out for a study called "The Systematics and Physiological Ecology of Tunisian Sponge Communities." Another so-called project in that country seeks, and again I quote, "information about what makes a desert a desert."

Over the years the taxpayers of this country have financed some pretty wild projects in Yugoslavia and this year they are going to bankroll a researcher or two to look at "Mammals of the Adriatic Islands and Adjacent Mainland of Yugoslavia."

We are financing a study of "Medieval Islamic Astronomy," which involves a study of manuscripts in Cairo, and another study to see if the temples at Karnak are aligned with the stars. This one, by the way, has been going on since 1971.

I am confident that the taxpayers will be delighted to know that they are paying for a study of, "The History of Flight in Poland." This may have replaced a study of chimps done there several years ago. We are also financing several cartoon films to be made in Poland, a survey of Polish textiles and, for some reason best known to the committee, a study of "traditional Polish musical instruments."

For some equally obscure reason the

beleaguered taxpayers—who cannot get a loan today without paying astronomical interest rates—are being asked to finance the "Translation of Manuscripts Available in India on Foundry Practices in Ancient Russia, and on the Russian Travels of Robert Fulton." Now there is a project with real priority, as my liberal friends are fond of saying.

The folks here at home will be paying for a study on the wild boar in Pakistan and a survey of the wild sheep and goat population in that country.

Across the border in India, intrepid researchers continue to plug away on their study of the "Comparative Bioenergetics of the House Sparrow." They have a colleague busy studying the anatomy of orchids, another one investigating the "Niche Ecology of the Garden Lizard" and still another making an anatomical study of the Indian Whistling Duck.

The fellow who was studying the behavior of the one-horned rhinoceros last year is still at it and it can be reported to you that those researchers who have been spending money since 1971 on the ecology and behavior of hoolock gibbons are not about to give up. They are going strong, as are their colleagues studying wild ungulates in the Gir Forest of India. They have been in the woods since 1970 and I predict they will stay there as long as the American taxpayers' money holds out.

Mr. Chairman, these are but a few of the dubious research projects being supplied money by this bill. It is long past time when this House stands up for the American working man and woman and cuts off money for the myriad of so-called cultural and scientific research and exchange programs in which the various agencies of the Federal Government have involved themselves.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time so that I may make additional comments to those made by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

It seems to me that the real problem in trying to ascertain how money for research is and has been dissipated over the years, lies in the fact that Congress rarely has the information with regard to how this money is being spent, or how it is going to be spent, until after some of these ridiculous projects are already in process.

Some 4 or 5 years ago I introduced legislation that would have required the establishment of a central data processing center for all research projects. I think in light of the fact that we are now spending across the several agencies some \$17 billion of the American taxpayers' money for research, that there ought to be some control. Yet there is little or no control under the present system.

If, however, we could move that type of legislation—and I certainly have no pride of authorship—it would be possible to use data processing and computer systems to feed in each prospective research project, so that the Congress, in turn, would know what projects were being considered and how these research in-

vestigations were being conducted. Until we do this, we will never get a handle on this, and we will be appropriating tax funds blindly for such projects as have been brought to our attention once again. And the folks back home, if my mail is indicative, are getting fed up with it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the interest of my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), in the various projects that have been undertaken by the Smithsonian Institution. The gentleman recites these projects each year, and of course we question the experts from the Smithsonian Institution about them because of this interest by the gentleman from Iowa.

On page 203 of part 2 of the committee hearings the Members of the House will find reference to one of the projects that the gentleman from Iowa alluded to; namely, the "Systems Analysis of the Pre-Saharan Ecosystem of Southern Tunisia." I think if the Members of the House will read that testimony they will see that there is reason for undertaking this project. It is a study of how a desert advances over fertile areas, and how that may be avoided in order to preserve the water of the particular area. This may bear upon saving some of our own areas in this country.

We asked the gentlemen from the Smithsonian Institution to give us some additional information on it, and the additional information that they gave us appears on page 206 of part 2 of the committee hearings, and I would like to read to the Members about some of the scientific titles and what those projects signify.

For example, project 1 was one that had the title of "Molecular Structure of Nucleic Acids," by James D. Watson and Francis H. Crick; published in *Nature*, in London on April 25, 1953.

This study revealed the shape of genes, and was basic to the study of DNA, which relates to the basic material of life.

No. 2. "On Antibacterial Action of Cultures of a Penicillium, with Special Reference to Their Use in the Isolation of *B. Influenzae*," by Alexander Fleming; published in the *British Journal Experimental Pathology* in London, 1929. This study opened up the whole field of antibiotics, without which so many diseases would still conquer and kill members of the human race.

The third project is on the "Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies" which was published in the *German Journal in Leipzig* in 1905. This was Professor Einstein's first paper on the theory of relativity.

The fourth project is the "Study on Plant Hybrids" which was published by Gregor Mendel in 1865. This began the study of plant genetics.

The point I am trying to make is that I know my own limitations. I know that many Members of the House know their own limitations. The fields of knowledge are without limitation, and what we are seeking to do in making these funds available for study is to make sure that the frontiers of mankind's knowledge are

expanded in a very practical way for the most part.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me suggest to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, that there are a host of research projects wherein few question their importance or validity. My remarks were directed to devising some type of control which is now nonexistent. I think the gentleman will agree that there are many of these research projects that he and Members of Congress are not aware of until after the decision has been made elsewhere, and that there is a great deal of duplication on these projects. All I am suggesting is that with growing sums of tax money being put into research, much of which is important, some of lesser importance, there ought to be some means by which we could control it. There should be some means by which duplication would not result, and some means by which we could exercise what I think is a degree of prudence at a time when we ask for as much Federal funds in research as apparently is being demanded at this time by many agencies.

Mr. YATES. I respect the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois. I am sorry that he is leaving the House. I would tell my friend that many of these projects are funded by foreign currencies which must be used in the countries issuing those currencies. We hope that as a result of the use of the currencies in those countries we do obtain knowledge which will be helpful.

Second, may I suggest to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, that there may be duplication. There is a great deal of duplication in the field of cancer research today. I say that duplication by itself is not necessarily bad, because one person may find a cure for cancer in a study that somebody else is doing, too.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is this a cancer study bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, and at the request of Mr. GROSS, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. Is this a bill to provide money for the study of cancer? Let me ask the gentleman if he has a report on the hulloak gibbons? They have been studying the hulloak gibbons for I don't know how many years. How about the catfish in India and their rhythms? Did the gentleman have a report on that at this time?

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman from Iowa wants one, I will be very glad to get him one.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman

was interested. He is a member of this appropriations subcommittee. I would like to hear the reports on some of the other studies that have been going on since time immemorial.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will let me know which ones he wants a report on, I will be very glad to get them for him.

Mr. GROSS. I am just calling this to the gentleman's attention. He has his hand on the spending throttle in the committee. He can turn it off and on. He has joined in bringing a bill here which is \$900 million more than was spent last year. He ought to be able to justify that kind of an increase.

Mr. YATES. We do justify it.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to put this \$900 million increase over last year in context. There is a one time appropriation of \$49 million in this bill for the purchase of land from the Klamath Indians, to provide the U.S. Forest Service with forest resources which will benefit the people of Iowa.

There is about \$80 million for GSA space which was not in last year because of new legislation. There is \$68 million for the new Indian Financing Act. There is a \$224 million increase this year for the land and water conservation fund, which the administration requested. If one would include a 10 percent escalation due to inflation since 1974 that comes to about \$257 million. In addition the committee provided large increase for energy research and development in the special energy research and development bill. That total, just for these things explains almost all of the \$900 million increase over last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MINES MINES AND MINERALS

For expenses necessary for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs; to foster and encourage private enterprise in the development of mineral resources and the prevention of waste in the mining, minerals, metal and mineral reclamation industries; to inquire into the economic conditions affecting those industries; to promote health and safety in mines and the mineral industry through research; and for other related purposes as authorized by law; \$77,703,000, of which \$26,991,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated for "Mines and minerals" in the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Act, 1975, shall be merged, without limitation, with this appropriation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF ARIZONA

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Arizona: Page 15, line 20, strike out the figure: "\$77,703,000," and insert "\$227,703,000," and strike out the figure: "\$26,991,000," and insert "\$176,991,000".

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I should also like to reserve comment on the point of order, whatever it may be.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise my colleagues that what we have done in this not very devious amendment is to raise the ante on the moneys appropriated for the Bureau of Mines by \$150 million. I do this for a very specific reason, because later on today or sometime tomorrow this body appears certain to pass the Surface Mining Act.

This particular Subcommittee on Appropriations is famous for the integrity of its legislation and in order that we maintain that reputation for integrity and pass a true appropriations bill, it will be essential that we have at least \$150 million for this new agency, whatever it may be, to administer the Surface Mining Act at least through the remaining 5 months of this calendar year.

So I think it would behoove the House and the record to recognize that what we do costs the consumer money, but this also will cost them money in the form of the general fund out of the budget.

I see that my objective friend from Idaho is seeking recognition and I yield to him.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding; but does he really think \$150 million would be enough to administer the Surface Mining Act?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I know the Interior Department has been lusting after the Interior Mine Act and I know they are caught up in their prudence and I know while they are lusting for this that cooler and stronger heads will prevail and they will only be able to spend \$150 million this year.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KETCHUM. As a member of the Interior Subcommittee, I am sure all that we have to go on in H.R. 11500, the strip-mining bill, is an estimate. We are informed that on one small project, an miniscule project, we are going to spend millions on reclamation; \$150 million seems like a pittance to even administer this bad bill.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I would be willing to entertain a modest increase.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would suggest a better course of action than providing these additional funds out of an already broken Treasury would be, when the strip

mining bill finally gets here, that the gentleman use his great powers of persuasion to help defeat that thing. Then we will avoid this terrible economic depression this country will face when the country does not have the energy because this strip mining bill, with its environment bias, will prevent us from digging the needed amount of coal.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I must say to the distinguished gentleman from California that thought had not occurred to me as a viable alternative, but I will seize upon it.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I am happy to see there seems to be a consensus that we are going to have a strip mining bill; but I would point out that there is another legislative body called the Senate which will have to consider this legislation.

Secondly, I would note we have ahead of us a conference with the Senate and there will be plenty of time to take care of it. It ought to be adequately financed to have the kind of strip mining we should have had years ago.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I also would advise the gentleman that the other body has already considered with its usual alacrity and in-depth understanding at the same time the Surface Mining Act and has come up with an act that I am sure will be very compatible with the version the House will pass. At any rate, \$150 million is a conservative amount.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SYMMS. The reason I asked the question about the \$150 million, I happened to be with John Sawhill of the Federal Energy Office last week. He informed me they had 200 employees last December, 2,000 this June, and expect to have 3,400 employees in the near future and I do not know how many next year. I can see the same thing would happen with the Bureau of Mines.

I wonder if the gentleman has thought this through and realizes if \$150 million comes even near what this agency will require.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I must confess that I am horrified that the gentleman would suggest that I would offer a quantitative amount of money without having gone into a tremendous amount of study and research. The way I arrived at this was to take the estimate of the Interior Department and triple it, which is my normal way of dealing with agencies.

I would assume it would last 6 months. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDade) seeking recognition?

Mr. McDADE. Yes; but I will do it on my own time.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I was afraid of that.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to press her point of order?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment relates to a bill not yet enacted, which has not even passed this House and is, therefore, clearly in violation of rule XXI, clause 2.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I call attention to page 14 of the report of the committee. Because the bills were not yet out of conference at the time of markup, funds were not included in the following: Saline water research was contained; the Youth Conservation Corps, the report of which has not yet come out of the committee, was omitted; the National Museum Act, which has not passed markup, was taken out; and the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do press the point of order where this has no business in this bill at this time. We did not go to the Rules Committee for a ruling, and I suggest that the amendment is clearly out of order.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

Mr. Chairman, I must find myself, for the first time that I am aware of, in disagreement with the gentlewoman from Washington.

I would point to the language of the legislation on page 15 which I am amending. In the section I am amending, we recite the uses for the money to be expended. On line 19 of that legislation, Mr. Chairman, are the words:

And for other related purposes as authorized by law.

The language that is offered is simply an increase in this budget. Its purpose may be as the gentlewoman described, but the amount of money involved is a direct reference, and completely compatible and therefore germane.

Mr. Chairman, I know the Parliamentarian is listening and has revised his hasty estimate of the value of the gentlewoman's request, and therefore, while he is revising that, I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell me what he is speaking of when he says we had all these speeches around here, if he just intended to raise the budget, which does not need increasing, but he stated that this was to carry out the implementation of the Strip Mining Act which is under consideration, so I would suggest that his statement match his other statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona merely seeks to increase the amount of funding for the Bureau of Mines, and the amendment itself does not specify the particular areas in which it is to be used.

The pending paragraph provides an appropriation for several purposes related to mines and mining; and the Chair knows of no statutory restriction on the total amount which may be appropriated. The language in this bill also provides that it be used only for such related purposes as are authorized by law.

The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona came to me and indicated that he wished to fund the Surface Mine Control and Reclamation Act. I think that it is entirely out of order to place an amendment before the House providing funds for a bill that has not yet passed the House.

May I suggest that the funding for the Bureau of Mines has been carefully reviewed, and money has been provided for its activities not only in this bill, but in the energy bill which passed earlier this year.

I would suggest that this amendment is entirely out of order at this time. May I say that this committee fully expects to pass legislation including funds for the Surface Mine Control and Reclamation Act when and if that act becomes law and when we have held hearings with those agencies involved on the necessary funding levels. I don't think it is wise to pick figures out of the sky.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman's remarks. It is amazing that anyone would suggest any amount for implementing a bill that has not yet been passed and has no possible estimates of cost to it.

There has been no testimony to support any dollar amount for implementing the strip mining law. Therefore, it is not only premature, it is totally out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to propound a question to my able friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE).

I wish to congratulate the able gentleman from Pennsylvania and his constituents for his ability to obtain funds for projects which pertain to his area. I think he has been eminently successful, and I hope my remarks will assist him in the future.

In particular, I would like to point out that on page 28 of the report there are "increases of \$2 million for mined land investigations and demonstrations—anthracite area." These are funds to be expended by the Bureau of Mines.

In conversations with the Director of the Bureau of Mines and other individuals in the Bureau of Mines, I have frequently pointed out that there are many areas throughout Appalachia, in the bituminous coal area, which desperately need the type of funds which are provided in this bill. The response I receive from the Bureau of Mines is that when the committee report specifies "anthracite area," that can only be used in Pennsylvania.

Since only less than 7 million tons annually of anthracite coal is now being mined, which is less than 2 percent of the total production, I wonder whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania could advise his bituminous friends how it would

be possible for non-members of the Committee on Appropriations to share in some of the funds which he has been able to obtain for these mined land investigations and demonstrations? The very able gentleman from Pennsylvania very well knows, from hearings his committee has conducted, that there are many areas throughout the mountains where there exist subsidence, gob piles, and other unsightly and damaging and dangerous results of coal mining. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania can give us some advice as to how we can achieve a small measure of the success of the gentleman has.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. Initially, I certainly want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, for his kindness in noting the small measure of success we have had in bringing to bear some Federal resources on the enormous environmental problems that have existed and do exist in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania.

I am happy to be able to inform him that we are making substantial progress in demonstrating methods to deal with those extraordinarily difficult consequences, almost all of which result from a past history of about 100 years of deep mining.

I know of my colleague's deep concern for this sort of problem, and I think I can tell him with unequivocation that he can take comfort in seeing these funds expended in Pennsylvania for this reason.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would hope that the gentleman would address himself to my question, which is, with 667 gob piles in West Virginia alone, what does the gentleman propose to do in order to get rid of some of these smoking gob piles that emit acrid, polluting smoke at a time when people are fined \$25 for burning trash in their backyard?

Mr. McDADE. If the gentleman will permit me to finish my answer, what I was going to say is that one of the things we are doing here is demonstrating a new process, a process that attacks the tremendous problems created by the deep mining industry, in an effort to restore the environment to the state that it was in before we had deep mining and piling up of this enormous solid waste disposal problem, as well as the problem of air pollution, the problem of water pollution, of subsurface subsidence all of those things that are consequent problems of deep mining.

This process, if we can get it absolutely demonstrated as we are trying to do, will then become a weapon that the Department can use all over the country.

Mr. Chairman, I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that they are doing that now on a small basis in the State of Wyoming. They are doing it in Rock Springs, which is in the district of the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming.

If that technology does apply—and I deeply hope it will—then we can transfer that technological breakthrough all over the Nation, including those areas of the gentleman's home State and other States where we do have this problem.

As the gentleman knows, when we get to the strip mining bill—and we almost got into it a little earlier—I hope to offer an amendment that will provide the earmarking of \$200 million from receipts of the Outer Continental Shelf. We now get in the receipts of the Treasury about \$8 billion. I hope to earmark \$200 million of that and make that amount available for appropriation for this committee to deal with these previously damaged areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) has expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish simply to say to my colleagues that I hope we can see fit to support that program I have just spoken about.

We would then earmark \$200 million out of those natural resource receipts. We would not have to feel a great deal of concern about whether or not the Office of Management and Budget or someone downtown would agree to send us a budget request. If we can get that kind of reliable, stable fund and bring it to bear on the problems that exist in the gentleman's State, in my State, and in, I think, the 29 States of this Union where we do have these abandoned workings, then we can take technology like this and bring it to bear on the problem and start to bind up the wounds of this Nation in those areas where we have suffered both from strip mining and from deep mining.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman has said.

Of course, my personal preference would be that these funds not be diverted from some other source but rather from a place where they obviously belong. They should come from a tax placed on the coal industry itself, which has created these wastes.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, in response, let me say to the gentleman that his suggestion sounds pretty good, but what is going to happen in my State, for example, is that a certain class of consumer is going to be required to bear the burden of this entire thing if that happens.

What I mean by that is this: I have people in my State who still burn coal. If we should put a surtax on this, for instance, that tax is going to be passed along to the consumer, and that narrow class of consumer is going to be required to pay for this \$10 billion worth of damage we have sustained around the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe a better way we can do it is to recognize that we have an obligation to bind up the national wounds, and the way to do that is to try

to do it, not by taxing a class of consumer with increased costs—because that is what will happen—but let us take some of the dollars we are talking about in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, that they are currently running about \$8 billion a year which is earmarked in the Treasury from general receipts. All I want to do is to earmark, if I can later on, about \$200 million of that in an effort to start to bind up these scars. I think that alternative is much more preferable to a tax, which gets passed on to the gentleman's consumers and to my consumers. It is preferable to a reliance upon the general funds of the Treasury, which may or may not result in a budget amendment which is presented to us. If we earmark it, then we will have a fund which the gentleman's constituents and my constituents and everybody in the Nation can have in order to accomplish this, a fund which we can recognize will be there and available to utilize technology such as this.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully disagree with the gentleman.

I think all costs of coal mining ought to be internationalized and made realistic, instead of putting them on the backs of others, either taxpayers or someone else.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will recognize that we are getting in the Treasury now the receipts of \$8 or \$9 billion, and the only lien against that \$8 or \$9 billion is the \$30 million in this bill for the land and water conservation fund. That is the only restriction on it.

I say, let us put one more restriction on those general receipts in the Treasury and take \$200 million more from that and get at the wounds which exist in the Nation, without putting taxes on or without increasing the cost of utilities and without increasing the cost of coal, which is still burned by many people. The gentleman will recall I said I still have people in my district who burn coal.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this subject, of course, is going to be debated extensively in connection with the Seiberling amendment, or any revision thereof, at which time those of us who favor the other approach will have a full opportunity to air our feelings.

But I certainly hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will consider one of these demonstration projects in the anthracite region could be extended a little for a demonstration in the bituminous coal fields.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from West Virginia that this is a national problem all over the United States.

I would also say to my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, that the way to make sure that we can begin to go about this task is to establish a reli-

able fund where we can take the technology we are developing here and apply it nationally, not by putting a tax on or raising the price of electricity or the price of coal and not by taxing a single class of consumers, but simply by earmarking some of the enormous resource dollars which are going into the Treasury now as a general receipt, and earmarking a very small portion of it. I say to my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, that if we can take that approach then I can assure the gentleman and the Members of this Committee that we can look forward to getting rid of this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection and utilization of national forest resources, point discharge monitoring and evaluation, and non-point discharge surveillance monitoring and evaluation, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein necessary to these objectives, \$31,459,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$1,576,000 of this appropriation may be used for acquisition of land under the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513-519).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the decision of the committee to provide an additional \$450,000 for air pollution research at the Forest Service's Delaware, Ohio laboratories. The committee was good enough to include this item in the appropriation for fiscal year 1973—but the funds were impounded.

I hope that the committee will be able to obtain assurances from the Department that they will carry out the clear intent of the Congress and obligate these funds.

A vigorous and accelerated research program by the Forest Service at its Delaware, Ohio, laboratory is needed to help develop types of trees which can help improve air quality by absorbing and removing pollutants from air. In addition, more research is needed on how trees can be helped in overcoming the weakening effects of steady, low-level air pollution. Today, this constant low-level smog is causing serious tree losses and tree diseases in our Nation's urban areas. This research is particularly important now that some of our air quality standards are being suspended in an effort to deal with the energy crisis.

Again, I want to thank the committee for its support of this appropriation. In terms of the future quality of life in urban areas, this is probably the most important research that the Forest Service will have ever undertaken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$145,000,000, of which \$67,250,000 shall be available until expended to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects

and productions in the arts through assistance to groups and individuals pursuant to section 5(c) of the Act, of which not less than 20 percent shall be available until expended to the National Endowment for the Arts for assistance pursuant to section 5(g) of the Act; \$67,250,000 shall be available until expended to the National Endowment for the Humanities for support of activities in the humanities pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act; and \$10,500,000 shall be available for administering the provisions of the Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the funds appropriated to the National Endowment for the Arts for the purposes of sections 5(c) and 5(g) and not to exceed 3 per centum of the funds appropriated to the National Endowment for the Humanities for the purposes of section 7(c) shall be available for program development and evaluation.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: on Page 36, line 20, strike out "\$145,000,000" and insert "\$105,275,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will explain this amendment in very short order. It is simple and to the point. The committee saw fit to increase the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities by \$39,725,000. My amendment would hold them right where they are. It would say to little Twinkle Toes and those promoting lessons in belly dancing that the \$105 million you got last year was enough. We can use this money for far better purposes than for the arts and the humanities.

I trust the Members remember that it was only a few years ago that the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities was started, and I believe the first appropriation was \$2½ million—perhaps \$5 million. Now take a look at this request for \$145 million. The deeper we go in debt the more Congress spends on things like this that we could do without altogether. I would like to strike it all out, but I am trying to present an acceptable amendment by simply cutting off the increase of \$39,725,000 in one year. I hope that in the interest of fiscal sanity, and in the interest of your taxpayers and mine, that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, the budget of this Government can never be balanced if programs of such little value as this in terms of essentiality are to be increased from \$105,000,000 to \$145,000,000 in 1 year.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is well aware of the financial problems in the United States, and we did very reluctantly reduce the budget increase requested by the administration for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

I might point out that the people who participate in the arts and in the humanities in the United States represent a greater number of people than those who participate in sporting activities. It was, as I said, very regretful that the committee had to reduce the budget request for the Arts and Humanities Endowments.

If any Members read the report in last night's Washington Star-News they would have seen what the Humanities Endowment has been doing and the good they are offering to the American people in regard to the Bicentennial Celebration. For example, "War and Peace" was presented on television under the sponsorship of the Humanities Endowment. I think the Members will find that these programs are meeting a great need of a great number of average Americans who do desire some opportunity to share the great wealth of literature, art, painting, and music.

I for one oppose and I am sure the committee opposes any attempt to cut the Arts and Humanities Endowments when there are increasing numbers of people participating. The States are year after year appropriating more money. We also have great numbers of young people who are participating all over the United States in these programs. I certainly think if we cannot afford this very small amount for what I consider some of the finest things in life, I think this country has truly become an impoverished country.

I do urge rejection of the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ICHORD AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ICHORD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 36, line 20, strike out the figures "\$145,000,000" and "\$67,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$105,275,000" and "\$48,387,500."

Page 37, lines 3 and 6, strike out the figures "\$67,250,000" and "\$10,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$48,387,500" and "\$8,500,000."

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment as a substitute amendment because I think the amendment drafted by the gentleman from Iowa should proportionately cut the earmarkings and the administration expenses.

The committee will note that the Committee on Appropriations has appropriated \$145 million for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and then it has \$67,250,000 earmarked for a specific purpose and another \$67,250,000 earmarked for another purpose and \$10.5 million earmarked for administration, a total of \$145 million. My amendment also proportionately cuts those earmarkings.

Let me take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to join in the accolades given to our distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Washington. There is no more beloved and no more respected leader in this House. I share the respect for the gentleman from Washington. Our loss in this body will be an even greater loss to the country. But, like all mortal beings, the gentleman is fallible and she has overlooked one item in this bill that should not be included among the many millions of dollars that are appropriated by this bill.

I am prompted, I would say to my beloved colleague, the gentleman from Washington, to offer this amendment be-

cause of the article that was written, and I am sure that many Members of the House have heard from their constituents about the same, an article written by James Dale Davidson. I imagine most of the Members have received copies of that article.

I asked the General Accounting Office to give me a rundown on that article as to how accurate it was in detailing blatant governmental waste in this country. The GAO report revealed that the projects were not as bad as the article depicts but the report does reveal frightening waste and flagrant disregard of the taxpayers of this Nation. This is the report that I received from the General Accounting Office as to the waste in the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities.

One item in the article involved payment to the author of Lighthouse, \$5,000. This is what the GAO said:

According to a Foundation official, Aram Saroyan (son of William Saroyan) authored the poem "Lighthouse." The poem, only seven letters long, is considered a literary illustration of refracted light. He was awarded \$500 when it was selected for the American Literary Anthology.

This American Literary Anthology has received several thousands of dollars from the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities.

No. 20 in this article, the "History of Comic Books," \$71,000. This is what the General Accounting Office said:

No information was readily available on a "history of comic books." However, Foundation officials were aware of a study conducted into the history of comic strips.

A grant of \$8,700 was awarded by the Foundation to the University of California at Santa Barbara for Professor David Kunzle to study the history of 19th Century European comic strips. The study, entitled "The History of the Comic Strip, Volume II: the 19th Century," focused on the social and political style of the comic strips which was much more prevalent then than now.

No. 21 in this article, a "Dictionary of Witchcraft," "A Few Grand":

In response to a general inquiry on a "Dictionary of Witchcraft," an Endowment official reported that a grant had been awarded to the University of California at Los Angeles to support the gathering of information for the reference book: American Popular Beliefs and Superstitions, a standard work for use in the fields of linguistics, mythology, and folklore. The sum of \$24,134 was awarded on February 15, 1974. The project had been supported in previous years, according to the spokesman, by a grant of \$21,995.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. ICHORD was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, now, I would point out to the Members that I also have a report concerning the Smithsonian Institution of such programs financed by them as the study of Lizards in Yugoslavia, \$15,000; collection of rare moss in Burma, \$5,000; study of wild boars in Pakistan, \$35,000; study of the bisexual behavior of the Polish frog, \$6,000.

I could go on and on.

Let me say to the Members of the

committee, I wish that my Republican colleagues had been in the Democratic Caucus this morning. They would have heard some very good speeches about the causes of inflation and the need of the Congress to take remedial action.

I offer this, I say to the gentleman from Washington, for two reasons. The causes of inflation that I learned in grade school are, and no government economist or other economists refute them, primarily are two; one is excessive Government spending and the other is productivity remaining at the same or decreasing productivity. In the last 5 years this Nation has spent at least \$100 billion more than it has taken in. No wonder we are experiencing rampant inflation.

This is just a little biting of the bullet. I would say to the gentleman from Washington that if we adopt this amendment, we are going to save \$39 million, approximately. That will pay the salaries of all the Members of the House for two and a half years.

A more important reason I would say to the gentleman from Washington is this: If we are ever going to stop such flagrant examples of waste, we better start slapping the wrists of the executive agencies downtown. These programs are a black mark on the executive and they are a black mark on the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GIAIMO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I wish the gentleman would use this program as an area to find the money to pay some of the salaries—

Mr. ICHORD. Is the gentleman in favor of the program of \$71,000 paying taxpayers' money out for the study of the history of comic strips?

Mr. GIAIMO. Of course not.

Mr. ICHORD. Then why does he not slap their hands, I say to the gentleman from Connecticut. Why does he reward them by giving them \$35 million more than they got last year? That is all I want to do, is cut them back to what they got last year.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I appreciate the gentleman's concern about spending a few thousand dollars on—

Mr. ICHORD. This is \$39 million, I say to the gentleman, and it will pay all of our salaries for two and a half years.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Two thousand dollars on a study of the bisexual life of the frog. I wish the same kind of anxiety and anguished outrage could be expressed by the gentleman on a far more important subject, and that is the inability of this Congress to do anything about the billions of dollars of military overruns we have on procurement contracts.

Mr. ICHORD. Let me say to the gentleman from Colorado—and I promise the gentleman from Colorado—there are such expenditures included in the military research budget. I intend in the future—that has already passed now—but I will make a promise to the House that

I will subject the same items in the military research budget to such an amendment if the House will adopt this amendment. There are many equally ridiculous examples of spending, and we should also slap their wrists. We should not reward such waste with increased budgets.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman from Washington spoke of the number of people who benefited by this program. I wonder if the number of people benefited by the arts and humanities program in any way compares with the number of taxpayers who will be called upon to pay for this increase of \$39,725,000, and a total of \$145,000,000?

Mr. ICHORD. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that the poor people of this country are now saddled with a national debt approaching a half trillion dollars—five hundreds of billions—and the interest on that national debt is predicted to be next year \$31 billion which will have to be paid before any services are paid to help the people of the United States.

I cannot see any valid reason why this body should not take this small step toward holding the line in the field of governmental spending.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the late and beloved President John F. Kennedy stated during his lifetime:

I want my country to be known for its strength, and I also want it to be known for its wisdom and for its devotion to the arts and to the humanities.

I do not think the American people would approve of the activities of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities as being described as "Little Twinkle Toes" and "Belly Dancing," which was the term used by the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman obviously has not studied the hearings on the endowments. Belly dancing is not among its activities. Ballet dance is. His amendment should be defeated.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) offers a substitute for a greater reduction. I doubt that he has read the record for he questions only projects from previous years which our committee questioned, too.

So, the examples of endowment error are old hat. They are things of the past. Why should such examples be used to justify a cut in appropriations far greater than that already made by the committee?

The gentleman from Missouri is an able member of the Committee on Armed Services. Earlier this year, his committee brought to the floor a bill providing for military expenditures approximating \$100 billion dollars. The gentleman talks of economy—why did he not reduce that enormous budget?

I feel strongly about this appropriation because I believe it is in keeping with the traditions for freedom upon which this Nation was established. Americans pride themselves upon their freedom to think and freedom to speak, the free expression

of ideas. We may not agree with some contemporary painters or writers, but should not we defend their right to express themselves freely?

Cannot the people of the United States afford \$145 million to foster the arts and the humanities if they are willing to appropriate almost \$100 billion to keep this country strong? Can they not afford to appropriate this relatively minor sum of money to give quality to the life of the people of this country?

Among his many accomplishments, President Kennedy probably did more than any other President to bring the arts to the attention of the American people. He knew the value of the arts, and he knew the value of a President's imprimatur, which he often and gladly gave to the arts in America.

The late President was fond of telling the following story:

One afternoon in the fateful year of 1941, the President of the United States had two callers. The first was Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador, who had just flown in from London to give Franklin D. Roosevelt an eyewitness account of the bombing of London. The second was Francis H. Taylor, museum director and authority on the history of art.

Taylor waited for two hours while the President and Lothian talked. Then he finally entered, he found the President "white as a sheet." Yet the President, we are told, kept Taylor in his office that afternoon for another hour and a half. Turning from a grim preoccupation with the war, Franklin Roosevelt talked about the arts in American life. He spoke of plans for broadening the appreciation of art, and looked forward to the day when "every schoolhouse would have contemporary American paintings hanging on its walls."

George Biddle, the distinguished American artist who records this meeting, adds on his own: "Roosevelt had little discrimination in his taste in painting and sculpture. (But) he had a more clear understanding of what art could mean in the life of a community—for the soul of a nation—than any man I have known."

... Roosevelt ... understood that the life of the arts, far from being an interruption, a distraction, in the life of a nation, is very close to the center of a nation's purpose—and is a test of the quality of a nation's civilization. That is why we should be glad today that the interest of the American people in the arts seems at a new high.

The great painter, Pablo Picasso, was upbraided by a viewer of his paintings for not being understandable. "Sir," he replied, "I don't understand Chinese, but a great many other people do. Should they cease talking because I do not understand their language?"

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Recently, there was a poll during which this question was raised. The results were most interesting. As I recall, people earning \$10,000 a year, and less, as a matter of fact, expressed the strong hope that there would be increased Federal spending for the arts and humanities.

Mr. YATES. That is true. May I quote some statistics taken from national polls which indicate the powerful interest of the American people in the arts:

49 percent of the public (16 years and older)—or 71.3 million people—said they "go to see things like art shows, museums, historical houses, or antique, craft, or furniture shows." In fact, more people attend such visual arts activities, museums, and historical sites than attend spectator sports (47 percent said that they attend spectator sports "a great deal" or "some").

48 percent—69.8 million Americans—attend the theatre, movies, ballet, or modern dance performances, opera, the circus, or other pageants.

43 percent—62.6 million Americans—reported that they engage in creative activities such as photography, painting or sketching, woodworking, and weaving.

37 percent—53.8 million Americans—attend musical performances such as rock, jazz, folk, symphony, or chamber music concerts.

34 percent—49.5 million Americans—attend lectures, take adult education courses, or spend time at the library doing research or studying.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to approve the committee's recommendation. This committee has already cut a substantial sum of money. It has already cut \$17 million from this appropriation.

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

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

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to point out that the committee did take \$17 million from the budget request.

I would like to also just make the observation that if Members of this body would carefully inspect the record and find out what other countries around the world are spending per capita on the arts and humanities, they will find that this amount, even though it is substantially over that of last year, is still a considerably small amount per capita, compared to most of the other civilized countries of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the committee's recommended appropriation of \$145 million for the activities of these two great foundations is based upon a realistic assessment that the American people strongly support our appropriating funds for the arts and the humanities in this country. The Endowments operate not only on a Federal level. Their good work is found in every State and in almost every local community throughout the country.

This is support given to artistic and cultural programs that will assure the American people greater joy and human fulfillment.

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

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

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I have never been more proud to associate myself with the remarks made by a colleague, than by the statements of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of these amendments.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I believe this amendment is an appropriate and a correct amendment that is in the spirit of the budget control bill which this House has already passed. One of the main purposes of that bill was to show the American people that we, as a Congress, are serious in our efforts to cope with inflation.

Many of my colleagues from the Democratic side of the aisle today, by resolution of their own caucus, have pledged to do something about inflation. All this amendment does is to say to the American people that we are maintaining the same level of expenditure as last year and we will not contribute further to inflation, by increasing expenditures in this area.

Mr. Chairman, my belief is that when my good colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, talks about the funding and support of sports events and circuses, fine, but those type people are not in here asking for a subsidy from the Federal Government. They do it on their own, and the customers who support that form of entertainment pay for it, not the Federal Government.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I will be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out to the gentleman that the reason that the people who sponsor sports events do not need a subsidy from the Government is that they get their subsidy through a special tax treatment on their investments.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, so do the people who are in the field of music and the arts and humanities. These groups have all kinds of nonprofit organizations, they have all kinds of foundations, and they get the same kind of tax treatment of which the gentleman is speaking. And on top of that they receive this additional Federal subsidy.

My point is this: I believe that if this Congress is serious about its efforts to stop inflation, we can begin to stop it right here with this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this very reasonable amendment.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I resented the inference of my distinguished colleague from Illinois when he was talking about this amendment being offered in a "know-nothing" attitude, and for a minute I thought, since he was referring to the Committee on Un-American Activities, and since I happen to chair the successor committee, the Committee on Internal Security, that he was referring to the gentleman from Missouri.

I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I happen to be one who does appreciate the arts. In fact, the last time

I was in Paris I spent 2 whole days in the Louvre in Paris. I happen to be married to a young lady who has a degree in art, and I would have to spend that time in the appreciation of art whether I liked it or not.

Mr. Chairman, I am not offering this amendment to "gut" the National Arts and Humanities. I am offering this amendment to see whether the gentleman from Illinois and other Members are willing to bite the bullet. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois whether he is willing to slap the hands of an agency which will pay out \$5,000 for a seven-word poem—"Light."

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois whether he is willing to slap the hands of an agency which will pay out at least \$8,700 for a similar program and approximately \$71,000 for a study of the history of comic strips. Is the gentleman willing to pay out a few thousand dollars for a dictionary on witchcraft?

Mr. Chairman, we have fiscal and monetary problems in this country. This is our chance to save \$39 million. Why should we not do it? If we cannot do it now, we will never be able to do it.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, except that he would not yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, when he asked for time.

Let me just conclude with this point, and then I will be glad to yield.

The Democratic Caucus today voted "to cut out waste and unnecessary expenditures wherever found." This is an add-on cost that is above last year's appropriation. If the Democratic Caucus was serious when they passed that resolution, I would say they should support this effort which has been made by my colleagues the gentlemen from Iowa and Missouri and show that they mean business in keeping the budget under control.

I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, that not only have these people already been slapped on the wrist, but they have been dealt a sledge-hammer blow, because the committee already cut \$17 million.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That so-called cut is from the budget, not from last year's appropriation level. That is the point the gentleman from Missouri is making. This is not a cut from last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, it is so easy to lose one's patience in talking about matters involving the arts and the humanities, but let us not do so because we are merely arguing about reduced fundings.

I think there is a national commitment to this program by the Congress. Many of us can well remember the days when this legislation was originally proposed

and it was laughed out of these Chambers, but finally its day arrived, and it passed, and was enacted into law.

It began as a modest program, and it has been growing each year. The President of the United States, to his credit has asked for greater amounts this year for this program. And I say that is to his credit. Why? Because Americans have at long last realized that there is a national commitment to the arts and the humanities, and wish to keep the commitment. Let us continue the program so that America will be increasingly and continually proud of its accomplishments in the arts and in the humanities.

Let me say this: It is so very simple to take programs that are questionable to us, and to say, "Would you vote for this program?" as the gentleman from Missouri has said. Well, if the gentleman from Missouri will come up to my district I can show the gentleman a Federal program where they studied the sex life of clams; this was done by the Federal Shellfish Laboratory and many important things have been learned from this program.

I do not know what is learned from studying comic strips, but maybe something is. But I will tell the Members something.

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

Mr. GIAIMO. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

If we were to go back several centuries we would have found some distinguished physicists dropping feathers and pieces of lead from over the short side of the Leaning Tower of Pisa. At that time some might have thought that they were crazy. But by dropping lead and feathers from that tower they established some great physical principles of serious import to the world.

My point is that we should not, you and I, act as arbitrary censors here. Wherever human knowledge is being developed let it develop, whether it is good or bad. We can afford to live with some of the bad knowledge.

Mr. ICHORD. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. GIAIMO. I will yield to the gentleman when I have finished.

As far as saving money, will the gentleman from Missouri join with me in a few weeks when I and some of my colleagues offer a proposal to cut military assistance aid to South Vietnam, which is measured not in a few million dollars, but in hundreds of millions of dollars? And will he join in cutting some of the huge military and foreign aid expenditures, which will in fact add more to our inflation than this very modest program, a program which also gives many jobs to people.

Mr. ICHORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I repeat, it also gives jobs to people in the United States in addition to the artistic and cultural contribution that is made.

Now I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Connecticut that I may well join with the gentleman

in the well in the amendment because of the great monetary and fiscal problem this Nation faces.

However, let me ask the gentleman, does the gentleman favor financing a program to write a seven-letter poem, L-I-G-H-G-H-T? Does the gentleman favor the expenditure of such funds? That is different from a study of the sex life of clams.

Mr. GIAIMO. I would hope so.

Mr. ICHORD. Does the gentleman support this program?

Mr. GIAIMO. I support the Federal program which appropriates funds for the many kinds of cultural purposes.

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman does not support this ridiculous program, does the gentleman?

Mr. GIAIMO. If some of them happen to be silly ones, it is up to our committee in our oversight function to see to it that the agencies administering those disbursements are properly supervising them, and that they do not waste money.

Mr. ICHORD. Why does the gentleman not slap their hands instead of giving them \$39 million?

Mr. GIAIMO. We did slap their wrists in the past by cautioning them about dubious or unwise expenditures. We did cut \$10 million from the budget request.

But to delete \$39 million as the amendment proposes is more than a slap on the wrist. It would be too severe a cut. I propose instead a better oversight by the agencies.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

May I say that I have listened to many of the arguments in favor of this amendment. Most of the material that has been presented is outdated. If the Members will study the records of our hearings last year and the year before, they will find the explanations they require. The items that have been discussed today have been corrected, and the gentleman is using outdated programs. In some instances, the projects and programs that have been mentioned today were not even funded.

I also want to say to the gentleman that I share his philosophy that all of us will benefit. There are a great many programs in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GIAIMO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield further, it is very easy to take a bill of this size with 27 agencies involved and pick out something that sounds very funny and very humorous. But, Mr. Chairman, I would remind the Members that anyone acting in a narrow provincial sense could be against music; against novelists; against artists; and against craftsmen. They could be against any number of things, but I would trust Members will remember that America is a nation of many people.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the State of New York has increased its appropriation this year from \$14 million to \$30 million. The State of Iowa has almost tripled its appropriation to \$175,000 this year. They get \$200,000 from this Federal money. In my State we cannot find the money in response to the demands of our citizens. There are some 20 colleges, our State museum, our philharmonic orchestra, our TV programs. They are all providing our citizens with a chance for a better quality of life.

Just recently I went down the streets of one of our principal cities when the temperature was 100 on the sidewalk. I will bet that I saw 20,000 kids right up to high school age with no interest and nothing to do, with no skills in music or no interest in reading. We can find it all over America. America needs this culture.

President Nixon asked for the increase, and we cut it \$10 million. This will be the best investment coming onto the Bicentennial program to increase the quality of life for every American citizen that it touches.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman mentioned the State of Iowa and the expenditure of \$175,000. If the State of Iowa wants more of the arts and humanities, then let the people of the State of Iowa pay for it.

Mr. PATTEN. They get \$200,000 under this bill. Every State gets \$200,000. We have 1,200 philharmonic orchestras around the Nation today, not to mention all the other arts. I think the program is necessary, and I think it is wonderful, and I support the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic caucus this morning committed itself to try to save the taxpayers money. I commend my friends for doing so. The action comes belatedly but it is welcome.

As one who has often voted to save the taxpayers money, including opposing this program when it was initiated because I had reservations about using Federal funding for arts and humanities, I want to say this is one of the times in which I erred in opposing this program. It is my conviction that this program has done a great deal of good for the people of our Republic. I know it has done good for the people of Alabama. Like the gentleman from New Jersey, we find ourselves in a situation in which we cannot fund the programs that are worthwhile which we would like to fund.

In my view, if anything these funds are inadequate. As the gentleman has indicated, we are approaching our Bicentennial celebration. Nothing could be more appropriate than that we could have funds for a positive constructive activity, one that means so much to the quality of life in our society. I hope the committee will be sustained.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama. It seems to me there are many places where we ought to cut in order to make sure that we do have less inflation in this Nation, but when we will see the serious problems facing our Nation there is some hope in the arts and the humanities. As the gentleman from Illinois mentioned, we are talking about the quality of life in America. If one looks at the biography of many great artists, be they visual artists or performing artists, their peers and contemporaries did not recognize their worth. Some received their chance in some other country. What we are doing is giving our budding artists a chance. In the humanities area it may not be as demonstrable as soon. Human values must be constantly assessed, and through the humanities there is hope for the Nation. But it seems to me if we look at the total expenditures in the arts and humanities we find a big plus sign.

Certainly LIGHT expenditure was a mistake, but I do not think the endowment will do that again. If we cut every cent out of this appropriation we will not stop LIGHT. It occurred long ago. This Agency had to learn as it went along too and it has been learning.

From the hearings we had in our committee I think this appropriation will bring results we can be proud of. I think this Agency is doing good for our Nation. Therefore I urge our colleagues to vote against this amendment.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. If there is no money in the Alabama treasury to pay for the arts and the humanities, the gentleman ought not to be coming to the Federal Government, because there is none here either. We are busted. I cannot believe the State of Alabama is as badly in debt as is the Federal Government and we have got to save. I will say to my friend from Alabama, wherever we can in order to take care of the foreign aid that the gentleman votes for all the time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will not say to my friend that we in Alabama might come out better by applying for foreign aid, but we do need the money for this. It serves a great purpose throughout the country. I wish it could be funded more completely and I make no apology for supporting this appropriation.

Mr. BRADEMANS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall make only two or three points. One of the first points I want to make is represented by the fact that we have just heard eloquent remarks in support of the committee bill and in opposition to the pending amendments on the part of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. Chairman, when I heard the gentleman from Alabama speak I was reminded of the equal eloquence with which our former colleague, the present Vice President of the United States, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, spoke when

we were working on the authorizing legislation last year. Members of the House may recall how our former colleague, Mr. Ford, then remarked that earlier in his career in the House of Representatives he had opposed the arts and humanities program, but how he went on to say that he had been moved, as a result of there having been placed in his home town of Grand Rapids a sculpture by Alexander Calder, one of the great artists of our time, to a position of strong support of the Arts and Humanities Foundation.

Mr. Ford remarked that the placement of that sculpture in a rundown part of Grand Rapids had so enlivened the spirit of the people of that community that it had brought about an awakening of immense interest in the area. The Calder sculpture became a source of great pride and achievement to the people of Grand Rapids, during that debate in the House, as chairman, Mr. Ford, as did our friend, the gentleman from Alabama, declared his vigorous support of the Arts and Humanities Endowments. If our Baptist friend from Alabama will allow a Methodist from Indiana to say so, I am delighted that he too has made public confession and now become a supporter of the program and, as I observed earlier, an eloquent one.

Mr. Chairman, now I think my friends on both sides of the aisle are aware that I have found it easy to restrain my enthusiasm for the works of the present President of the United States. But I have also, Mr. Chairman, made public protestation of my support of what this administration has done in giving attention to the arts and humanities in American life.

I think it is significant, Mr. Chairman, that under President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Nixon, and with the support of both Democrats and Republicans in Congress, we have begun to provide support from our public tax moneys of a kind that can give us pride in the work of our National Government in support of the works of the life of the mind and of the imagination.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the observations of my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHEM), who was quoting a poem that has been quoted here many times whenever we debate this program.

I would only say this to him, and I say this with all candor, I do not think it is sound public policy to expect that we, as elected politicians, should give our approval to every program that may be supported by either the Arts or the Humanities Endowment. Indeed, I believe that one of the most valuable dimensions of this program has been that it has been free from control by elected politicians.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me make another point. The works of the life of the mind and of the imagination are very powerful. We know that. We know that in the Soviet Union, for example, the government controls what people write. It controls what people paint. The Soviet government does not approve of a number of the works of some of its artists and thinkers and writers. We have seen only in recent times how one of the great

artists of our times, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, has had to flee his country to live in a part of the world that is free. Why? Because in his homeland, the government controls the works of the mind and the imagination.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the legislation authorizing the Arts and Humanities Foundation I am adamantly opposed to any effort on the part of politicians—and I am proud to be a politician—to dictate each and every program that may be supported by the Arts and Humanities Endowments. I may be in disagreement with some of their judgments, but I do not think it is appropriate to legislate what they should or should not support.

I have just two other points I would like to make before I yield, Mr. Chairman. The American people overwhelmingly support these programs. Evidence for that assertion can be seen in the repeated support by Presidents of both parties and by solid bipartisan votes in the House and in the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to take advantage of this opportunity to speak some words of tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Interior and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, our distinguished colleague and friend, the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN of Washington. This may be the final time she defends one of her bills on the floor of the House of Representatives.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman the people of the United States owe JULIA BUTLER HANSEN an enormous debt of gratitude for the leadership she has given in her subcommittee and in the House of Representatives and in Congress in struggling for adequate funds for the arts and humanities program.

When the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) retires from the House of Representatives she will know better than any of us with respect to which of her many activities in the House, she will take most pride.

In my own judgment—and I confess I speak as chairman of the gentlewoman's counterpart subcommittee on the authorizing committee—the gentlewoman ought to take enormous pride in what she has done for the arts and the humanities for the people of the United States. If for no other reason, than to honor the gentlelady from Washington, I hope we vote down this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me also touch for a moment on JULIA BUTLER HANSEN's efforts to modernize the operations of the House of Representatives.

I believe that all those concerned with the operations of the House must express their gratitude to Mrs. HANSEN for her gifted and effective leadership as chairman of the Select Committee on Organization and Procedures of the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives.

I think it is not too much to say that without the Hansen committee and its recommendation, the House would be lacking in many of the reforms most of

us now agree have proved invaluable to a modern legislator in a great country.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add an observation about the personal qualities of Mrs. HANSEN. She is a tireless worker, possessed of a quick mind, sensitive to the attitudes of persons of various points of view, and a person with a first-class sense of humor.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I might here note that one of the most pleasant experiences I have had came when I was able to be present for the awarding to Mrs. HANSEN of a honorary doctor's degree by St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Ind., in the congressional district I represent, a degree awarded in recognition of Mrs. HANSEN's outstanding contributions as a legislator.

Mrs. HANSEN is, without question, Mr. Chairman, one of the ablest Members of the House of Representatives with whom during my 16 years in this body it has been my pleasure to serve.

We shall miss her in the House, and we all wish her well as she retires to her home State of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I insert in the RECORD the text of a letter paying tribute to Mrs. HANSEN, from Dr. Ronald Berman, chairman of the National Endowment of the Humanities:

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT

FOR THE HUMANITIES,

Washington, D.C., July 24, 1974.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: It is a great pleasure for me to join with others in Washington and throughout the country in honoring Julia Hansen. It is known by many people that Mrs. Hansen has made a distinctive contribution to her state and to the nation, but we know this especially at the National Endowment for the Humanities because of the constant and careful attention she has given to promote national programs in the humanities. She has seen the significance which comes to a nation that intelligently studies and preserves the past and makes this past an important element in the life of the present. By supporting the scholar in the academic and by urging that the humanities also be a part of the public life of the nation, she has vigorously furthered the two main activities of the Endowment.

The fact that those activities directed at increasing the appreciation, understanding, and use of humanistic knowledge by the average citizen now comprise the largest component of the agency's efforts is due in large measure to Mrs. Hansen's own insistence that the humanities should be not simply adornments to be enjoyed in our personal lives but rather are essential elements to responsible decision-making in a democratic society. This view is reflected especially in programs which bring citizens and humanists together to discuss critical public issues. Four years ago no such program existed in any country, and now they are in operation in nearly every state and involving over one million Americans.

This afternoon, for the last time, we shall watch Julia Hansen steer the appropriations bill for the Arts and the Humanities through the House. We shall reflect, as usual, upon the perceptiveness of her questions during long and studious hearings in the spring; and we shall respect the acumen with which she advised us on priorities. Humanists, like artists, are sometimes thought not to be good at figures; and to have little understanding of the real political process. If that is true, then they have reason indeed to have valued Julia Hansen's leadership. We shall miss her

immediate presence; but we shall still look for her counsel from afar. And we wish her well.

Sincerely,

RONALD BERMAN,
Chairman.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I had endeavored to get my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) to yield.

I would say I certainly join in the remarks about the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Now, I listened to the very eloquent speech of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana very closely.

I would say it would be very relevant if, by this amendment, I was trying to cut or to gut the National Foundation. The gentleman from Michigan quoted the late John F. Kennedy, and one would think that I was gutting the appropriation. I point out to the committee again that all this amendment does is to hold the line; all this amendment does is to appropriate exactly the same as was appropriated last year.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman is not keeping it at exactly the same, because we have an increased number of participants and we have the higher cost of inflation.

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, since our good colleague from Indiana did not have time to yield, I think he invoked the Vice President's name as a supporter of this bill. It is true the Vice President supports the arts and humanities. During the last month, the Vice President has been calling for the Congress to restrain our expenditures. I know, because I was with him a week ago at several appearances. He clearly did not recommend increasing expenditures, as a matter of fact he suggested the Congress cut programs.

I want to call to the attention of our colleague from Indiana the fact that he was not here when we talked about the Democratic caucus, which today voted very decisively to stop inflation. I think this is a very simple test. Are we really serious about stopping inflation?

All that my good colleague from Missouri is trying to do is to have this expenditure continued exactly as it was last year. That is a simple restraint, and that supports the spirit which the Vice President is trying to encourage us to do, since my good colleague from Indiana invoked the spirit of the Vice President. I think it was very wise that he did.

So, my point is that my colleague from Missouri has very properly introduced an

amendment which merely holds the expenditure to where it was last year. That is a reasonable proposition. It merely says that it stops it where it was last year and stops the inflationary expenditure binge of this Congress.

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I hope we are not met, let me say to my friend from California, to construe the Vice President's words. He is saying that the Vice President is opposed to the budget recommendations of the President.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I think we can assume that the President in setting up his budget is as much concerned as we about the matter of keeping our fiscal house in order.

I did not rise for that purpose. I rose to sadly note that this is the last time one of the finest chairmen this House has ever had to preside over any bill from the Appropriations Committee, or any other committee, will honor us by her presence. I want to say out of my own heart, JULIA, that I appreciate the great service you have rendered to the House of Representatives.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 284, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

AYES—126

Andrews, N.C.	Devine	Landrum
Archer	Dickinson	Lott
Armstrong	Downing	Lujan
Ashbrook	Duncan	McCollister
Bafalis	du Pont	Mallary
Bauman	Erlenborn	Maraziti
Beard	Fisher	Martin, Nebr.
Bennett	Fountain	Martin, N.C.
Blackburn	Frey	Mathis, Ga.
Bray	Fröhlich	Michel
Brinkley	Gaydos	Miller
Brown, Ohio	Gilman	Minish
Broyhill, N.C.	Goldwater	Minshall, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.	Goodling	Mizell
Burleson, Tex.	Green, Oreg.	Murtha
Butler	Gross	Myers
Byron	Grover	O'Brien
Camp	Harsha	Poage
Carter	Henderson	Powell, Ohio
Clancy	Hinshaw	Pryor
Clark	Hogan	Price, Tex.
Clawson, Del.	Holt	Quillen
Cochran	Hosmer	Randall
Collier	Huber	Rarick
Collins, Tex.	Hudnut	Roberts
Conlan	Hunt	Robinson, Va.
Crane	Hutchinson	Rogers
Daniel, Dan	Ichord	Roussetot
Daniel, Robert	Jarman	Runnels
W., Jr.	Johnson, Colo.	Ruth
Davis, Wis.	Jones, N.C.	Satterfield
de la Garza	Kemp	Scherie
Dennis	Ketchum	Shipley
Dent	Lagomarsino	Shuster
Derwinski	Landgrebe	Snyder

Spence
Staggers
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stubblefield
Symms
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.

Teague
Towle, Nev.
Treen
Wampler
Ware
White
Whitehurst
Wiggins

Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wylie
Young, Fla.
Young, S.C.
Zion

NOES—284

Abdnor	Gray	Owens
Abzug	Green, Pa.	Farris
Adams	Gubser	Fassman
Addabbo	Gude	Patman
Alexander	Gunter	Patten
Anderson,	Guyer	Pepper
Calif.	Haley	Perkins
Anderson, Ill.	Hamilton	Pettis
Andrews,	Hammer-	Peyser
N. Dak.	schmidt	Pickle
Annunzio	Hanley	Pike
Arends	Hanna	Podell
Ashley	Hanrahan	Price, Ill.
Aspin	Hansen, Wash.	Pritchard
Badillo	Harrington	Quie
Baker	Hastings	Rallsback
Barrett	Hawkins	Rangel
Bell	Hays	Rees
Bergland	Hechler, W. Va.	Regula
Bevill	Heckler, Mass.	Reid
Blaggi	Heinz	Reuss
Blester	Helstoski	Rhodes
Bingham	Hicks	Riegle
Blatnik	Hillis	Rinaldo
Boggs	Holtzman	Robison, N.Y.
Boland	Horton	Rodino
Bolling	Howard	Roe
Bowen	Hungate	Roncallo, Wyo.
Brademas	Johnson, Calif.	Roncallo, N.Y.
Breaux	Johnson, Pa.	Rooney, Pa.
Breckinridge	Jones, Ala.	Rose
Brooks	Jones, Okla.	Rosenthal
Broomfield	Jordan	Rostenkowski
Brotzman	Karth	Roush
Brown, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Roy
Brown, Mich.	Kazen	Roybal
Buchanan	King	Ruppe
Burgener	Kluczynski	Ryan
Burke, Calif.	Koch	St Germain
Burke, Fla.	Kuykendall	Sandman
Burke, Mass.	Kyros	Sarasin
Burton, John	Latta	Sarbanes
Carney, Ohio	Leggett	Schneebeli
Casey, Tex.	Lehman	Schroeder
Cederberg	Lent	Sebelius
Chamberlain	Littton	Seiberling
Chappell	Long, La.	Shoup
Clausen,	Long, Md.	Shriver
Don H.	Lukens	Sikes
Cleveland	McClory	Sisk
Cohen	McCloskey	Skubitz
Collins, Ill.	McCormack	Slack
Conable	McDade	Smith, Iowa
Conte	McEwen	Smith, N.Y.
Conyers	McFall	Stanton,
Corman	McKay	J. William
Cotter	McKinney	Stanton,
Coughlin	McSpadden	James V.
Cronin	Macdonald	Stark
Daniels,	Madden	Steed
Dominick V.	Madigan	Steelman
Danielson	Mahon	Stephens
Delaney	Mann	Stokes
Dellenback	Mathias, Calif.	Stratton
Dellums	Matsunaga	Stuckey
Denholm	Mayne	Studds
Donohue	Mazzoli	Talcott
Drinan	Meeds	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	Melcher	Thomson, Wis.
Eckhardt	Metcalfe	Thone
Edwards, Ala.	Mezvinsky	Thornton
Edwards, Calif.	Millford	Tierman
Eilberg	Mills	Traxler
Esch	Mink	Udall
Eshleman	Mitchell, Md.	Ullman
Evans, Colo.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Fascell	Moakley	Vander Jagt
Findley	Mollohan	Vander Veen
Fish	Montgomery	Vanik
Flood	Moorhead,	Veysey
Flowers	Calif.	Vigorito
Foley	Moorhead, Pa.	Waggonner
Ford	Morgan	Waldie
Forsythe	Mosher	Walsh
Fraser	Moss	Whalen
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Ill.	Whitten
Frenzel	Murphy, N.Y.	Widnall
Fulton	Natcher	Wilson,
Fuqua	Nedzi	Charles H.,
Gettys	Nelsen	Calif.
Gialmo	Nichols	Wilson,
Gibbons	Nix	Charles, Tex.
Ginn	Obey	Winn
Gonzalez	O'Hara	Wolf
Grasso	O'Neill	Wright

Wyatt
Wyder
Wyman
Yates

Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.

Young, Tex.
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—24

Brasco
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Phillip
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clay
Culver
Davis, Ga.

Davis, S.C.
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Evins, Tenn.
Flynt
Griffiths
Hansen, Idaho

Hébert
Holifield
Jones, Tenn.
Rooney, N.Y.
Steele
Sullivan
Symington
Zwach

So the substitute amendment for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY
BOARD OF REVIEW
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review, as authorized by law (30 U.S.C. 721) including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$60,000.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose simply of asking the very able gentlewoman from Washington concerning the \$60,000 for the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review. It would seem to me if there were ever a case of a board that has used its time in innocuous desuetude it would be this Board. This Board of Review has had no cases, no appeals, and has had some \$10,000 in travel funds, as I understand.

I would simply like to raise the question why this Board has to continue in existence when it obviously is performing no useful function whatsoever?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, Congress created the Board and Congress can terminate the Board.

The Board has not acted on a case to date but there could be a case or an appeal and the board must have adequate funds to respond if appeals are made. I would not object to the abolishing of this Board if that is the will of Congress.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington. I think this is one agency of the Government that ought to be abolished, and as an abolitionist I would like to see this Board completely abolished.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 16027) making appropriations for the Department of the

Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

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

There was no objection.

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.

Mr. SCHERLE. 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 385, nays 22, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

YEAS—385

Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Armstrong
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Bafalis
Baker
Barrett
Bauman
Bell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Blester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Bray
Breaux
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burton, John
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conte
Conyers

Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert
W. Jr.
Daniels,
Dominick V.
Danielson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley

Hanna
Hanrahan
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Hastings
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Hogan
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hudnut
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Lifton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lott
Lujan
Lukens
McClary
McCloskey
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKinney
McSpadden
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallory
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.

Martin, N.C.
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvinisky
Michel
Milford
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Owens
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Podell
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Quillen
Rallsback

Randall
Rangel
Rarick
Rees
Regula
Reid
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio, Wyo.
Roncalio, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roussetot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scherle
Schneebell
Schroeder
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Staggers
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Stark
Steed
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens

Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Studds
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Teague
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Treen
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wyder
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—22

Archer
Ashbrook
Beard
Clancy
Collins, Tex.
Conlan
Crane
Davis, Wis.

Devine
Gross
Huber
Hunt
Ketchum
Landgrebe
McCollister
Miller

Powell, Ohio
Robinson, Va.
Shuster
Steiger, Wis.
Traxler
Young, S.C.

NOT VOTING—27

Abdnor
Brasco
Broyhill, N.C.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Phillip
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clay
Culver

Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Dickinson
Diggs
Dorn
Evins, Tenn.
Griffiths
Gunter
Hansen, Idaho

Holifield
Jones, Tenn.
Quie
Rooney, N.Y.
Steele
Sullivan
Symington
Wilson, Bob
Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Gunter.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Clay.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Abdnor.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Phillip Burton with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Texas, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1250, Rept. No. 93-1216), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 1250

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. 14780) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1975 for carrying out the provisions of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973. 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 Foreign Affairs, 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. 14780, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3190 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. 14780 as passed by the House.

POLICY STUDY BY JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON INFLATION

Mr. YOUNG of Texas, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1251, Rept. No. 93-1217), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 1251

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 concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 93) relating to an inflation policy study. After general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution 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 Rules, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute

rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REGULATING REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES

Mr. YOUNG of Texas, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1252, Rept. No. 95-1218), which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 1252

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. 9989) to further the national housing goal of encouraging homeownership by regulating certain lending practices and closing and settlement procedures in federally related mortgage transactions to the end that unnecessary costs and difficulties of purchasing housing are minimized, 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.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 386, URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Texas, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1253, Rept. No. 93-1219), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 1253

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (S. 386) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the conference report for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 3, Rule XXVIII are hereby waived.

RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Texas, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1254, Rept. No. 93-1220), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 1254

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. 15736) to authorize, enlarge, and repair various Federal reclamation projects and programs, and for other purposes, and all points of order against Title I of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, Rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. 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.

200TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 1255 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1255

Whereas the First Continental Congress met two hundred years ago, September 5, 1774, through October 26, 1774, as the first American congress of representatives, and enunciated those principles of government of free men which have inspired Americans throughout their history and which still guide this nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, that the two hundredth anniversary of the meeting and accomplishments of the First Continental Congress be commemorated, and to that end the Speaker of the House will appoint four Members of the House of Representatives to constitute a Committee on Arrangements.

The Committee on Arrangements shall plan the proceedings, issue appropriate invitations, and select distinguished scholars of the period of the American Revolution to deliver a memorial address.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not think I will object—may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what this is all about?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a resolution that rightfully belongs to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE). The gentleman presented the resolution to the leadership of the House on both sides, and we thought it was an excellent idea in view of the fact that in September of this year Congress will be celebrating its 200th anniversary.

If the gentleman from California would yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman could further explain the resolution.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the action of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) in bringing up this resolution. I would just like to say that

all we are trying to do is to set up a small mechanism so as to be able to recognize that 200 years ago in September the first Continental Congress met. As I say, we are trying to set up a Committee on Arrangements to find out a way to arrange for the House to take note of one of the most important developments in our Nation's history.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether this would not possibly be the same type of a ceremony we have had such as that concerning the observance of Flag Day?

Mr. McDADE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for yielding.

As my colleagues, I am sure, will recollect, not long ago we had in this Chamber a celebration of Flag Day. Also in previous years we have had distinguished Americans, such as Carl Sandburg, who came before us in the Chamber and spoke on the anniversary of Lincoln's death.

We contemplate setting up a Committee on Arrangements so as to be able to take appropriate note of that tremendous event that occurred just about 200 years ago, when the first Continental Congress convened.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) whether our country at that time was \$500 billion in debt, and would the gentleman state whether there would be any recognition of that fact at that time?

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that we will recognize appropriately all of the issues that were before that Continental Congress, and we hope all of the issues that are before this Congress.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PROCEDURE FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 568) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 568

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That notwithstanding the provisions of S. C. 132(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 USC 198), as amended by Section 461 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (Pub. Law 91-510; 84 Stat. 1193), the House of Representatives and the Senate shall not adjourn for a period in excess of three days, or adjourn sine die, until both Houses of

Congress have adopted a concurrent resolution providing either for an adjournment (in excess of three days) to a day certain, or for adjournment sine die.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader explain what this concurrent resolution is all about?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by section 461 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, referring to section 132(a), unless otherwise provided for by the Congress, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than July 31 of each year. This motion is the customary procedure that we have followed every 2 years.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So that if I were to object, we would have to adjourn?

Mr. O'NEILL. I would presume we would have to go to a vote on that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, might this then be described as another great reform that has bit the dust for years?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would have to say that it is, but this one bit the dust back in 1946, about 28 years ago. I do not know how many times it has bit the dust throughout the years. But I will say that in my 22 years here, I think we got out only once before July 31. So I would have to answer the gentleman in the affirmative.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the distinguished majority leader that it is time that this charade was ended. I certainly would have no objection to adoption of the amendment. I hope, though, that the reformers around here who are so eager to change everything and the procedures in the House, and all of the rules, take note of the means of this one that never should have been.

Mr. O'NEILL. May I say to the gentleman I will be sorry to see him leave.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is the intention on scheduling to go through until 7 o'clock, and at 7 o'clock the Committee will rise. The legislation tomorrow will be the strip mining bill, and we will move forward. I presume the gentleman's agreement that was made earlier will be kept.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. It is now 5:55 p.m. We are on a unanimous-consent request which has to do with a 3-hour discussion. We started operations on this bill a week ago, 8 days ago. We had it Wednesday, Thursday. We had it Monday and Tuesday, and now the gentleman, I gather, wants to chop it off after another hour and then come back again and take it up again piecemeal. I have found that in connection with this legislation when there are enough people on the floor to hear it discussed, the amendments that I offer are accepted, and when they are not here, there is a corporal guard for the environmental people who manage to defeat these amendments. Now we are at the hour where the sun is down past the yardarm where one of the previous Speakers of this House used to frequently strike a blow for liberty. I just want the gentleman to know that if he is insistent that we go ahead, and then chop me off at a position where by tomorrow the membership will have forgotten what they were mad about on this bill today, I am going to take as many measures as I can to make certain that we have a quorum. I would suggest to the gentleman that he would seek to come in early tomorrow. Let us get this thing out of the way in the same fashion without chopping up consideration of this. Let us get it out of the way. Otherwise I will have to use whatever parliamentary safeguards I have to protect my rights and protect the rights of the minority.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. O'NEILL. I would be remiss if I did not thank the gentleman for his cooperation.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The majority leader said that the intention was to have the strip mining bill become the first order of business tomorrow. Does that mean we will not take up the conference report on legislative appropriations until after the strip mining bill is completed?

Mr. O'NEILL. As far as I know, that is right. At this particular time, unless there be a change in the schedule, the answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will yield further, we have once again the controversial matter of the west front included in this bill, and I should like to have the majority leader's assurance that we will know when that bill is going to be brought up, rather than have it brought up suddenly in advance of the strip mining bill, which is billed as the first order of business.

Mr. O'NEILL. That legislation will not be on the floor tomorrow, but will be scheduled for next week.

REQUEST FOR HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

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, Thursday, July 25, 1974.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.
The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

SURFACE MINING AND RECLAMATION ACT OF 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11500) to provide for the regulation of surface coal mining operations in the United States, to authorize the Secretary of Interior to make grants to States to encourage the State regulation of surface mining, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 324, nays 54, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]
YEAS—324

Abdnor	Clancy	Gaydos
Abzug	Clausen,	Gettys
Adams	Don H.	Gialmo
Addabbo	Cleveland	Gibbons
Alexander	Cochran	Gilman
Anderson,	Cohen	Ginn
Calif.	Collier	Goldwater
Anderson, Ill.	Collins, Ill.	Gonzalez
Andrews, N.C.	Conte	Grasso
Andrews,	Corman	Green, Oreg.
N. Dak.	Cotter	Green, Pa.
Annunzio	Coughlin	Grover
Archer	Crane	Gude
Ashbrook	Cronin	Guyer
Ashley	Daniel, Dan	Haley
Aspin	Daniels,	Hamilton
Badillo	Dominick V.	Hammer-
Bafalis	Danielson	schmidt
Bell	Davis, Wis.	Hanley
Bennett	de la Garza	Hanrahan
Bergland	Delaney	Harrington
Biestler	Dellenback	Harsha
Bingham	Dellums	Hastings
Blatnik	Denholm	Hays
Boggs	Dent	Hechler, W. Va.
Bolling	Derwinski	Heckler, Mass.
Bowen	Dingell	Heinz
Brademas	Downing	Helstoski
Breaux	Drinan	Henderson
Breckinridge	du Pont	Hicks
Brinkley	Eckhardt	Hillis
Brooks	Edwards, Ala.	Hinshaw
Brotzman	Edwards, Calif.	Hogan
Brown, Calif.	Elberg	Holt
Brown, Mich.	Esch	Holtzman
Brown, Ohio	Eshleman	Horton
Broyhill, N.C.	Evans, Colo.	Howard
Broyhill, Va.	Fascell	Hudnut
Buchanan	Findley	Hungate
Burgener	Fish	Ichord
Burke, Calif.	Fisher	Jarman
Burke, Fla.	Flood	Johnson, Calif.
Burke, Mass.	Flowers	Johnson, Colo.
Burleson, Tex.	Foley	Johnson, Pa.
Burton, John	Ford	Jones, N.C.
Butler	Porsythe	Jones, Okla.
Carter	Fountain	Jordan
Casey, Tex.	Fraser	Karth
Cederberg	Frenzel	Kastenmeier
Chamberlain	Prey	Kazen
Chappell	Puqua	Kemp

Kluczynski	O'Brien	Slack
Koch	O'Hara	Smith, Iowa
Kuykendall	O'Neill	Snyder
Kyros	Owens	Staggers
Lagomarsino	Passman	Stanton,
Latta	Patman	J. William
Leggett	Patten	Stanton,
Lehman	Pepper	James V.
Lent	Perkins	Stark
Litton	Pettis	Steed
Long, La.	Peyser	Steelman
Long, Md.	Pickle	Steiger, Ariz.
Lott	Pike	Stokes
Lujan	Podell	Stratton
Luken	Preyer	Stubblefield
McClary	Price, Ill.	Stuckey
McCloskey	Price, Tex.	Studds
McCormack	Pritchard	Talcott
McDade	Quile	Taylor, Mo.
McFall	Rallsback	Taylor, N.C.
McKay	Randall	Teague
McKinney	Rangel	Thompson, N.J.
McSpadden	Rees	Thomson, Wis.
Macdonald	Regula	Tiernan
Madden	Reid	Traxler
Madigan	Reuss	Udall
Mahon	Rhodes	Ullman
Mallory	Riegle	Van Deerlin
Mann	Rinaldo	Vander Jagt
Maraziti	Roberts	Vander Veen
Martin, N.C.	Robison, N.Y.	Vanik
Mathias, Calif.	Roe	Veysey
Mathis, Ga.	Rogers	Vigorito
Matsunaga	Roncallo, Wyo.	Waggonner
Mayne	Rose	Walsh
Mazzoli	Rosenthal	Wampler
Meeds	Rostenkowski	Ware
Melcher	Roush	Whalen
Metcalfe	Roy	White
Mezvisky	Roybal	Whitten
Michel	Runnels	Williams
Milford	Ruppe	Wilson,
Mills	Ruth	Charles, Tex.
Minish	Ryan	Winn
Mink	St Germain	Wolf
Mitchell, Md.	Sandman	Wright
Mitchell, N.Y.	Sarasin	Wyatt
Mizell	Sarbanes	Wylder
Moakley	Satterfield	Wyllie
Moorhead, Pa.	Scherle	Wyman
Morgan	Schneebeli	Yates
Moss	Schroeder	Yatron
Murphy, Ill.	Seiberling	Young, Alaska
Murphy, N.Y.	Shipley	Young, Fla.
Murtha	Shoup	Young, Ga.
Myers	Shriver	Young, Ill.
Natcher	Shuster	Young, Tex.
Nedzi	Sikes	Zablocki
Nichols	Sisk	Zion
Obey	Skubitz	

NAYS—54

Arends	Erlenborn	Nelsen
Armstrong	Flynt	Parris
Baker	Frelinghuysen	Poage
Bauman	Fröehlich	Powell, Ohio
Beard	Goodling	Quillen
Bevill	Gross	Rarick
Blackburn	Hosmer	Robinson, Va.
Bray	Huber	Roussellot
Broomfield	Hunt	Sebellus
Byron	Hutchinson	Spence
Camp	Jones, Ala.	Stephens
Clawson, Del	Ketchum	Symms
Collins, Tex.	King	Towell, Nev.
Conable	Landgrebe	Treen
Conlan	McCollister	Whitehurst
Daniel, Robert	McEwen	Young, S.C.
W., Jr.	Miller	
Dennis	Moorhead,	
Devine	Calif.	
Duncan	Mosher	

NOT VOTING—56

Barrett	Evins, Tenn.	Roncallo, N.Y.
Blaggi	Fulton	Rooney, N.Y.
Boland	Gray	Rooney, Pa.
Brasco	Griffiths	Smith, N.Y.
Burlison, Mo.	Gubser	Steele
Burton, Phillip	Gunter	Steiger, Wis.
Carey, N.Y.	Hanna	Sullivan
Carney, Ohio	Hansen, Idaho	Symington
Chisholm	Hansen, Wash.	Thone
Clark	Hawkins	Thornton
Clay	Hébert	Waldie
Conyers	Holifield	Widnall
Culver	Jones, Tenn.	Wiggins
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Wilson, Bob
Davis, S.C.	Martin, Nebr.	Wilson,
Dickinson	Minshall, Ohio	Charles H.,
Diggs	Mollohan	Calif.
Donohue	Montgomery	Zwach
Dorn	Nix	
Dulski	Rodino	

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 11500, with Mr. SMITH of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). The Chair will attempt to explain the situation.

Before the Committee rose on yesterday, it had agreed that the remainder of the substitute committee amendment titles II through VIII, inclusive, would be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The Committee further agreed that the time for debate under the 5-minute rule would be limited to not to exceed 3 hours and allocated time to titles II through VIII as follows: 50 minutes for title II, 20 minutes for title III, 50 minutes for title IV, 5 minutes for title V, 5 minutes for title VI, 40 minutes for title VII, and 10 minutes for title VIII.

In an attempt to be consistent with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on yesterday, the Chair will endeavor to recognize all Members who wish to offer or debate amendments to title II during the 50 minutes of time for debate on that title.

If Members who have printed their amendments to title II in the RECORD would agree to offer those amendments during the 50-minute period and to be recognized for the allotted time, the Chair will recognize both Committee and non-Committee members for that purpose.

Members who have caused amendments to title II to be printed in the RECORD, however, are protected under clause 6, rule XXIII, and will be permitted to debate for 5 minutes any such amendment which they might offer to title II at the conclusion of the 50 minutes of debate thereon.

The Chair will now compile a list of those Members seeking recognition to offer or debate amendments to title II and will allocate 50 minutes for debate accordingly.

The Chair will give preference where possible to those Members who have amendments to offer to title II.

Members who were standing at the time of the determination of the time allocation will be recognized for 1 minute and 20 seconds each.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman, I note that the time is approximately 6:30 p.m., and it is my understanding that the Committee will rise at 7 o'clock p.m., tonight.

Does that mean now that the Members who have not been recognized in these next 30 minutes will be continued to be recognized tomorrow when we resume debate on this great issue?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that time will remain on this title. The gentleman is correct.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, will amendments be in order as soon as the chairman goes ahead with proceedings here?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I take this time in order that some questions may be directed to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise for the purpose of directing a question to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

The question is this: Does this bill as presently written permit the mountaintop and valley-fill method of surface mining?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, as I said on two previous occasions in the debate—and I shall ask permission to revise and extend my remarks, and I will go into this in some detail in the extension of my remarks—I made it clear that this bill is not intended to outlaw the surface-mining technique known as mountaintop removal.

What the bill says is that that kind of mining—and I might add that this type of mining has done more damage over the years than any other type of mining in Appalachia—this type of mining can continue, but it can continue only if it meets the standards in section 211 applicable to other steep-slope mining operations.

There are other techniques for accomplishing mountaintop removal if they can be utilized to meet these necessary standards; these particular techniques can be used if they restore the shape of the mountain as they go along.

Mr. Chairman, I will put a complete exposition of this in my extension of the remarks so we will have the benefit of that.

If they can restore the shape of the mountain, they can use these various methods, the valley-fill or the head-of-the-hollow, for instance.

You can put the fill on the benches, or place it on level ground away from the mining site if all of these fit in with the post-mining plan. We are not trying to outlaw mountaintop removal if it meets the standards of the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Does this mean that spoil can be placed in the valley, or at some other location away from the mining site? For example, the head of a hollow located elsewhere on the mountain being mined?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, if it meets the stand-

ards set up in the bill, but the extent and how this is done depends on characteristics of the specific site, the mining and reclamation method employed, and the post-mining land use and its configuration as contained in the approved mining and reclamation plan. All spoil disposal areas must be part of the permit area.

Various types of earthmoving and fill operations are necessary to prepare lands for developed post-mining land uses. This is discussed on page 106 of the report and I would like to insert that portion here.

In short, these fill areas must be appropriately engineered and constructed in order to assure to the greatest extent possible the stability of the fill, adequate permanent drainage and a usable surface upon completion of mining. It is expected that the regulations issued by the Secretary of Interior would specify engineering and materials handling practices along with appropriate drainage controls—to prevent pollution and assure stability—for these activities.

EXCEPTIONS

Although usually preferable, it may not always be best to return mountain lands to their approximate original contour. In various areas such as the mountainous Appalachian coal fields, there is a paucity of flood free, relatively flat developable land. Thus some surface mining operations offer the opportunity for creating a resource which otherwise might not be available or might be prohibitively expensive.

The mining application process and the environmental standards for steep slope mining allow for variance from the regarding requirement to achieve a desirable postmining land use, provided that the proposed use of the land is reasonable and capable of being met with respect to public and private investments. The bill also stipulates that fill areas created for such development are to be designed and constructed so that the land is capable of development upon completion of mining. It is expected that the Secretary of Interior will include in regulations to be issued under this act such fill placement standards as are necessary to assure suitable site development potential upon completion of mining. Standards might parallel those used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for developing fill areas for construction purposes.

The committee felt that these planning and fill placement requirements were reasonable since:

First. The utility of a flat land site on a mountaintop is dependent upon suitable access, adequate utilities, such as water, storm water, and sewage control. Without indication that public jurisdictions involved will assume responsibility for maintaining the necessary public facilities, the development of flat areas should not be encouraged.

Second. Controlled placement and compaction of spoil is desirable so that surface created is suitable for use without waiting for an extended period of years for settling prior to development.

Third. As the requirement of return to approximate original contour and the

limitation of dumping spoil downslope are environmentally preferable, exceptions to the standards should only be granted where it is demonstrated that such exceptions are necessary to allow a desirable and achievable postmining land use.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Does this mean that the original contour need not be restored?

Mr. UDALL. Not if a postmining plan is developed that meets the standards, and is otherwise in compliance with the act. I want to assure the gentleman that mountaintop removal raises problems, but we do not intend to outlaw it; under approved conditions it can continue. The appropriate problems of the committee report include the sections on "approximate original contour"—pages 85-92—and "steep slope mining"—pages 102-107.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Eighty-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Chair announces that he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred and one Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 2, further proceedings under the call shall be considered vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MELCHER TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MELCHER to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute: Page 172, line 4, strike out "and", and immediately before line 5 insert the following, and renumber the following paragraph accordingly:

"(12) the surface coal mine operations are not located within, and would not adversely affect, an alluvial valley floor in semi-arid and arid regions;"

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment offered to protect and safeguard the valley floors of our rivers and streams in the West. It is an eminently needed amendment. I offer it for the consideration of the Committee.

My colleague from Colorado (Mr. EVANS) is the proponent of this amendment and I am delighted to join him and other supporters in encouraging the House to recognize the extreme importance of the valleys in our Western States that are irrigated or subirrigated and provide the base ranches for our livestock industry.

It is on land such as this that produces the hay and grain on the rich, lush pastures that provides additional forage to add significantly to the range grasses on the prairies surrounding. By making sure

that these valleys are not mined we maintain the needed balance for the range-land surrounding.

If mined the disturbance to the water table or the resulting sediment or erosion would in many instances cause permanent damage. For these reasons this amendment protecting these valleys is essential.

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

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

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

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

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a highly important amendment. I rise in full support of it and hope our colleagues will follow suit.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my good friend and colleague a question about this amendment. When the gentleman defines alluvial valley floors is he talking about the alluvial valley floors of some 150 million years ago, which is what the coal lies on, or is it the present alluvial valley floors which presently contain water and contribute to supporting crops?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in regard to the term "alluvial valley floors" I yield to the gentleman from Arizona to comment on what the committee means when it uses the term "alluvial valley floors."

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the term "alluvial valley floors" as used in the bill and the committee report refers to those unconsolidated deposits formed by streams—including their meanders—where the ground water is so near the surface that it directly supports extensive vegetation.

These alluvial valley floors receive recharge of their waters from areas surrounding them, and the water availability in such floors is in excess of the actual precipitation on the surface of such deposits.

Further, these alluvial valley floors have streams flowing through them which contribute significantly to domestic, municipal, agricultural, recreational, or industrial use.

Does the gentleman agree that is his intention and definition in reference to alluvial valley floors?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I agree with your statement of the meaning of "alluvial valley floors" as the term is used by the committee report and in this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this does not include the naturally dewatered deposits on hills or casual gullies which do not contain supportive underground subirrigation?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, would this language actually prohibit mining under any stream? It seems to me under any stream we have an alluvial valley floor and this would be a prohibition against any mining under any stream.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I do not so construe this. This is to protect the arid and semiarid areas of the United States. I call to the attention of the committee a finding by the Academy of Sciences that studied this proposal problem of strip mining. They said:

In planning of any proposed mining and rehabilitation it is essential to stipulate the alluvial floors be preserved.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. This, then, is where farming is actually being practiced, subirrigated hay meadows or other crop land but not casual grass lands.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. The gentleman is correct. I appreciate my colleague making that point clear.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER). This amendment would prohibit surface mining in alluvial valley floors in semiarid and arid regions. Such a prohibition could be interpreted to prevent surface mining across any watercourse, no matter how trivial. Obviously such an interpretation would completely disrupt surface mining operations in the West. This legislation is replete with similar restrictions, all subject to differing interpretations. To concur in the addition of yet another ambiguity to this bill compounds this insult to reason. Hence, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if we do not adopt this provision, my fear is that once we strip mine these valley floors it is difficult, if not almost impossible, to restore them. We are talking about areas where rainfall is very scarce, ranging from 8 or 9 inches up to 17 or 20 inches. That is not how we define semiarid and arid, but these floors are critical to the economic stability of the mountainous West.

I would say that the areas generally we are talking about would include parts of the States of Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico. These are the principal ones. There could be others.

(Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, strip mining will have tremendous impacts on the ground water resources of my State of Wyoming. H.R. 11500 has been drafted so as to minimize those impacts. The bill establishes detailed requirements for premining information, standards which I helped draft to minimize the disturbance to the hydrologic balance, and monitoring information that must be gathered as the mining operation progresses.

One productive and limited area, however, has not been adequately protected by this legislation—alluvial valley floors.

These are the prime agricultural lands of my State that lie along the rivers and streams where the ground water table is so near the surface that it directly supports vegetation. These are the subirrigated hay meadows that produce hay now selling for over \$70 a ton. The hydrologic impacts of mining these alluvial valley floors cannot be minimized. As the National Academy of Sciences recommends, they should be preserved.

The Evans' amendment to protect these alluvial valley floors should not be confused with mining of coal seams that are aquifers. The committee bill and the Evans' amendment would allow the mining of aquifers so long as the hydrologic impact of the mining operation is "minimized"—section 211. This would mean that a coal company could remove a coal seam that was serving as an aquifer.

The Evans' amendment will not prohibit mining in my State. It will limit the operations at some mines and cause other operations to alter their future mining plans, but it certainly will not prohibit surface mining. Neither will the Evans' amendment stop or curtail coal production from my State. The prohibition on alluvial valley floors will not become effective for 2 years under the interim program of H.R. 11500 and thus any mine that might at present be mining in an alluvial floor will have ample time to alter its mining plan. At present in the Powder River Basin it is estimated that only one or two mines would be affected and these operations will have up to 2 years to mine or alter their mining operations.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Evans amendment.

Protection for alluvial valley floors is a crucial issue for the West. Alluvial valley floors are the most fertile areas in the arid lands of the West—the ground water level is so near the surface of an alluvial valley floor that it directly supports extensive vegetation. In addition, these valley floors receive water from surrounding areas and are thus capable of sustaining vegetation well in excess of what would be expected based on the precipitation levels in the area. As a result, these areas produce the finest hay meadows which are key to the successful ranching industry in the West.

The Evans amendment insures that at least this area will be preserved from the ravages of strip mining. Reclamation of these areas has never been proven successful—this amendment is one lone example of where H.R. 11500 is responsive to the scientific facts on reclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER) to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a division, and pending the division, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I appeal the decision of the Chair and on that I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman demanding a division on the amendment?

Mr. HOSMER. No, on the Chairman's decision. I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman appealing?

Mr. HOSMER. I am appealing the decision of the Chair that a quorum is present and demanding a division on my appeal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from California that the ruling of the Chair is not appealable. If the gentleman desires a division on the pending amendment, that is in order.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I did demand a division on the Melcher amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOSMER) there were—ayes 64, noes 2.

So the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Chairman, the complexity of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1974, further complicated by hundreds of amendments, makes it difficult to come to grips with the bill. Nevertheless, I think that it is important to make wise and informed decisions on such important legislation. I have carefully reviewed the bill and I wish to set forth my views and my support for several amendments.

I believe that some reclamation of surface mining areas is essential, and I support reasonable legislation requiring reclamation. On the other hand, in a time of energy shortages, we cannot afford to shut mining down or make it prohibitively expensive. We must balance the need for minimum environmental standards with the need to mine our valuable surface coal resources.

H.R. 11500 is an attempt by the Interior Committee to strike such a balance. It has some commendable features which I support. One such provision would provide aid to schools of mines for the training of metallurgical engineers. I have long been outspoken about the coming mineral shortage and the growing shortage of metallurgical engineers. I have introduced legislation to aid the training of metallurgical engineers.

On the other hand, some provisions of H.R. 11500 interfere unreasonably with coal mining. Several provisions, although innocuous in appearance, could be devastating if expansively interpreted. It should be remembered that difficult restrictions can only add to the consumer's cost. Accordingly, I support some important amendments.

Section 206(a)(3)(B), providing for the designation of an area as unsuitable for surface coal mining if it would "affect fragile or historic lands in which such operations could result in significant damage to important historic, cultural, scientific, and esthetic values and natural systems," could have widespread impact if interpreted too expansively. Some people believe that all development should be precluded on great masses of land to protect "historic, cultural, and esthetic values." These values were significant, should be protected, but development needs, should also be considered. I support an amendment which would add:

If it is determined that these values are more important to the national interest than the production of coal.

Section 209(d)(9) would totally prohibit strip mining coal operations in national forests, unless the mining or significant commitments to mining had taken place prior to September 1, 1973. I do not favor the degrading of the beauty of our national forests. I also favor multiple use of forest land. But I think it unwise to completely preclude all future strip coal mining in national forests, even where it would not be inconsistent with scenic and multiple use values. There are billions of tons of coal in our national forests, and some of it can be recovered, if properly managed and reclaimed, without destroying other important values.

Section 211(d)(1) provides an exemption from the approximate original contour requirement if "an industrial, commercial, residential, or public facility development" would "constitute a higher or better economic or public use of the affected land." I would add agricultural and recreational uses to the list of exceptions. Certainly if agricultural and recreational use are determined by the governing agency to be a better use of the land, it should be allowed rather than returning the land to approximate original contour. One of the major potential strip mining areas in Utah probably could not be returned to approximate original contour but could be reclaimed for higher use as pastureland.

I have reservations about section 212 which regulates the surface effects of underground mining operations. The vast majority of Utah's, and the Nation's coal resources must be deep mined and therefore great care must be taken to avoid unreasonable restrictions which would effectively prohibit underground mining of the Nation's coal. Because the focus of the bill is on surface mining, attention has been diverted from this section. I urge my colleagues to consider the wide ranging impact of this section and to act favorably on amendments to remove unreasonable restrictions on the underground coal mining industry.

Section 223 establishes the right to bring citizens suit. Effective enforcement requires that legal actions be provided for, but experience has taught that provisions allowing anyone, no matter what their interest, to bring suit are often abused. Environmental suits have too frequently caused long delays. I favor limiting the right to sue to person "having an interest which is or may be adversely affected," rather than allowing "any person" bring a suit. I also favor amending subsection (b) by eliminating the words "in any manner" and by adding the words "and not primarily through the injured parties' own negligence" after "the Secretary." This would still allow a person suffering injury to sue for damages, as opposed to an amendment which would entirely eliminate the provision, but would give the coal company a defense if the person's injury was his own fault.

Finally, I oppose title VI, designation of lands unsuitable for mining of minerals other than coal. Although the provisions appear reasonable on a casual reading, careful examination indicates that the section could have far ranging impact. In a bill directed at regulating surface mining of coal, a provision to regulate all mining is out of place. Regulation of mining generally should be considered in separate legislation, after appropriate hearings. In addition, the Federal land classification being carried on by the Interior Department is accomplishing much of what this provision is intended to do. Federal land use plans are being developed and mining has been prohibited or severely limited in some areas.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the efforts being made here this week to enact effective and responsible legislation for surface mining regulation.

I want simply to offer some general comments on the subject and to suggest some recommendations on what the final legislation should include.

First of all, I would point out that there is no stronger imperative for us than to develop to the fullest practicable extent our domestic energy resources.

In the heat of Washington's July, we may tend to forget that last winter we had a very serious fuel crisis that affected the life and work and comfort of millions of Americans. We may not readily recall that this crisis was brought on, in large part, by our overdependence on foreign powers for fuel supplies.

To turn our backs now on domestic energy reserves as substantial as those recoverable through strip mining would be as irresponsible, as shortsighted an action as the Congress could take.

Strip mining currently provides roughly half the coal being produced and consumed in the United States. Approximately 300 million tons of strip-mined coal were used last year to heat our homes and schools and hospitals, and with our current known reserve of 45 billion tons of strip-mineable coal, we could continue at that same rate of consumption for another 150 years.

And so it is inconceivable to me that

we should enact legislation to ban strip mining completely.

But neither can we close our eyes before the great stretches of ravaged land that stand in silent, profound testimony to the evil abuses that uncontrolled strip mining has inflicted upon the Earth.

There must be a middle ground between total abolition of strip mining and total destruction of the land, and it is this middle ground that we must find.

If strip mining is to be permitted, it must be accompanied by reclamation standards that are effective and enforceable.

We must establish standards that will guarantee the land's recovery before allowing the land's desecration. There may be honest disagreement about the technical aspects of that recovery, and in our lengthy debate this disagreement will doubtless be resolved. But above all, the principle must be established, and the law must be strictly enforced.

Beyond this basic standard of reclamation, we must adopt provisions for strict control of pollution that unavoidably emanates from strip mining operations. Again, there will be disagreement on particulars, but we cannot retreat from our responsibility to protect the environment even as we move forward in our efforts to increase domestic energy supplies.

Working within these broad guidelines, I am confident that we can fashion a legislative measure that will accommodate our energy needs, our environmental requirements, our national interest.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, according to rule XXIII, clause 6, I offer my amendment numbered 62 to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute: page 173, line 2. Strike out "Sec. 210." and insert a "Sec. 210." to read as follows:

Sec. 210. (a) Each application for a permit pursuant to a State or Federal program under this Act shall be submitted in a manner satisfactory to the regulatory authority and shall contain:

(1) the names and addresses of the permit applicants (if the applicant is a subsidiary corporation, the name and address of the parent corporation shall be included); every legal owner of the property (surface and mineral) to be mined; the holders of any leasehold or other equitable interest in the property; any purchaser of the property under a real estate contract; the operator if he is a person different from the applicant; and, if any of these are business entities other than a single proprietor, the names and addresses of principals, officers, and resident agent;

(2) the names and addresses of every officer, partner, director, or person performing a function similar to a director, of the applicant, together with the name and address of any person or group owning, of record or beneficially, 10 per centum or more of any class of stock of the applicant and a list of all names under which the applicant, partner, or principal shareholder previously operated a surface coal mining operation within the

United States or its territories and possessions;

(3) a description of the type and method of surface coal mining operation that exists or is proposed;

(4) evidence of the applicant's legal right to enter and commence surface coal mining operations on the area affected;

(5) the names and addresses of the owners of record of all surface and subsurface areas abutting on the permit area;

(6) a statement of any current or previous surface coal mining permits in the United States held by the applicant and the permit identification;

(7) a statement of whether the applicant, any subsidiary, affiliate, or persons controlled by or under common control with the applicant, has held a Federal or State surface coal mining permit which subsequent to 1960 has been suspended or revoked or has had a surface coal mining performance bond or similar security deposited in lieu of bond forfeited and a brief explanation of the facts involved in each case;

(8) such maps and topographical information, including the location of all underground mines in the area, as the regulatory authority may require, which shall be in sufficient detail to clearly indicate the nature and extent of the overburden to be disturbed, the coal to be mined, and the drainage of the area to be affected;

(9) a copy of the applicant's advertisement of the ownership, location, and boundaries of the proposed site of the surface coal mining and reclamation operation (such advertisement shall be placed in a newspaper of general circulation in the locality of the proposed site at least once a week for four successive weeks and may be submitted to the regulatory authority after the application is filed);

(10) a schedule listing any and all violations of this Act and any law, rule, or regulation of the United States or of any department or agency in the United States pertaining to air, or water environmental protection incurred by the applicant in connection with any surface coal mining operation during the one-year period prior to the date of application. The schedule shall also indicate the final resolution of any such notice of violation.

(b) Each application for a permit shall be required to submit to the regulatory authority, as part of the permit application, a surface coal mining and reclamation plan which shall contain:

(1) the engineering techniques proposed to be used in the surface coal mining and reclamation operation and a description of the major equipment; a plan for the control of surface water drainage and of water accumulation; a plan where appropriate for backfilling, soil stabilization, and compacting, grading, and appropriate revegetation (where vegetation existed prior to mining); an estimate of the cost per acre of the reclamation, including statements as to how the permittee plans to comply with each of the applicable surface coal mining and reclamation performance standards established under this Act;

(2) the consideration which has been given to developing the surface coal mining and reclamation plan in a manner consistent with local physical, environmental, and climatological conditions and current surface coal mining and reclamation technologies;

(3) the consideration which has been given to insuring the maximum practicable recovery of the coal;

(4) a detailed estimated timetable for the accomplishment of each major step in the surface coal mining and reclamation plan;

(5) the consideration which has been given

to making the surface coal mining and reclamation operation consistent with applicable State and local land use programs;

(6) a description, if any, of the hydrologic consequences of the surface coal mining and reclamation operation, both on and off the mine site, with respect to the hydrologic regime, quantity and quality of water in surface and ground water systems, including the dissolved and suspended solids under seasonal flow conditions, and the collection of sufficient data for the mine site and surrounding area so that an assessment can be made of the probable cumulative impacts of all anticipated surface coal mining in the area upon the hydrology of the area and particularly upon water availability;

(7) a statement of the results of test borings or core samplings from the land to be affected, including where appropriate, the surface elevation and logs of the drill holes so that the strike and dip of the coal seams may be determined; the nature and depth of the various strata of overburden; the location of subsurface water, if encountered, and its quality; the thickness of the coal seam found; an analysis of the chemical properties of such coal to determine the sulfur content and the content of other potentially acid and toxic forming substances of the overburden and the stratum lying immediately underneath the coal to be mined; and

(8) proprietary information, which if made available to the public would result in competitive injury to the applicant, may be designated confidential and, if accepted by the regulatory authority shall be subject to the provisions of section 1905 of title 18, United States Code. Appropriate protective orders against unauthorized disclosure or use by third parties may be issued with respect to such information, and violations of such orders shall be subject to penalties set forth in section 224 of this Act.

(c) Each applicant for a surface coal mining and reclamation permit shall file a copy of his application for public inspection with an appropriate official, approved by the regulatory authority, in the locality where the mining is proposed to occur, except for that information pertaining to the coal seam itself.

(d) A valid permit issued pursuant to this Act shall carry with it a right of successive renewals provided that the permittee has complied with such permit. Prior to approving the renewal of any permit, the regulatory authority shall review the permit and the surface coal mining and reclamation operation and may require such new conditions and requirements as are necessary or prescribed by changing circumstances. A permittee wishing to obtain renewal of a permit shall make application for such renewal within one year prior to the expiration of the permit. The application for renewal shall contain:

(1) a listing of any claim settlements or judgments against the applicant arising out of, or in connection with, surface coal mining operations under said permit;

(2) written assurance by the person issuing the performance bond in effect for said operation that the bond continues and will continue in full force and effect for any extension requested in such application for renewal as well as any additional bond the regulatory authority may require pursuant to section 216 of this Act;

(3) revised, additional, or updated information required under this section. Prior to the approval of any extension of the permit, the regulatory authority shall notify all parties who participated in the public review and hearings on the original or previous permit, as well as providing notice to the appropriate public authorities, and taking such other steps as required in section 209 of this Act.

Mr. HOSMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Clerk is not reading the amendment verbatim, and ask that it be read verbatim.

Mr. Chairman, I demand regular order.

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk proceeded to read the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HOSMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11500) to provide for the regulation of surface coal mining operations in the United States, to authorize the Secretary of Interior to make grants to States to encourage the State regulation of surface mining, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FIRST NATIONAL STUDY OF COMBINED WELFARE BENEFITS SHOWS THEY SURPASS WOMEN'S WAGES

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to my colleagues' attention the latest study of public welfare programs in a series published by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee. The study, entitled "Welfare in the 70's: A National Study of Benefits Available in 100 Local Areas," allows the first national generalizations to be made about the welfare system. The 100 counties surveyed, chosen as a statistical sample of the Nation, include all major urban areas and are listed below.

This analysis reveals the welfare system's average financial incentives for family breakup, motherhood, and for not working. Previously we have known that benefits varied greatly among States and that they rose with presumed need—that is, that they were larger for large than for small families, and larger for broken and jobless families than for intact

families and working families. The new data permit us to measure the differences in combined benefits on a national basis.

Major findings:

FAMILY STRUCTURE

By splitting up, poor families generally can increase joint income by more than enough to pay for the cost of maintaining a separate household. Benefit gains in cash and food range as high as 50 percent of original family income. For instance, if a father with a full-time job at \$2.00 an hour moved out of the household in July 1972, thus qualifying his wife and three children for federally aided welfare cash (Aid to Families with Dependent Children), the family's combined income gain in cash and food benefits averaged \$2,358. In 36 States the mothers and children would gain eligibility for Medicaid for the first time from the father's move. (The other States offer Medicaid to children, but not parents, in intact families who are poor.)

By having her first child, an unemployed single woman can almost double her cash and food benefits (the average annual boost in July 1972 was \$1,159). Without a child, her needs are smaller, and she qualifies only for food stamps and State- and locally-funded general assistance ("home relief") where available.

WORK DISINCENTIVES

By going to work full time, most jobless welfare mothers of three who are enrolled in the food stamp program can increase the family's discretionary income (that left after payment of taxes and work expenses) by no more than one-fourth of wages. For instance, such a mother who obtained a \$2.00 per hour job in July 1972 increased discretionary income by an average of 25 cents per wage dollar; but one-third of AFDC families lived where the gain either exceeded 35 cents or fell below 15 cents. If the family lived in public housing, the gain averaged only 16 cents.

By going to work full time at either the old or the new minimum wage, fathers on AFDC for unemployed fathers (AFDC-UF) face net losses in family income because the forfeited welfare cash generally exceeds the net wage gained. For instance, in 1972 a man with a wife and three children who found a full-time job at \$1.60 an hour received an after-tax income of \$3,034, but lost AFDC-UF benefits of \$3,840 in San Francisco or \$3,588 in Portland, Oregon.

Many people have argued that welfare families face high financial penalties for work. Others have said that because Federal rules require States to reimburse AFDC families for their work expenses, and because some States permit them to earn a sizable sum without any cut in their welfare grant, the work incentives are strong. This study finds that 65 percent of AFDC families live in States that fail to fully reimburse working mothers for taxes, food, clothing, and transportation expenses, and that, on the average, welfare families cannot increase discretionary income very much by going to work.

Also, the data leave little doubt that welfare does establish large incentives for low-income families to break up, or to not marry in the first place, and there is a sizable benefit for a woman who has her first child, but this declines for additional children.

BENEFITS FOR THE WORKING POOR

The study surveyed benefits that specific kinds of families and individuals,

with earnings ranging from zero to area median earnings, could have received in the 100 local areas in 1972. Only broken or jobless families are eligible for AFDC cash, but intact families with children, single persons, and couples without children are eligible for food stamps, public housing, and some State and locally financed general assistance cash programs.

The report found that 59 percent of the poor lived in States with AFDC benefits for unemployed fathers and that 40 percent lived in areas offering general assistance on a long-term basis to the able-bodied poor. In addition, 74 percent lived in counties with public housing projects, although most counties lacked enough apartments to meet the demand. In July 1972, 75 percent of the poor lived in areas that offered food stamps, but by July 1974 most counties offered stamps, and all were scheduled to do so by September.

The study shows that in most areas there is aid of some type available to needy two-parent families, and to poor individuals and couples who are neither old nor disabled. However, because Federal cash aid is prohibited for them, their overall potential benefits are much lower than those of fatherless families. For instance, in July 1972, average cash and food benefits available for families of men with a full-time job at the minimum wage were only from one-fourth to one-third as large as corresponding benefits available to mother-headed AFDC families of the same size and with the same earnings. Average food and cash benefits for these non-AFDC intact families were from \$1,800 to \$2,200 lower—gross taxable equivalent basis—than for the AFDC families.

Weighting the county data by the distribution of the poverty population, the average cash and food benefits available to persons working full time at the old and the new minimum wages were as follows:

GROSS TAXABLE SUM EQUIVALENT TO AVERAGE ANNUAL CASH WELFARE AND FOOD BENEFITS (JULY 1972)

Family type	Works 40 hours at \$1.60 (earns \$3,200 a year)		Works 40 hours at \$2 (earns \$4,000 a year)	
Single individual ¹		\$84		\$64
Couple ¹		324		113
Mother and child	1,793		1,432	
Mother and 2 children	2,678		2,260	
Mother and 3 children	3,236		2,805	
Father, mother, and child ¹	743		460	
Father, mother, and 2 children ¹	1,083		683	
Father, mother, and 3 children ¹	1,489		1,089	

¹ Ineligible for AFDC.

BENEFITS FOR AFDC FAMILIES

The study found that potential AFDC benefits in July 1972 averaged \$2,947 for a penniless mother with three children. However, 22 percent of such AFDC families lived where benefits were below \$2,000, and 15 percent where they exceeded \$4,000.

Available food benefits for a family of four whose only cash was a monthly AFDC grant averaged \$884 annually, raising the cash-food benefit total to \$3,831—equal to \$4,104 in taxable income, only \$77 below 1972 median earnings of women workers. Because national food stamp benefits have risen 34 percent in the last 2 years, and because AFDC benefits have risen in some States, the report understates benefits available today. Based on the July 1974 food stamp schedule, average cash and food benefits now available to an AFDC family of four would be about \$4,100, or about \$4,400 in taxable income.

In July 1972 public housing benefits, when available, averaged \$748 annually, and Medicaid, \$770, for an AFDC family of four. Virtually all AFDC families receive Medicaid; and, in January 1973, 60 percent received food stamps, but only 14 percent lived in public housing.

The study shows that such a family in July 1972 could have received an average of \$4,579 in tax- and expense-free cash, food, and housing benefits—equal to about \$5,006 in taxable income. This was greater than gross earnings received by 30 percent of the women who worked full time all year long, and \$398 above the median wage and salary income of all women workers in 1972.

Among the 100 counties studied, a four-person AFDC family in 1972 could have received as much as \$6,136 a year in tax-free cash, food, and public housing benefits—equivalent to about \$6,950 in taxable income, plus Medicaid—if it lived in Boston, Mass., but only \$2,181 plus Medicaid in Bolivar County, Miss.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Because of the complexities of welfare programs, the study of benefits unintentionally became a study of program quality as well. I am grateful to State and local welfare officials for replying to the subcommittee questionnaire. Most States cooperated fully, and some filed answers quickly, completely, and accurately. But staff analysis found one or more of these errors in many State responses:

High rate of error in computing benefits;

Inconsistent application of State welfare policies by different persons within the agency;

Poor coordination between the welfare agency and associated State or local agencies; and

Inability to cope with the workload imposed by the subcommittee's 130 hypothetical welfare applicants.

The difficulties that the States had illustrate the severe problems that plague administration of welfare programs for real recipients. Welfare is not only a tangle of inequities and disincentives; it also is an administrative jungle.

This study provides the most complete picture ever assembled of what we are doing with our welfare dollars and should be a boon to researchers. I urge that the study be updated periodically to aid Congress and the executive branch in setting welfare policy.

The list of the 100 areas surveyed follows:

LIST OF 100 LOCAL AREAS INCLUDED IN SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISCAL POLICY STUDY OF CURRENT WELFARE BENEFITS

State (or other State-level jurisdiction)	County (or other local jurisdiction)	Pages in report showing benefits as of July 1972 ¹
Alabama	Jefferson	68-9
Arizona	Pima	70-1
Arkansas	Saline	72-3
California	Alameda	76-7
	Contra Costa	90-1
	Fresno	92-3
	Kern	96-7
	Los Angeles	74-5
	Orange	86-7
	Riverside	84-5
	Sacramento	88-9
	San Bernardino	78-9
	San Diego	82-3
	San Francisco	80-1
	Santa Clara	100-1
	Shasta	98-9
	Ventura	102-3
Colorado	Denver	104-5
	Pueblo	106-7
Connecticut	Hartford	108-9
Delaware	New Castle	110-1
District of Columbia	Washington (city)	112-3
Florida	Dade	114-5
	Duval	116-7
	Orange	122-3
Georgia	Burke	118-9
	Fullton	120-1
	Richmond	124-5
	Telfair	126-7
Illinois	Cook	130-1
	Hancock	128-9
	Tazewell	132-3
Indiana	Lake	134-5
Iowa	Taylor	136-7
Kansas	Leavenworth	140-1
Kentucky	Calloway	138-9
	Letcher	144-5
Louisiana	Iberville (parish)	142-3
	Orleans (parish)	146-7
	Vermilion (parish)	148-9
Maine	Kennebec	150-1
Maryland	Baltimore (city)	152-3
Massachusetts	Essex	154-5
	Middlesex	158-9
	Plymouth	156-7
	Suffolk	160-1
Michigan	Gogebic	162-3
	Monroe	164-5
	Washtenaw	166-7
	Wayne	168-9
Minnesota	Dakota	170-1
	Hennepin	172-3
Mississippi	Bolivar	174-5
	Tippah	176-7
Missouri	Pemiscot	178-9
	St. Louis (city)	180-1
New Jersey	Bergen	182-3
	Camden	184-5
	Essex	186-7
	Hudson	188-9
	Morris	190-1
New Mexico	Bernalillo	192-3
New York	Albany	194-5
	Erie	196-7
	Monroe	198-9
	Nassau	200-1
	New York City	202-3
	Rensselaer	204-5
	Suffolk	206-7
North Carolina	Haywood	208-9
Ohio	Cuyahoga	210-1
	Franklin	212-3
	Guernsey	214-5
	Montgomery	216-7
Oklahoma	Tulsa	218-9
Oregon	Lane	220-1
	Multnomah	222-3
Pennsylvania	Allegheny	224-5
	Dauphin	226-7
	Lehigh	228-9
	Philadelphia	230-1
	York	232-3
Puerto Rico	Caguas (municipio)	234-5
	Ponce (municipio)	236-7
Rhode Island	Providence	238-9
South Carolina	Beaufort	240-1
South Dakota	Shannon	242-3
Tennessee	Hamilton	244-5
	Shelby	246-7
Texas	Bezar	250-1
	Dallas	248-9
	Hale	252-3
	Harris	254-5
	San Patricio	256-7
Virginia	Dickenson	258-9
	Richmond (city)	260-1
Washington	King	262-3
	Snohomish	264-5
West Virginia	Lincoln	266-7
Wisconsin	Milwaukee	268-9

For aid in reading tables, see pp. 63-66 of the report.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISCAL POLICY

House of Representatives

Martha W. Griffiths (D-Mich.), Chairman; Richard Bolling (D-Mo.), Hugh L. Carey (D-N.Y.), William B. Widnall (R-N.J.), Barber B. Conable, Jr. (R-N.Y.).

Senate

William Proxmire (D-Wis.), Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr. (D-Tex.), Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.), Richard S. Schweiker (R-Pa.).

BRADEMAS HAILS RETURN OF CIVILIAN GOVERNMENT TO GREECE

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives are aware, I am the first native American of Greek origin elected to Congress.

It has been a cause of deep distress to me not only as one of Greek descent but as an American to see the country of my father's birth and, in the phrase so familiar to us all, the cradle of democracy, controlled by successive military juntas.

As I observed in the House on Monday, in my view, the current crisis between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus is in large part the consequence of the continued failure of the Nixon administration to come to grips with the dangers to the strength of the Western Alliance of the continuation in Greece of a military dictatorship.

I am, accordingly, delighted at the announcement yesterday of the resignation of the military government of Greece and its replacement by former Premier Constantine Caramanlis as head of a civilian government.

This is great good news for the people of Greece and those who love freedom everywhere.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Caramanlis was Premier of Greece from 1955 to 1963. I know him and have talked with him in Paris during his exile there. Mr. Caramanlis is a man of integrity and ability, with a deep commitment to free political institutions.

I hope that the Government of the United States will not hesitate to support him and the civilian government which, according to the reports today, he has been invited to lead.

In a time, Mr. Speaker, when much of the news for democracy is discouraging, the fall of the military dictatorship in Greece and the coming into power of civilian leaders who are committed to parliamentary institutions is a breath of fresh air.

Let us all hope that the cease-fire on Cyprus will be observed and that the governments of both Greece and Turkey will restrain themselves from any further actions that could provoke new outbreaks of violence.

And, Mr. Speaker, to reiterate, I hope that the United States will respond swiftly and unequivocally to these dramatic developments in Greece and Cyprus by making clear our strong support for free and democratic governments in both countries.

THE NATIONAL PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the testimony before the Subcommittee on International Trade made clear the urgent need for the following:

First. Protection of American labor and industry against unfair competition from the nonfree and slave labor of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries.

Second. Assurance that the security of the United States is not endangered by transfer of U.S. technology and capital equipment to those Communist governments.

Third. Reassertion of the constitutionally assigned congressional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce.

When we consider H.R. 15264, I will introduce an amendment, in the nature of a substitute. The title of the amendment is the National Protection Act. Its purpose:

First. Prevent the exportation and re-exportation of American technology, capital equipment, scientific accomplishments and agricultural commodities to nonmarket economy countries and unfriendly governments.

Second. Prevent the exportation of such products by American subsidiaries operating abroad to nonmarket economy countries and unfriendly governments.

For the information of my colleagues, I am introducing the full text of the National Protection Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLACKBURN TO H.R. 15264

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "National Protection Act".

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 (50 U.S.C. App. 2401) is amended by striking out paragraphs (3) and (4).

SEC. 3. Section 3 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 (50 U.S.C. App. 2402) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) thereof by striking out "countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations, except those countries with which such trade has been determined by the President to be against the national interest" and inserting "market economy countries and friendly nations (except nonmarket economy countries)";

(2) in paragraph (2) thereof by inserting "unfair competition or" immediately before "the excessive drain", by striking out "significantly", by striking out "and to fulfill its international responsibilities", by striking out "and" immediately before "(C)", and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (D) to the extent appropriate to retaliate against a nation or group of nations which have unreasonably restricted United States access to their supply of a particular commodity";

(3) in paragraph (3) thereof by striking out "and" immediately before "(B)" and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (C) to deal with world shortages of particular commodities, whenever feasible, through international cooperation with the major suppliers and consumers of such commodities, rather than by taking unilateral actions";

(4) in paragraph (5) thereof by inserting "either military or economic potential of those governments which may threaten the

security or economy of the United States or which has the effect of furthering or supporting" immediately after "furthering or supporting";

(5) in paragraph (6) thereof by striking out "representatives of appropriate United States Government agencies and qualified experts from private industry." and inserting "two members (who may not be from the same political party) of each of the following committees: the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce 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."; and

(6) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) It is the policy of the United States that the encouragement of exports is a secondary consideration and that the primary concerns of the United States are national security considerations and considerations regarding possible harm to the American economy from unfair competition arising out of United States exports used in combination with slave and semislave labor within non-market economy countries."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 (50 U.S.C. App. 2403) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to carry out this Act and to effectuate the policies enumerated in section 3."

(2) by striking out subsections (b) and (d); and

(3) by redesignating subsections (c) and (e) as subsections (b) and (c) respectively.

SEC. 5. (a) (1) The first sentence of section 5(a) of the Export Administration Act of 1969 (50 U.S.C. App. 2404(a)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and from two members (who may not be from the same political party) of each of the following committees: the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce 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".

(2) The second sentence of such section 5(a) is repealed.

(b) (1) The first sentence of section 5(b) of the Export Administration Act of 1969 (50 U.S.C. App. 2404(b)) is amended by inserting "except in cases which involve national security or threat to the national economy, or both" immediately before the period at the end thereof.

(2) The second sentence of such section 5(b) is repealed.

(c) Section 5(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1969 (50 U.S.C. App. 2404(c)) is repealed.

SEC. 6. Section 14 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is amended by striking

out "1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "1977".

QUESTION OF INFLATION

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, it is astounding to me that a Member of the House since the 80th Congress, and a Rhodes scholar, would have to visit the supermarket to discover that we are in an inflationary period. Yet that is what he told us last Thursday.

I also find it astonishing that this same man, who has voted in the House of Representatives since 1947, and has seen many periods of economic worry come and go, should point the finger of blame at the administration. A recent Harris poll indicated that nearly half the American people believe the Federal Government is no longer wise enough, or competent enough, to avert a major recession. Surely it is not our job to feed their wariness and disgust by bickering amongst ourselves as to whose fault inflation is. I am not standing here to indict or defend this or any other administration, and I would hope that none of my colleagues would so demean themselves, or our Government.

Economic instability and loss of public confidence are the fruits we are reaping for ignoring the fundamental principles of sound fiscal policy. Inflation did not come to visit us like a spirit in the night, from some mysterious source. It began right here in the Congress, with our inability to hold Federal expenditures in line with our revenues.

Massive Federal deficits, once the popular crash solution to sluggish business, now roost permanently in our economic life, in good times as well as bad. Even amidst the heady expansion of 1973, the Government found itself writing in red ink in figures over \$14 billion. In 3 out of the last 6 years, Federal deficits approached and passed the \$25 billion mark.

This record has caused results which required no crystal ball to foresee: huge Federal borrowing on commercial loan markets has pushed interest rates to unprecedented highs, while the Federal Reserve, struggling to maintain liquidity under the load of this borrowing, has expanded credit, fanning the flames of inflation. Caught in a continual upsurge of prices, both businessmen and consumers now plan around the anticipation of future inflation. Consumers speed up the purchase of durables, thinking the price may rise later; labor unions demand ever higher wages, to protect their membership from the apparently unsanforized dollar.

If we are to reverse this process, we

can no longer excuse a bloated, gluttonous budget by claiming that three-fourths of it is uncontrollable. An uncontrolled budget means an uncontrolled economy, and that we cannot tolerate any further.

We were told, last Thursday, that the Congress has stayed within 1 percent of the President's recommended expenditures—but that is a misleading statistic. Dealing with our present huge figures, a mere six-tenths of a percent increase in Federal spending as a percentage of the gross national product represents an average annual increase of \$6.6 billion. And, if you can shrug at that, then let us ask what the Congress has done to cut Federal spending—nothing. How many of our Members who voted not to increase the debt ceiling have voted in favor of massive appropriations bills? More than 90, I would be willing to bet.

The gross Federal debt has grown steadily from \$270.8 billion in 1954 to an estimated \$505.5 billion for 1974. More important, interest on the public debt has risen much faster than the debt itself. So we may summarize the trend of Federal fiscal policy as one of constantly increasing expenditures, which have long since caught up with and passed population growth, and affluence.

The Government continues to engage in more programs and services at the Federal level. Obviously, this takes more and more money, and it appears that little or no thought is being given to exactly where our priorities lie.

One of our recent priorities, it seems, was the funding of the International Development Association to the tune of \$1½ billion. When each of you who voted for that bill visit your districts, what do you tell your constituents? That they now have the right to own gold? How many of them could afford to buy gold, even to fill their teeth. But every one of them will share in the repayment of that \$1½ billion. They cannot afford a home mortgage, yet we tell them that, through our outrageously increased deficit spending, they can afford to finance projects halfway around the world.

Or, let us consider the Consumer Protection Agency—in this inflationary period, with its attendant disillusionment on the part of the American public, can we seriously expect the average consumer to believe that, by spending \$50 million, we are decreasing the cost of living to him? I think not.

And how about a bill we are presently considering? The strip mining bill, which will cost \$10 million in Federal assistance to States in the first year—and \$200,000 in research institute expenditures, in the first year. These figures are estimates, and nowhere in the bill is there even an estimate for administrative costs. Can it really be considered a priority expense for the Federal Government to subsidize research, duplicating an effort which is already being performed by the States? Is this wise fiscal policy in an inflationary period?

I have said before, and will say again and again that the answer to our spiraling inflation lies with the Congress as does the responsibility to put that answer into practice. What we need is strong leadership. Our leaders should demand

fiscal responsibility; demand cuts in appropriations by committees. We should have a constitutional amendment to require a balanced Federal budget. If no appropriation could be made in excess of the estimated revenue of the country in any given fiscal year, then there could not be this deficit spending. And, while the recuperation period for our chronically sick economy might be a long, tough one, its eventual return to full health through fiscal sanity would be well worth the effort.

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

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, inflation must be blamed on the Congress as well as the executive branch.

Some statistics will illustrate the problem quite well. In 1962, the Federal budget passed the \$100-billion mark for the first time. A scant 9 years later, in 1971, we passed \$200 billion. Now, for 1975, we face a budget of \$300 billion. Gentlemen, this is not the stock market. This is Federal spending. Money that we collect from the taxpayers. Spending is the direct cause of inflation. When you triple spending in 13 years, especially when you do it with deficit financing, you are the cause of the inflation which is robbing our citizens.

The people of this country are not fools. In just 2 years we will celebrate the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution—a revolution caused by excessive taxation. Today, the total bite out of every working person's paycheck for local, State, and Federal spending is 44 percent. That means the average person works the first 2¼ days of every week just to pay the cost of Government programs.

How long can we expect the average person to pay for such foolishness? The taxpayer gives more than a third of his paycheck to the Government, and the Government, through its economic policies, discounts the other two-thirds at the rate of 10 percent a year or more in inflation.

I tell you, if we do not take more care to listen to what the taxpayers are saying, they are going to send us a message we will not forget at the next election.

We have passed the budget reform act. Now we must make it work. Only if we limit spending can we control inflation.

A situation where the Congress blames the Executive and the Executive blames the Congress will do nothing for the American people. What will do is a firm resolve how to end runaway spending and restore fiscal sanity in Washington.

The American people are awaiting our decision.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank my old friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) for his participation in this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and for taking this special order today. I am only sorry that if I were to look up into

the press gallery, which I would not do, I am sure I would see that it was empty, because all of the members of the press are more concerned about the latest television show that will be going on the air tonight, and are not at all interested in something that will have an effect upon and impact on the American people.

Webster says that inflation is strictly an expansion of the money supply. One of the biggest mythologies that is promoted by our great liberal leadership of this country is that rising prices cause inflation. That is just mythology. Rising prices are the result of spiraling inflation. Inflation is causing a watered-down money supply just like pouring water in the soup. What we have done in this Congress during the past 40 years has been disgraceful to the American people as we have printed more and more and more I O U nothings—and I might say to the gentleman in the well that if he or I were to get a printing press and start printing money like they do at the Federal Reserve down on Independence Avenue at 14th Street at the Treasury Department we would be thrown in prison for counterfeiting, but because of the legal tender laws the Government is allowed to print that legally.

I hold in my hand here a 10,000 mark note that represented the life savings of a factory worker in Germany, much like those of a factory worker in America. This was some 54 years ago in Germany, and it represented this worker's life savings, and it was worth at one time \$8,700, but in 1923 it was worth nothing.

I wonder how long it will take us at the rate we are going to have the dollar hit zero, just as the German mark did in 1923?

We are on a very, very precipitous course toward the day of reckoning when all things, all debts, will have to come home to roost.

That is one of the reasons that the interest rates are going up, as the gentleman in the well says. The gentleman in the well pointed out that there are too many loans out, too many notes being sold, too much Government debt being put on the money market forcing interest rates up.

We have to come back to the reality that 2 plus 2 is 4, and not 22. We also have to come back to the reality that prices are set by the demands of goods and services produced by the people of this country going into the money supply, and that is where prices come from.

Legislation like we are discussing on the strip mining bill will only further and further make the pricing system of this country make prices go up, and thus it will be harder and harder to produce the goods and services in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman for the stance he has taken in this 93d Congress, for his consistent conservative voting record in voting against the irrationality of big Government spending programs which are doing nothing but keeping the working American taxpayer away from a fair shake.

I think it is high time that the Members of this House take their constitutional responsibility to heart, and that is to control the spending bills and con-

trol the spending, and start setting the policy like a group of men rather than running home and promising programs, and then only coming back to Washington to pay for them through deficit spending instead of overtly going to the public and asking them for the necessary taxes to pay for those programs.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from California, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind the recent suggestion that we combat current economic problems by expanding Federal spending is tantamount to treating diabetes with cotton candy. Or to return to wage and price controls is like using a muzzle to treat lockjaw. It is antiquated economic theory held over from the 1930's and still championed by those who sold us social security as a low cost saviour of the Nation's elderly. We, the American people, have followed the spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect approach to where we are today.

This spring when the results of my annual constituent questionnaire came in, the people made their point perfectly clear: Cut spending. By and large the majority favored cuts in social programs, but a plurality also favored looking to the defense budget as a source of savings. I have honored their decision, and will continue to do so. They are right.

Our economy is bloated with excess spending. It is not all excess Federal spending. Plastic consumer money, the ubiquitous credit card, is also involved. We may not be able to do much about the latter, but we can do something about the former by balancing the budget and not dumping another \$9 or \$10 billion into the already bloated economy. This much we can do, but it will take some guts.

The distinguished majority leader in the other body has suggested the possibility of dealing also with consumer credit. That is also tough medicine, and we should consider that too.

The problem is inflation. The way to deal with inflation is with antiinflationary medicine and that means reducing the number of excess dollars available to buy the goods and services available for sale. We can do that best by reducing our contribution to the excess. We must also encourage the production for sale of goods and services. We do not need, we certainly do not need renewed economic stagnation legislation such as that of phases one through four. All that did was create shortages.

To give an example of how wage and price controls do not work, let us look at home canning, "putting up" fruits and vegetables. During World War II we had controls and they worked. The costs to the manufacturers of canning containers were controlled and their prices were controlled. So was their production. In fact, sizes were standardized—the 63 millimeter container. It all worked because production, in addition to wages and prices were controlled. But when we tried to adapt the economics of the 1940's

to the situation in the 1970's, we did it by controlling only wages and prices, not production. None other than Chester Bowles, wartime OPA Administrator, pointed out the folly of this selective application of a only part of a once-effective system.

Now, I submit if this body wants to grandstand with economic controls, there is no point in going back to something that did not work because it could not work. We can not blame the administration for the failure of wage and price controls. They were doomed at birth. I would oppose resumed controls in any event, but suggest that if those favoring controls are sincere they should come forward with legislation that controls wages, prices, and production. That would mean their saying: First, thou shalt be paid no more than x dollars for thy work, second, thou shalt charge no more than y dollars for thy products, and third, thou shalt produce z number of things meeting thy Government's specifications.

We must also improve our national productivity, the share of goods and services produced relative to what goes into production in the form of labor and materials. That means cutting down on nonproductive spending, the kind that goes toward completing septuplicate Government reports that are seldom, if ever, constructively utilized. That means dealing with the problem of 5 or more million aliens illegally in this country taking jobs from citizens and creating more demand than supply of goods and services. That means encouraging production of consumer goods and services rather than discouraging it.

But it does not seem sensible to me to grandstand by penalizing the productive element in society, and by reimposing economic stagnation legislation. We should ignore complaints about unemployment coming from anyone who is not simultaneously pushing for a solution to the illegal alien problem. We should ignore complaints about inflation coming from those who propose inflationary budget deficits.

The time for burying the economic theories of the 1930's and 1940's is at hand. They have flunked the course in the 1970's. It is time to balance our budget and let the American economy provide jobs for Americans.

That is why I have urged the President to seize the only initiative that can lead to a balanced budget for fiscal 1975: namely, to veto the entire series of appropriations bills that we send to him. If he will take this bold and unprecedented action, it will then be possible for the Congress to consider these spending bills en bloc and cut them back to fit the available revenues. Forty-two colleagues have joined in supporting this fiscally responsible approach.

Strong medicine must be taken because there is no other way to cut the fever and ease the pain of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in thanking the gentleman from California for taking the initiative here today to provide this special order so that we can discuss these theories that were ad-

vanced on the floor of the House quite recently.

Mr. KETCHUM. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. I particularly appreciate the letter on which I was a cosigner is making suggestions to the President.

I now recognize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE).

Mr. LANDGREBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to congratulate the gentleman from California for taking this special order. I wish to associate myself with the comments he made in response to the Speaker's charges last week that our Nation is on the brink of a great depression. Let me say, however, that I see no signs of a great depression or a recession in our country.

Rail carloadings are breaking new records. Delivery time on new trucks, farm equipment, and manufacturing machinery is now backlogged many, many months, and in some cases years. In fact, with the annual expenditures of the Vietnam war reduced by more than \$30 billion, with thousands of jobs awaiting the willing hand in the marketplace, there can be absolutely no plausible explanation for the wasteful spending, the pump-priming, and the spending for spending's sake.

Government spending, Government intervention is our problem. Inflation is the result. Chaos and instability will be our ultimate lot if this Congress fails to accept its responsibility now and balance the budget by holding the line on spending and taking the shackles off of the marketplace.

Again I wish to thank the gentleman for taking this special order.

Mr. KETCHUM. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Mr. Speaker, I now recognize the gentleman from California, my friend (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from California, BILL KETCHUM, for taking this special order today to give us an opportunity to remind Congress of the role it has played in fueling the inflation machinery.

It is Congress that has the constitutional responsibility for appropriating tax dollars, and controlling the level of the public debt. And it is Congress that has ignored the impact these actions have on the inflationary spiral.

Deficit spending over the last 10 years—that is, from fiscal year 1964 through fiscal year 1974—amounts to nearly \$181 billion, and the July 3, 1974, report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures estimates that the deficit for fiscal year 1975 will be over \$20 billion. To quote from the respected chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman GEORGE MAHON:

No government, not even the richest on earth, can continue to overspend or under-tax by multi-billions of dollars nearly every year and still not eventually plunge itself into financial disaster.

A good case in point is the bill (H.R. 15580) this House recently passed which would appropriate \$33,156,541,000 for the

Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare in fiscal year 1975. Final passage of this measure was supported by 329 Members of this body. In addition, the House Committee report on H.R. 15580 estimated that the budget requests not considered in this legislation because the authorizing legislation had not yet been enacted total \$4,648,293,000. This addition would push the grand total for appropriations in this fiscal year for Labor-Health, Education and Welfare up to nearly \$38 billion, an increase of almost \$10 billion over the fiscal year 1974 appropriation.

Another good example of an area where Congress must bear the responsibility for excessive Federal spending is "backdoor" authority. From fiscal year 1969 through fiscal year 1974, Congress has added \$31,026,000,000 in "backdoor" budget authority to the President's budget requests. This "backdoor" budget authority includes debt authority or borrowing authority, contract authority, and permanent authority; for example, interest on the public debt, revenue sharing, and social security benefits. As we all know, "backdoor" authority has added billions of dollars to outlays which have not been provided for through the appropriations process.

Even the so-called relatively uncontrollable outlays which are estimated to be 73.5 percent of fiscal year 1975 spending are only uncontrollable when considered in relation to current laws, laws which were voted on and approved by Congress.

Congress must clearly share the responsibility for the inflationary machine. Most economists generally agree that the continued trend to increase Federal spending for goods and services financed through heavy deficits, coupled with the Federal Reserve Board's creation of new money, is the primary inflationary pressure in our economy. It is the deficit spending financed by increases in the money supply that allows Government to spend in excess of revenues, and thereby make more money available in the public sector.

Congress has the responsibility for the appropriations process, and Congress has the responsibility for approving legislation containing "backdoor" authority. If we are truly concerned about inflation, we have the constitutional means to bring it under control. It is irresponsible to try to pass the buck to the administration for our own weaknesses. Just 2 months ago the Speaker of this body cast the tie-breaking vote in favor of legislation increasing the public debt limit to \$495 billion.

It is going to take the full cooperation of both the executive and legislative branches of Government to ease the burden of inflation on the American people. It is not the blame that is important but the results.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM) for providing Members with this opportunity to discuss the excessive level of spending by the Federal Govern-

ment. It is an important service which he renders through this colloquy.

Only when we affix responsibility for this excessive spending, can we begin an active program to stop it.

Government spending has been out of control for years—perhaps, for decades. Almost everyone knew it, but too few were either willing to admit it or willing to put a ceiling on it. But the rhetoric of those who decried this spending was not always matched adequately with votes against it. We are seeing, thankfully, a decided change in that posture, at least to the extent that national leadership is now saying, even publicly, that this spending must stop.

Unfortunately, this debate has been characterized by too many pointing the finger of blame at some institution other than their own. The Congress says the President is to blame; the President says the Congress is to blame. Both say the demands of various economic constituencies—seeking benefits from Government—are to blame. There is more than a grain of truth in each of those assertions, however, and that fact must be recognized and reckoned with, if we are to get this spending under control.

Last week, a distinguished chairman of one of this House's most powerful committees dispatched a telegram to the President, asking him to exercise leadership on this issue, including proposing cuts in the budget and even impounding funds which are in excess of spending requests. I think each of us needs to call upon the President—as the originator of fiscal requests through his Office of Management and Budget and as the executor of our laws—to exercise stronger leadership on this matter. But, the President does not bear the responsibility alone, and we should not try to pass the whole question over to him.

The Congress has the power to make cuts in both budget requests and in actual appropriations. We should exercise it, not simply call upon the President to make those difficult decisions as to which program will be cut and which will not.

The Congress has the power to authorize the President in each instance of spending to withhold the obligation of appropriated funds in the interest of holding down spending and protecting the solidity of the dollar. We should exercise that statutory power, conferring to him thereby adequate discretionary authority. This is certainly preferable to recommending outright impoundments, practices which have been frequently overturned by the courts and are themselves, stop gaps for ineffective congressional action.

The Congress has the inherent power—in its constitutional power to tax and to appropriate money—to determine national priorities—what programs are so essential that they ought to be funded before others. We should exercise that power, instead of "passing the buck" on such a hard-nose decision to the President, letting him take the abuse of those who feel adversely affected by his determination of such priorities.

This is not to say, however, that the President should not be held fully accountable for those particularly spend-

ing and fiscal responsibilities which rest with the Executive.

It is within the Executive that the budget is formulated and initial decisions made as to which departments and agencies should receive which level of funds. It is there also that the decisions are made on which new programs to recommend to the Congress, or which existing ones be revamped or terminated.

It is there that the basic decisions on the level of personnel within the departments and agencies are made—one of the largest factors on the budget.

And, of great importance, it is there—in the Presidency—that the people's attention customarily focuses on economic problems. The President can command the attention of the people, the economic constituencies, and the Congress—particularly those who are ready, willing, and able to stand behind the President in making some major cuts in the level of spending—in getting us on the right track.

Everyone is going to have to understand that unless all of us are willing to tighten our belts by living with less government spending that we are inviting the dislocation of the entire economy.

I think it is far better to take a little hurt now than to run the unavoidable risk of a major disaster at some point down the road.

It is for this reason that I believe a joint effort is going to be required. The President is going to have to make some specific proposals to the Congress—not just some vague jawboning—on programs on which he thinks we should make cuts. He is going to have to threaten vetoes of excessive spending bills in order to discourage the big-spenders in Congress. He is going to have to direct his department and agency heads—and OMB—and the Federal Reserve Board—to hold the line on all spending and to take immediate measures to alleviate our economic condition.

It is for this reason that I have appealed to him yesterday, by letter, to take these steps. The text of that letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1974.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President of the United States, The
White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the past several weeks, the Nation has become more acutely aware of the serious economic problems confronting us and of the necessity of national leadership—the Executive, the Congress, and the private sector—taking decisive action to help restore among the people a confidence in our economy.

I do not believe, as some would infer, that the responsibility for our present economic problems lies solely with the Executive, nor do I believe it lies with the Congress alone. There is a mutual, joint responsibility to care for the taxpayers interests which, in my opinion, has not been exercised adequately by either branch during recent years. It took our country 185 years to get to an annual spending level of \$100 billion, but it took only 9 years more to double that to the \$200 billion level, and then only 4 more years to reach the \$300 billion level. This simply cannot continue, if we are to preserve and expand our private enterprise economy.

The time has come for specific plans of action, not mere words. If we do not move aggressively to stop excessive government

spending and the adverse economic results which have flowed from that spending, particularly double-digit inflation and a tight credit market, we cannot expect the people to have confidence in the economic future.

There are many of us, Mr. President, in the Congress who are committed to holding the line on spending, but we are in the minority. Our efforts can be reinforced only when the Executive shows a clear determination to hold down spending too.

I take this opportunity to associate myself with the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. Mills of Arkansas, in his call of last week for you to veto all bills which appropriate funds in excess of your budget request, to submit a supplemental budget message providing for a reduction in projected Fiscal Year 1975 spending of at least \$10 billion, and to withhold the obligation of appropriated funds in excess of the initial budget requests. These measures would show a clear intent on the part of your Administration to bolster the economy and to avert most of the imbalances existing in the economy today.

In addition to these measures called for by Mr. Mills, I believe strongly that you should submit only a balanced budget to the Congress for Fiscal Year 1976 and that you should persuade the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System that there should be no additional increase in money supply which is not coupled with a prior, equal increase in national productivity. These measures would help lessen the inflationary spiral immeasurably, for our economic history shows inflation to be directly related to both government spending and the issuance of paper money behind which stands no like increase in productivity.

I cannot help but feel that over the coming years our economic solidarity would be best served by instituting a specific constitutional or statutory mechanism limiting the government's share of the people's income to a fixed percentage of gross national personal income. Government takes more and more from taxpayers each year, as a percentage of their income. We simply cannot continue to move forward with economic progress, while assuring the sanctity of our political and economic freedoms, when government takes ever-increasing shares of the people's labors—their incomes. The Office of the Presidency, as the Nation's principal voice on economic affairs, would be an appropriate place to launch anew an effort to control spending through control of revenue from which that spending comes.

If the Executive and the Congress work together in resolving this issue, we can be successful. If we do not, we should be held fully accountable by the people for the turmoil which will ensue.

Sincerely,

JACK KEMP.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time, Congress must hold the line on authorizations and on spending. We should not enact any bill—authorization or spending—which commits more money than that requested by the President's budget—as proposed to be scaled down by him.

And, we must tell the people how important it is to hold the line—that in meeting the separate demands of individual economic and fiscal constituencies—no matter how well deserved—that taken as a whole we invite the collapse of the economy because of the total aggregate spending which arises from those separate measures. We cannot expect the people to tighten their belts unless we are willing to do likewise; therefore, I think the President and the Congress must show the people that we are.

The situation today is so closely analogous to the late 1920's as to be startling. Instead of everyone saying the other guy is to blame, we had better all row together. I, for one, want no role in policies which invite a repeat of 1929 and all which followed. We can avoid a calamity. We can avoid even a recession. But only if we take action and do it now. We have a chance to start that process, and there is no more better a time to do it than today.

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM) in his discussion on inflation and our national economy.

There is no doubt that inflation is our No. 1 issue. Consumers all over the country are worried about the runaway rise in prices and the skyrocketing cost of living. The high cost of borrowing money has made it practically impossible for young families to buy homes. Inflation is certainly our most serious domestic problem, the one people are most concerned about. It has been called the cruellest tax of all because it decreases the earning power of the worker and pulls down the living standard of those who live on fixed incomes in their older or disabled years.

In assessing the blame for the present economic conditions, the Congress must share the responsibility as well as the executive branch. It is the Congress which controls the purse strings and in the past 44 years, annual Federal spending has increased from \$4 billion to a proposed \$305 billion. In the same period, the average bite of earnings that the Government takes from taxpayers has jumped substantially, cutting deeply into spendable income levels of consumers.

The Government role in fueling inflation can also be seen by the amassing of \$218 billion in budget deficits and the addition of \$234 billion to the national debt in the last 20 years.

The most effective action that could be taken to slow inflation and reduce interest rates would be to cut Government spending and stop the borrowing that is necessary because of budget deficits. In this connection many months ago I submitted a bill (H.R. 7154) to require the Federal Government to operate on the basis of a balanced budget except in times of congressionally declared emergencies, and to make systematic payments on the national debt. Others have introduced similar bills, but so far we have not been able to get a hearing on the proposal.

While this Congress has passed the Budget and Impoundment Control Act, we still await the delayed proposal to reform the House committee structure. Little will be accomplished toward balancing the budget if several committees still have jurisdiction in the same areas and propose spending measures that overlap in function. Committee reform should be put on the list of "must" action.

It is my hope that the Congress will take these steps. It is certainly not in the best interest of our Nation to let a situation develop whereby the Congress blames the Executive and the Executive blames the Congress.

We must work together to solve the problems of inflation. The American people

are awaiting our decisions and they are ready to help us in our effort. They are suffering and sacrificing in this inflation spiral and they are looking to us for help in this struggle.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, this House heard a commentary on the Nation's economic problems, led by the distinguished Speaker of this Chamber. He was joined in this commentary by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Thus, I believe it is reasonable to conclude that the opinions and policies expressed by these men constitute the opinions and policies of the majority party as it is represented in this body. I am sad to observe that these opinions and policies represent nothing new, and are in fact just a rehash of the same programs of a bygone era which brought us to our present difficulties.

The reporter writing on business and economic matters for the Baltimore Sun observed recently that the biggest game going in Washington these days is the mad rush to point fingers at virtually anyone else in an effort to avoid blame for inflation. This reporter's own opinion was that there is more than enough blame to go around; that no one has an exclusive claim to causing the problem. I think he is right, and proof of his theory was in ample supply in this Chamber last Thursday. Majority party leaders spent considerable energy deploring what the Speaker termed "Republican economic theory," conveniently ignoring their own prominent role in creating our present economic problems.

By the peculiar definition of the gentleman from Oklahoma, GOP economic policy boils down to tight credit and high unemployment. Such a contention is absurd, and the gentleman knows it. But it does make us look like heartless ogres, and so serves a purpose of sorts come November.

I am glad my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM) has organized the special order on this subject here this evening. It is time the record was set straight. The principal source of inflationary pressure in the country today is this Capitol building. The cause is excessive Federal spending and horrendous budget deficits, both of which could be halted by this Congress if a majority of us could assemble the courage to stop promising so much to so many at the taxpayer's expense.

As I said earlier, there is plenty of blame to go around. I am sorry to have to note that an administration of my party has played a significant role in running up more than \$100 billion in deficits since 1969. Its efforts at holding down spending have been too sporadic to be effective. But "administration policy" and "Republican policy" are not one in the same. A majority of the Republican Members of this House have protested excessive budgetary recommendations by the President in the past, and have voted our convictions on numerous occasions even when it meant opposing the White House position.

But the administration just does not deserve all the credit. The Democratic

Speaker of the House, in proposing his own "solutions" to the Nation's economic problems, offered a series of programs which would exacerbate those problems, not solve them.

"The answer," he said with a straight face, "is obviously an income policy." That, for the uneducated, is a euphemism for economic controls. And we all know how well economic controls worked between 1971 and 1973. How does the Speaker justify dragging out this completely discredited method of "dealing" with inflation? By complaining that "the administration has rendered it ineffective."

Economic controls are "ineffective," all right, but it is not the administration's fault. Economic controls were doomed to failure from the first because they cannot possibly work under any circumstances. They attack symptoms, not causes of inflation. But that simple truth seems persistently to escape my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Economic controls were a disaster for this Nation because controls, no matter how they are administered, can only cause severe distortions in the economy, the effects of which last long after controls are lifted. Controls cannot solve inflation because they have no effect on the Government's budgetary excesses or deficits, nor do they affect monetary policy in the slightest.

Controls are merely cosmetic surgery, but it is surgery which carries with it side effects of the most serious and debilitating sort for the Nation's economy. If this is the Democratic "solution" to our economic problems, we are all in serious trouble indeed.

Finally, the Speaker concluded by recommending a series of proposals which would, you guessed it, cost more money! Lots of money! And he did not even mention a program proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) in concert with his friend, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), a health scheme which would add some \$13 billion to the Federal budget, at the most conservative estimate. This free-spending attitude on the part of the majority in this Congress is at the real root of our inflationary problems. The propensity to establish dozens of new programs each year, which require progressively higher appropriations in succeeding years to satisfy ravenous bureaucratic appetites, can be laid at the doorstep of the majority party almost exclusively. Truly, the orgy of finger pointing witnessed in this Chamber last Thursday was a classic case of the pot calling the kettle black.

James Madison once wrote:

In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.

Mr. Speaker, we have managed quite well to control the governed. The latter half of Madison's equation remains unfulfilled.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is reeling from the sharpest price increases in American history. Runaway

prices have caused severe hardship for millions of Americans, particularly the elderly and others on fixed incomes.

Even worse hardship is yet to come. And our economic and political system may be toppled unless Congress comes to its senses.

Leaders of agriculture, labor, and business, as well as scholars and politicians, have finally realized what consumers have long known: the situation is getting out of control.

Economists fear permanent damage to the Nation's financial structure, savings institutions are shaky; the public is rapidly losing confidence in the ability of our political system to cope with the situation; the Chairman of the Federal Reserve cautions that steep inflationary trends such as we are now experiencing cause disillusionment and discontent. He warns:

The ultimate consequence of inflation could well be a significant decline of economic and political freedom for the American people.

But Congress has repeatedly ignored these warnings or, worse yet, answered with superficial responses and illogical solutions.

Panic is beginning to spread across the Nation. Congress has precious little time to correct past mistakes and reestablish policies which will prevent an economic collapse or worse.

Considering the seriousness of our present situation, I am deeply disturbed by remarks of the Speaker of the House on July 18. The Speaker blames President Nixon for mismanaging the economy. Certainly he is entitled to criticize. I, myself, have often disagreed with the President's economic policies and have never hesitated to criticize the sometimes illogical policies of the administration, as my colleagues know.

But mere criticism is not enough—certainly it is no substitute for effective leadership. The Speaker's statement underscores the lack of such leadership and congressional preoccupation with the President. Day after day on issues affecting the national economy, and on other issues, Members of Congress whine about the President's actions or inactions.

Ladies and gentlemen, in heaven's name, are we hypnotized by the President? Do we think our mission as Members of Congress is no more than to advise or criticize the President?

We are the Congress. We are the architects of policy for this Nation. It is for us—for Congress, not the President—to formulate policy decisions for this Nation.

Congress has caused inflation. Congress must reverse the trend.

Although many factors have contributed to rising prices, the primary cause has become increasingly obvious—excessive Government spending.

Year by year, by decades of unbalanced budgets, Congress has fostered increasingly serious economic dislocations. For a time, some people thought the consequences of excessive Government spending could be avoided; and others thought inflation could be managed or held to a minimum; a few may have even thought the risk was worth taking.

But as the rate of inflation has risen, almost everyone has come to realize the human, as well as economic, cost of inflation and how it threatens the stability of our society. Obviously, something must be done.

Will Congress come to grips with inflation before the situation goes completely out of control—as it has already done in other countries?

This Congress still has a chance, possibly the last clear chance, to restore sound financial policies to our Government and thereby avoid panic inflation and the consequences: reckless speculation, bank failures, joblessness, civil unrest, the ultimate breakdown of our system itself—as Dr. Burns has warned.

Clearly, the Federal Government is spending too much. Not too much for the appetite of program administrators; possibly not too much, or even enough, as measured by the needs of people to be served and the value of worthwhile programs. But more than we can continue to spend without ruinous inflation, higher taxes or both. More than we can continue to spend without permanent damage to our national economy.

The decision to restrain spending will not come easily. As Clare Boothe Luce recently pointed out,

Congress is a kind of economic wine—hopelessly addicted to spending, even though it knows it can all wind up in the gutter of a great depression.

Some may yet believe the President, not Congress, should be held primarily responsible for the financial mess this country is in. Any who think so should consider the wise counsel of Senator MANSFIELD:

The fault lies not in the Executive Branch but in ourselves, in the Congress. We cannot insist upon the power to control expenditures, and then fail to do so. If we do not do the job, if we continue to abdicate our Constitutional responsibility, the powers of the Federal government will have to be recast so it can be done elsewhere.

I am pleased to quote Senator MANSFIELD for two reasons: First, because he is right. Second, to underscore my belief that responsible fiscal policy is not and should not be primarily a partisan concern.

And this is another reason I am dismayed by the partisan tone of the Speaker's recent comments. Although I have frequently addressed the House on this subject, I have never done so in primarily partisan terms. Nor do I now imply that just one political party is responsible for what is going wrong with our country. Despite the Speaker's partisan attack, I acknowledge the failures of Congress are not entirely the fault of the Democrats.

Having controlled Congress for 40 of the last 44 years, the Democratic Party must certainly bear prime responsibility. But I am well aware that some Democratic Members of Congress have pleaded with party leadership for more responsible fiscal policy. Were it not for their efforts the crisis would be even deeper and more severe.

Nor have members of my own party always been responsible in establishing spending limitations. But I must admit a degree of pride at the extent to which my party has resisted political temptation.

Members of my party have been amazingly consistent in fighting for fiscal restraint and balanced budgets.

But the main issue far overshadows partisan consideration. The country is in an economic mess. The need to control the Federal budget before reckless spending ruins our country is a proper concern of all Americans of all political parties. It is particularly the duty of those of us who serve in Congress and who have the constitutional responsibility to control spending and a moral obligation to do so wisely.

Let us do our duty.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I have attended literally hundreds of meetings with my constituents in the past few years. There is no question but that the most pressing problem they face is inflation, and there is no question but that the Democrat-controlled Congress is responsible.

Mr. Speaker, the old days of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect, which is still the Democrat Party's creed, must come to an end. The American people are not nearly as naive as they once were. When demagoging Democrats on the one hand protest inflation and on the other hand continue to force spending above appropriations, there can be no question of the responsibility. It is interesting to note that while creating inflationary pressures on the one hand, they loudly protest when the administration vetoes excessive spending bills or attempts to curtail the ravages of inflation by impounding funds in excess of income. No, Mr. Speaker, the American people will not buy it this time. They know that every committee chairman, every subcommittee chairman, and the majority of every committee is made up of members of the Democrat Party. They certainly know that the dissatisfaction which they so appropriately feel can certainly not be relieved by electing more of the people who have caused the problems.

It is most significant to note that the last time we had a Republican administration and Congress, we balanced the budget, reduced the national debt, lowered taxes, and got out of the Korean war. It is that type of Congress that this Nation desperately needs; and, in my view, they deserve to have it.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, instead of producing a coherent policy to fight double-digit inflation, which is bankrupting our constituents, the administration and this Congress have been floundering in futility, ignoring the truth.

The truth is that the Federal Government has devoted years to pumping billions of unearned dollars into the currency, and has thereby devalued the real dollars the people have earned.

There is no escaping this truth, but this country will pay a fearful penalty if the congressional majority fails to recognize it and deal with it responsibly. I am disheartened when I hear many of my colleagues offering gimmicks instead of reality to a desperate public.

There is only one answer to the riotous inflation that is ruining the American economy, and that is to reduce Federal spending to the level of revenues.

Federal spending exceeded revenues by \$23 billion in the 1971 fiscal year, \$23 billion in fiscal 1972, \$14 billion in fiscal 1973, and an estimated \$5 billion in the last fiscal year.

A total of 65 billion unearned dollars were poured into the currency in just 4 fiscal years, devaluing the earnings of every American and causing intolerable inflation.

The administration cannot escape responsibility for the economic mess we are experiencing. It proposed deficit budgets. But the congressional majority cannot escape responsibility either, for its response to deficit budgets was to authorize even more spending.

The administration has proposed a fiscal 1975 budget that is \$10 billion higher than estimated revenues, but I have not detected any firm resolve in the congressional majority to eliminate that deficit.

Instead, some Members of Congress seem determined to make the situation worse than it already is.

We are constantly dealing with proposals to expand Federal spending instead of restraining it, and the expansionists are forever telling us that the poor need more programs.

Mr. Speaker, the poor are not helped by the circulation of more money that buys less. The poor are not helped by growing central bureaucracies that consume much of the devalued money on the pretense of helping them.

Hard-working, middle-income taxpayers are being dragged backward toward poverty by inflation which erodes their earnings and savings.

The people did not ask for inflationary Federal spending to support the growth of a monstrous bureaucracy that increasingly regulates their lives and usurps the responsibilities of States and local governments.

The people want less government and less inflation, but there is considerable doubt whether the congressional majority has learned that lesson.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, under special order of the House, there was an extended discussion of the economic problems now facing the Nation, particularly the problem of inflation. That discussion was led by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, the Speaker of the House.

I am glad to see that the leadership of the majority party, which has controlled this Congress for 20 years, is concerned about our economic problems. However, I must respectfully disagree with both the diagnosis and the prescription.

There is no simple explanation or solution for the present dilemma of high inflation, and stagnant economic growth. However, to guide the Congress in its course of action, there are certain axioms which are not arguable.

First, Federal budget deficits contribute to inflation in at least two fundamental ways. When the Federal Government borrows to finance a deficit, it competes in the money market, and drives up interest rates. When the Government spends that borrowed money, it competes for scarce goods and services, and drives up the prices of those goods and services.

Second, every dollar on the Federal balance sheet—expenditures, revenues, deficit, and debt—is entered pursuant to legislative authority granted by the Congress. Our legislative responsibility for that balance sheet, and for its impact on the economy, is clear and inescapable.

Third, the balance sheet for the past 20 years, with the opposition party controlling the Congress, and the Congress controlling the purse strings, shows that this country has and will run Federal funds deficits estimated to total \$218 billion, adding \$219 billion to the public debt.

During the first 5 full fiscal years of this administration, 1970 through 1974, congressional actions and inactions on the President's budget requests increased Federal expenditures by \$12.3 billion. During the current fiscal year, 1975, we have already enacted legislation increasing expenditures by an estimated \$1.1 billion.

During the 5 fiscal years 1970-1974, congressional action through the appropriations process, led by the House Committee on Appropriations, has reduced spending by \$6.7 billion; a record in which I take great personal pride. This action consists of a reduction of \$8.6 billion in regular appropriations bills for the Department of Defense and Military Construction, and an increase of \$1.8 billion in all other appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that Federal spending is the sole cause of inflation, or that reductions in Federal spending will by themselves bring inflation completely under control. I do say that the country looks to us for leadership, and that the most immediate and direct leadership we can provide—for both its real and psychological effects—would be prompt and significant reductions in Federal spending.

During the discussion last Thursday, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Arizona, recommended the prompt implementation of the budget control procedures provided in the budget control legislation which has just been signed by the President. I strongly endorse that action, and call to the attention of the Members that section 906 of that law provides certain provisions may be implemented for fiscal year 1976, and applied to the budget for that fiscal year, which we will receive next January.

I call on the majority party to join us in providing this leadership. Let us reverse the trend, already apparent in this fiscal year, toward busting the President's budget. Let us show the country that Congress can be responsible, and that financial chaos is not inevitable.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the greatest problem the American people face at present is inflation and a chief cause of that inflation has been the policy of Federal budget deficits. It is a fact in a family budget as well as a government budget you cannot continue to spend more money than you take in without serious consequences.

Although it is easy to blame an administration in power for a reckless fiscal policy, it is true that if such a policy

is put into effect, it is primarily the responsibility of the Congress. It is the Congress which has the power to authorize programs and appropriate funds for Federal Government programs. It is clear from our own political history that the Democrats, who have controlled Congress for 38 out of the past 42 years, have encouraged and aided the trend toward Federal deficit financing. The other consequences of this reckless fiscal policy have been the centralization of power in the hands of the Federal Government and the increase of more and more controls over our free enterprise system. There can be no effective program for fiscal responsibility unless it has the active support of the Democratic leadership. Over the past 4 decades—and certainly during the time I have served in the House—the leadership of the Congress has not exercised fiscal restraint.

The record of Republicans in Congress has been based on sound conservative principles: reduction of Federal spending, promotion of individual freedom, strengthening our free enterprise system, curbing inflation, eliminating Federal deficits, and easing of the tax burden for all Americans especially the middle class. As a result I have been voting the minority against new and massive spending programs passed by the Congress.

The Democratic leadership and a majority of Democratic Members have voted to increase funds for programs in the President's budget. These funds have been raised above even record high spending levels. This increase in expenditures is only part of the problem. There has been a consistent stream of costly proposals for massive new Federal programs. It is strange that at the same time certain voices in Congress decry the problem of inflation, these same individuals are proposing new spending programs which would dwarf our present programs in costs to the taxpayers. If adopted, these new measures would greatly increase our problems with inflation.

If the Democratic leadership and the majority of Democrats in this Congress wish to take positive action to eliminate Federal deficits, cut spending and reduce inflation, I invite them to cosponsor and vote for the constitutional amendment I have proposed to require a balanced Federal funds budget. This would be a positive, permanent, and effective step toward a policy of fiscal responsibility. It is only by getting back to the fundamental law of economics—you cannot continue to spend funds you do not have without suffering the economic consequences that we can hope to restore fiscal sanity.

Congress needs to adopt a mechanism for itself and for the administration in power to curb Federal spending. It is only by establishing a balanced budget that all of us in Congress—Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals—can prove our commitment to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished Speaker of the House and many of his majority party colleagues take the floor of the House to place the blame for inflation on the President of the United States and the

Republicans in Congress, in amazement I say to myself, "Look who's talking."

Some of those very same Members trying to divert "blame" to other parties are the very same people who vote for every spending bill—except national defense, for every amendment to increase spending amounts—except national defense, and oppose every effort to cut appropriations bills—except national defense.

The prime impetus for big Federal spending, and the big Federal borrowing to support it, has been Democratic administrations and Democratic-controlled Congresses. With the "New Frontier" and "Great Society" programs, the stream of Federal money into the economy became a deluge. The inflationary spiral began to take off.

When President Nixon took office, the inflationary pattern was well-entrenched. His immediate reaction, therefore, was to reduce the Federal bureaucracy and cut back on Federal spending.

Cries of outrage and anguish arose immediately from all those vested interests which had been feeding at the Federal trough. The attempted discontinuance of a costly and unworkable program brought floods of lobbyists for its continuance. Impoundment of appropriated funds brought lawsuits and threats from congressional leaders. The return of power to States and local governments brought massive resistance from bureaucratic and congressional leaders who saw their power bases undermined.

Despite the President's best efforts, the Congress—under Democratic control—continued to authorize new programs and spend at a rate which could not be met from Federal revenues.

Here is an economic and political "fact of life":

The annual budget figure—some \$305 billion this year—is not pulled out of thin air by the President and his advisers. It is a figure which is largely mandated by congressional action in authorizing and appropriating legislation. Attempts to blame the President, therefore, for a record Federal budget and a record deficit are misdirected. The Congress set the parameters for that budget, the Congress enacted by "backdoor spending" the "uncontrollables"—items not subject to annual appropriations—which now constitute more than two-thirds of our budget expenditures, and the Congress repeatedly and explicitly authorized further and further expansion of our public debt. Most recently, the Speaker himself broke a 190 to 190 tie vote on yet another increase in the "temporary" debt ceiling.

The President has consistently resisted the big spending bills of a Democratic-controlled Congress. He has vetoed 38 bills altogether; these bills proposed a total expenditure of \$137.9 billion. On 33 of these bills, the Congress sustained his veto and subsequently passed less expensive measures, for a total savings to the taxpayer of \$25 billion. However, the Congress also overrode five vetoes, at a total cost to the taxpayer of \$32 billion.

The Congress has taken a major step away from the fiscally irresponsible pat-

terns of the past by enacting the Budget and Impoundment Control Act. This legislation establishes Budget Committees in both House and Senate, and requires approval of a spending ceiling for each fiscal year. In its actions on appropriations measures, the Congress must remain within this ceiling. Furthermore, the legislation prohibits such "backdoor spending" as the items which have contributed so substantially to inflation in the past.

Perhaps the most important feature of the Budget Control Act is that, for the first time, it places the fiscal responsibilities of the Congress "up front" and makes them highly visible to all concerned. No longer can the majority push through large expenditures without consideration of their eventual inflationary consequences.

No longer will we have multibillion dollar "bailouts" for every special interest group which can command a Democratic majority. Under Democratic leadership, Congress has been responsible for substantial inflation over the past decade, and it will now be called to account for its actions in "priming the pump" of an already overheated economy.

From recent statements, however, it appears that the Democrats have learned nothing from past experience. Their proposals for dealing with inflation drag out some of the same old chestnuts which have caused so much agony in the past. No further comment need be made on the harmful effect of increased Federal spending; it is a short-run palliative which worsens the long-run disease. Wage and price controls have proven to have such a totally distorting and disastrous effect on the economy that private enterprise is still trying to recover. Not only did these controls drive important commodities out of U.S. markets and into more lucrative foreign markets, but they set the stage for horrendous increases when the controls were lifted.

Food prices have increased an average 22 percent since last year.

The cost of living has gone up more than 12 percent.

The country is beset by waves of strikes, as unions demand wage increases ranging up to 25 percent or more, to make up for the period when they were under controls.

It is somewhat incredible to me that leading Democrats continue to look upon wage and price controls as the answer to inflation, given the sorry track record of such controls.

As for a tax reduction, I would be the first to support such a break, providing that the reduced revenue is offset by a comparable reduction in Federal spending. We are on exceedingly shaky financial ground already, and our \$10 billion deficit for this year is not going to be helped by a measure which reduces tax revenues by several billion more dollars but which does nothing to reduce spending. Senate Democrats who attempted to attach a tax-cut rider to House approved legislation were voted down by their wiser colleagues, who realized that tax reform is a complex fiscal and economic issue which cannot be treated as a political football.

Inflation is a cancer on our economy. It is the most pressing problem facing our Nation today. Inflation lurks always to challenge industrialized and underdeveloped nations alike. But we can face inflation head on, and we can bring it under control, if we have the determination. The first step in this process has got to be the exercise of fiscal responsibility by the Congress, and this especially means the majority party. Federal spending must be cut. The enactment of expensive new programs must be balanced by the excision of worthless old programs. Political gain must be subordinated to a long-term concern over the good of the Nation.

This has always been my own program, and that of most fiscally responsible Republicans. We are losing our chief spokesman and most dedicated crusader, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) at the end of this Congress. I can only hope that those on the majority side will take heed of his repeated warnings of fiscal disaster—a disaster which seems ever-closer in reality—and work with us to stem the tide of inflation and restore fiscal integrity to the Federal Government.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, does not anyone in Washington understand that it is the price of food, climbing interest rates and other rising costs that are the real problems facing Americans? Cannot anyone see beyond Watergate far enough to realize that inflation is robbing everyone and tearing this country apart?

Those are very basic questions, and similar ones are thrown at me nearly every day. The rising cost of living is by far people's biggest concern.

The answer is that many of us are very concerned about this problem, but there can be no doubt that it is a concern that has been played down by the news media in its concentration on other stories out of Washington.

Arthur Burns, head of the Federal Reserve Board, is a major economist who has expressed alarm about the inflationary situation.

Dr. Burns said recently:

Inflationary forces are now rampant in every major industrial nation of the world. For many years our economy and that of other nations has had a serious underlying bias toward inflation.

He went on to point out that inflation breeds fear. It saps public confidence in a more personal way than almost any other threat; it produces generalized anxiety likely to lash out against politicians, institutions, foreigners, social classes—against any handy target. Dr. Burns said:

The gravity of our current inflationary problems can hardly be over-estimated. If past experience is any guide, the future of our country is in jeopardy. If continued, inflation at anything like the present rate would threaten the very foundations of our society.

That is an ominous warning coming from so scholarly a gentleman. But the reaction of many people to higher prices at the grocery store, reduced pensions, increased education expenses, and all the other personal economic problems caused

by inflation should be enough to convince national leaders of the wisdom in Burns' evaluation. People are angry and they want action. The danger comes when the action some politicians propose threatens our whole way of life.

Even after our unhappy experience with partial wage and price controls a few months ago, you hear talk again about going to that kind of policy. The statements are coming from many of the same Democrats who saddled us with that disastrous control program in the first place. Obviously they cannot be talking about going back to a program of partial controls, because we saw that they do not work either equitably or economically.

So the proposal must be for complete controls, and complete economic control can only be accomplished by nationalizing all major means of production—in other words, socialism. That would be a drastic change in our way of life and one that I am doubtful many Americans want to take.

It puzzles me that this kind of proposal gets talked about when there is another more reasonable route to getting our economy back in order. The main problem with this route is that it does not appeal to the politicians, particularly the politicians in Congress. The reason it lacks appeal is that it would bring screams from every special-interest group in the country, and nearly every American is the member of at least one such special interest.

This route to economic stability is cutting Government spending. Obviously, that is nothing new or novel, but, so far, it has proved almost impossible to bring about.

Let me give you some figures to make it a little clearer why Government expenditures are so much a part of the inflationary problems. In the past 44 years, 40 of which the Democrats have controlled Congress and therefore controlled exclusively the Nation's purse strings, annual Federal spending has risen from \$3 billion to \$304 billion. That is a 10,000-percent increase in spending during a period when the Nation's population only doubled. It has to be a major inflationary factor.

In that same 44-year period, the Federal bureaucracy has increased 450 percent since the end of World War II, the Federal pay has gone up 146 percent. The combination of a bigger and bigger bureaucracy at higher and higher pay just has to be very inflationary.

Meanwhile the average percent of earning paid out by all Americans to all levels of government has jumped from 11.6 percent to 31.3 percent. Therefore, not only has increased Government spending contributed significantly to the cost-of-living problem, but the tax dollars needed to support that spending have cut into the spendable income you need to personally cope with the inflationary spiral.

Yet another set of statistics suggest Government's role in fueling inflation. In the past 20 years, all of which have seen the Democrats running the economy in their role as the legislative majority, Congress has rolled up \$218 billion in

budget deficits adding \$234 billion to the national debt. Exactly 20 years ago, in the 1954-55 period, the rise in the cost-of-living averaged out to almost nothing. It is not hard to calculate that two decades of deficits have been significant contributors to our present inflationary problem.

The answer to inflation for anyone involved in Government is rather obvious—cut spending. It is necessary not only to balance the budget, but reduce spending to a point that we can begin paying off the national debt. Only then will Government dollars stop interfering with the free market, and thus stop pushing prices upward.

But, the solution, while obvious, is not so easy. Everyone is for cutting Government spending—until it affects them adversely. If we are to make the cuts necessary to do the job of halting inflation, no program can be sacred. These cuts cannot all come out of some favorite whipping boy like defense. They will have to be made across the board. And they will, without a doubt, hurt.

That is where the political problem comes in. Are people upset enough about inflation to hurt a little to stop it? Too many politicians think not. Thus, the spending goes on and the inflation follows it. But, if Arthur Burns is correct that in the near future that attitude could destroy our society, maybe it is time to get the word to those politicians.

The word is this—inflation is serious and we must act to stabilize the economy. We must face up to the pressures that will be brought by special interests as they seek to save their portion of the dole. We must act in the national interest which does not necessarily mean satisfying each little special interest. The national interest is getting the inflation thief out of everyone's pocket. That means cutting Federal spending, and no amount of congressional cover-up by the Democrats can bury the fact that the legislative leadership responsibility for doing just that has been entrusted to them. If they fail to act, then the responsibility for rampant inflation must be placed squarely on Democratic Party shoulders.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the other Members of the House this afternoon in discussing inflation, and specifically the direct effect that expanded Federal spending has upon the inflationary pressures which we, as a nation, face.

In researching the subject, I noted with great interest a statement by the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. MAHON of Texas. Mr. MAHON's statement was made at the time he presented to the Congress the "1974 Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 11." He advised that:

The total impact of Congressional actions and inactions in the recent session was to increase outlays by \$3.5 billion over the original January budget as amended.

The budget report was prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures and was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 14, 1974.

Further research reveals that the Dem-

ocrat-controlled Congress added substantial budget increases to dozens of measures and in many instances insisted on mandatory authorizations and appropriations. Many of these are programs that have very dubious records of administration and effectiveness—welfare, food stamps, and pork barrel programs are examples.

Notwithstanding the necessary preoccupation of Congress with the impeachment issue, I believe we have an obligation to the American public to move to curb inflation. I direct the special attention of Members of the House to a constitutional amendment I cosponsored, and which was just recently introduced.

My amendment would require the Federal Government to operate under a balanced budget. Further, it would require passage of revenue-producing legislation prior to spending legislation in periods when a Federal deficit is expected for 2 or more fiscal years.

Our serious problems with inflation demand that we eliminate the chief cause of that inflation—deficit spending by the Federal Government. We cannot expect significant relief from inflation until the Congress is forced by constitutional law to spend within the Government's income, which is the intent of my proposed constitutional amendment.

I would like to emphasize to Members of the House that even though we are looking at reforms in the tax codes of the country, we cannot ignore the fact that the critical question is still spending reform. Our whole system now is based upon going further and further into debt each year, and each year the Congress simply votes to increase the debt ceiling rather than decrease the spending ceiling.

Just like an individual's personal debts, that Federal debt is going to have to be repaid—and we all know it will be the individual citizens of this country who will have to pay it, as well as cope with the inflation it is now causing.

The record clearly shows that Democrats have been consistently irresponsible in adding to Federal expenditures, and failing to balance these increases by either other economies or adding to the Federal revenues. Thus, we do not have to speculate about the pernicious effects of inflation, because we can see them all about us. As far as inflation is concerned, the No. 1 culprit in our country is the Democrat-controlled Congress.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from California for sponsoring this special order on inflation and Government spending. Economic affairs constitute one of the most important issues before the American people. I doubt if there ever was a time when we had to chart so narrow a course between the twin threats of runaway inflation and devastating recession.

The problem with inflation merits our most concentrated attention and objectivity. I was interested in the distinguished Speaker's views on the economy, for his statement focuses our attention on this vital matter. But I was also rather disappointed at the partisan tone of some of his remarks. The American people are not interested in assessing the

blame for our economic problems. They do not want promises of instant solutions which they know cannot be fulfilled. They want a dispassionate, reasoned, and disciplined attack on increasing prices.

With the situation as difficult as it is, it seems to me there ought to be plenty of humility to be passed around among all policymakers, including us in Congress. It is just plain silly for one party to blame the other or for one branch of Government to blame the other when we should be expending our energy in the effort to increase our understanding of our economic problems.

The solution to inflation must follow from a careful and comprehensive appraisal of the causes of inflation. The Democratic leadership has made no such appraisal.

Instead, our distinguished speaker has merely asserted that the fundamental tools of monetary and fiscal policy do not work and that an incomes policy, a return to direct price, wage, and profit controls is the appropriate course.

I must take sharp exception to such a view. There is simply not one shred of evidence which indicates that wage and price controls can effectively hold down prices over the long run without causing economic chaos. Many of the shortages we have now have resulted because controlled domestic prices led to decreases in investment, increased exports, and so on.

Before controls were implemented, most economists stated that they would cause dislocation, shortages, black markets, and a large bubble of price increases as soon as controls were removed. In spite of this advice, Congress gave the administration a blank check to impose controls and virtually insisted that it do so. The administration finally made the mistake of acceding to that demand in August of 1971, in spite of the fact that monetary and fiscal restraint had brought inflation down from above a 6-percent rate to below a 4-percent rate by that time.

The controls were followed by dislocations, shortages, and black markets, as in beef. Prices were repressed for a time, but as soon as controls were removed, there was an explosion of prices. It has proven very difficult to remove controls.

And yet, while the inflationary pressures, partly caused by controls, are still working their way through the economy, the Democratic leadership calls for new controls. The public must think we are slow learners.

The assertion that fiscal and monetary tools will not work to bring down inflation is also mistaken. The evidence over the last 100 years shows that decreases in money supply are followed, after a lag, by recession, and greater than average increases in the money supply are followed, again after a lag, by inflation. The evidence is also just as clear that when consumption and investment demand are already strong, deficits in the Government budget lead to inflation. This was made clear in the 1967-69 inflation, which was stimulated by the failure to increase revenues to cover the costs of the Vietnam war and again in the last

3 fiscal years, when large deficits were run in spite of booming investment and export demand.

Government deficits fuel inflation in two ways. They put more money in the hands of the public to purchase goods, and they finance programs which take resources out of the private sector, thus reducing the amount of production which may be applied to the kinds of goods which consumers wish to buy. It amazes me that anyone who would claim credit on behalf of Congress for passing the Budget Act of 1974, which recognizes the need for proper fiscal policy, would at the same time argue that Government spending makes no difference to inflation.

That argument is merely a rationalization for continued reckless spending. And Congress has spent recklessly. We do not evaluate programs to see that they are achieving their objectives. We do not eliminate outmoded programs. We have allowed backdoor spending to explode, thus wiping out the discipline which has been exercised by Appropriations Committee.

Our problem now is not lack of demand. The economic downturn of recent months is directly due to the oil shortage and consequent price hikes and other materials shortages which constrain production. Raw materials processors are operating at well above 90 percent of capacity which is far above their desired levels of output. Even with the downturn, unemployment has remained at 5.2 percent which is low for a period of falling real output.

Our problem is inflation. The demand induced inflation of last year, coupled with unavoidable increased cost of food and energy, have created a rampant inflation psychology. To turn the corner on inflation, we must defeat the inflation psychology which feeds on itself. We must disappoint the expectations of those who are looking for higher prices.

The only reliable way to accomplish this is through continued fiscal and monetary restraint. When people see that Government is not going to endorse inflation by expanding credit and Government demand, inflation will recede. Restraint must be applied prudently so that we do not set recessionary forces in motion. But the restraint must last until business, labor and consumers expect less inflation instead of more. Once this occurs, we can begin to set the stage for a new sustained, noninflationary economic expansion.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in this body over the past few weeks about the serious problems this country faces in combating the terrible inflation that grips our economy. Unfortunately the blame for inflation has been placed everywhere except where it belongs—on the Democratic-controlled Congress.

It is the responsibility of the Congress, and especially the House, to be the fiscal watchdog for the country. Instead Congress has embarked on spending programs like a 10-year-old with his allowance in a candy store. It is very easy and convenient to place the blame for inflation elsewhere. But the plain fact is that Congress controls the Federal purse-

strings and it is Congress' obligation to see that they are pulled tighter when Government spending has reached excessive levels. It is obvious that those levels have been achieved. For the first time in our Nation's history we are heading for a budget of over \$300 billion. Tagging along with this astounding figure is his inflationary brother—a deficit of close to \$11 billion. If the citizens of this land want to know what is feeding inflation, they have to look no further than Capitol Hill. It is long past time to tighten our belts, make some tough decisions—and cut Federal spending.

One of the problems that Congress must face in reducing the level of spending is the many bills that come before us containing a variety of programs, some good and some bad. All too often the congressional attitude has been to take the whole bill since the overall effect is felt to be beneficial. However, this is exactly the type of voting that feeds inflation. Rather than cut out the extravagant portion that will contribute to inflation, too many Members have been content to swallow the entire package. It is time to do some pruning of these loaded bills.

Since the beginning of the 93d Congress I have voted against over \$75 billion for various pieces of legislation. Unfortunately some of what was contained in those bills was undoubtedly beneficial. However, it was the same old story of forcing us to swallow the bad with the good, the extravagant giveaways with the wise spending. If the Congress is ever to assume the responsibility to control Government spending that is rightfully ours, we must stop accepting this type of legislation. Instead, each Member should assume the obligation to search for the fat in each piece of legislation and then act to cut that fat. It is the only way that inflation can begin to be brought under control. Congress need look no further than the halls of Capitol Hill to find the answer to this problem.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Young) for having to take this special order on such an auspicious occasion, when I am sure in another 10 or 15 minutes all America will be breathlessly awaiting the great road show that will be taking place in the Rayburn Building. I hope they all have their makeup on.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest and considerable dismay to the special order on Thursday, July 18, in which several of my colleagues in Democratic leadership positions participated. As you will undoubtedly recall, the subject of that special order was the sorry state of the American economy.

The gist of the message which was delivered during the special order was that the blame for the inflationary spiral we are now experiencing can be placed on one place only—squarely on the shoulders of the administration. It was implied that Congress has performed admirably in its fight against inflation—a notion with which I must strongly take issue. Therefore, I welcome this opportunity to bring into the open some addi-

tional facts concerning the role of Congress in fueling inflation.

Mr. Speaker, all of the economic experts with whom I have ever conferred believe that the single most important cause of inflation is excessive Government spending. And there is no question that we, as Members of Congress, play a very vital role in the determination of each year's level of Government spending.

As we all know, each year the executive branch assimilates and delivers to the Congress the projected budget requirements of all Federal departments and agencies. It is then the responsibility of the Congress to analyze these budget requests and to formulate and approve the necessary authorization and appropriation bills in order to fund the Federal Government.

If the Congress believes that the budget request for a specific category is insufficient, the Congress may raise that level. Conversely, the Congress may also decrease funding in areas where it believes the administration has been excessive in its budget request.

In the past 44 years, annual Federal spending has increased from \$4 billion to a proposed \$305 billion in fiscal year 1975, which is almost a 1,000-percent increase. Over the past 30 years, more than \$218 billion in budget deficits has been amassed and consequently, it has been necessary to raise the national debt limit by \$234 billion. Statutorily, all of these increases have had to receive congressional approval.

During Thursday's special order, specific mention was made of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act which was recently signed into law. I certainly agree that this is much-needed legislation which will provide an effective mechanism toward better congressional control over the annual budgetary process. However, there are certainly other areas where we need to take immediate action. For example, where is the meaningful tax reform legislation, which the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has repeatedly assured us will be forthcoming in this Congress? The bill is still in markup stages in the committee; even if it were to be reported out in the immediate future, that would leave precious little time for both Houses to approve the bill prior to adjournment of the 93d Congress. Where is national health insurance? Yet to be considered by the Ways and Means Committee. Where is House Resolution 988, the committee reform resolution? Bottled up somewhere in the Democratic Caucus. And where is the Oil and Gas Energy Tax Act, which deals with the oil-depletion allowance and foreign tax credits? The bill is being held up by infighting among the Democratic leadership.

All of these things deserve immediate consideration by the Congress, so that appropriate action may be taken prior to adjournment. And all of these bills will certainly help us to improve and reduce our inflationary spiral, so that the pinch which our constituents feel may be reduced.

I realize it is difficult for us all to rec-

ognize the impact that we, as Members of Congress, have had in adding to our inflationary trends. I also realize how easy it is to "point the finger" elsewhere and blame the administration for the entire economic mess in which we find ourselves and how tempting it becomes to support appropriations for everything from social programs to defense budgets. However, unless the Congress takes positive action now to enact sound legislation and to reform its internal workings to better cope with the inflationary crisis, we will continue to do permanent harm to our Nation's economy and to our constituents.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation is looking to the Federal Government for relief from inflation. But what do they see? They see Congress and the executive branch pointing the finger of blame at each other like naughty children while prices go up and up.

It is about time we realize that Congress is as much to blame for inflation as the administration. The only way we are going to lick the problem is by joining forces and working as a team.

If we can cut Government spending, we can at least slow inflation. The annual Federal budget has grown from \$4 billion in 1930 to more than \$300 billion today. The national debt now stands at \$234 billion and Federal spending now accounts for more than one quarter of the gross national product.

Granted, we have taken a step or two in the right direction toward reducing Federal spending. We recently passed the Budget Control and Impoundment Act which would give us greater control in budgetary matters. Hopefully, this measure will be implemented in the near future.

However, we are still waiting action on the House committee reforms proposed by the Bolling-Martin committee. Unfortunately, the leadership in the House has stalled these reforms. How can we expect to make any progress toward balancing the budget if numerous committees retain jurisdiction in the same areas and continue proposing spending measures that are overlapping in purpose? Reform is needed to streamline this arrangement and cut down on costly inefficiency.

In addition, we must put the lock on back-door spending which accounts for a substantial part of the budget.

No one can deny that Government spending fuels inflation. In 1962 the budget topped the \$100 billion mark. Only 9 years later it hit \$200 billion and now, 3 years later, it is up another \$100 billion to more than \$300 billion. If spending continues at that rate, we could conceivably be faced with a \$400 billion budget for fiscal year 1976.

One way or another, we are going to have to pay a high price for our years of fiscal irresponsibility. I realize that it is easier to search around for a scapegoat than to solve the problem.

There just are no simple solutions. One thing is certain though. Bickering among ourselves will not end inflation nor will it do much to regain the confidence of the American people. The citizens of this country have been tightening their belts

to fight inflation for quite a while. Now it is up to Congress and the rest of the Federal Government to shoulder their share of the responsibility and help the people in their struggle.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague from California (Mr. KETCHUM) for arranging for this forum on the economy and on congressional and Presidential action related thereto.

Modern fairy tales are fascinating, but none is more intriguing than the efforts of the majority party to portray itself as the "white knight" in the battle to control inflation. We have heard some descriptions of economic conditions which would challenge the imagination of Lewis Carroll of "Alice in Wonderland" fame.

The American citizen and the taxpayer in particular is tired of politicians who pass the buck. It is time we put the responsibility for the uncontrolled inflation exactly where it belongs: on the tax-and-spend philosophy of the Congress which has been Democrat-controlled for many years.

There has been an imaginative effort by many to minimize the dramatic growth of our national debt by making comparisons with the growth of the gross national product, GNP, but the comparison is hardly parallel. In the past 10 years the national debt has increased 50 percent, and the cost of living is up 53 percent.

Has Federal spending been inflationary? The close parallel of these trends persuades me that it is inflationary. Approximately one-fourth of the total national debt has been incurred during the past 4 years. The public debt through 1970, including two world wars, the Korean Conflict, and most of the cost for the war in Vietnam, was \$382.6 billion. Four years later at the conclusion of fiscal year 1974, the public debt ceiling was raised to \$495 billion, and it is very likely to exceed \$500 billion before the end of fiscal year 1975.

Has the Congress acted responsibly in fiscal matters? Much of the growth in Federal spending has occurred in the "human resources" programs. They accounted for only 34 percent of the budget during fiscal year 1969, but make up more than 50 percent of the fiscal year 1975 budget. Consider what has happened to Federal spending during the last decade—1965–75:

Health: Increased from \$1.7 billion to \$26.3 billion; a 1,444 percent increase.

Income security—social security, unemployment, welfare, et cetera: Increased from \$25.7 billion to \$100.0 billion; a 289 percent increase.

Education and manpower: Increased from \$2.3 billion to \$11.5 billion; a 400 percent increase.

Veterans benefits and services: Increased from \$5.7 billion to \$13.6 billion; a 139 percent increase.

Food assistance—food stamps, child nutrition, school lunches, et cetera: Up from \$600 million to \$5.8 billion; an increase of 866 percent.

Defense: Up from \$49.6 billion to \$87.7 billion; only a 77 percent increase.

Deficit financing is the vehicle that

Congress has utilized to fund new programs. It is an "expedient" form of taxation. While tax increases may not be popular back home, neither is inflation, and the prime cause of inflation is the policy of deficit financing practiced by the Congress. The last budget year in which tax revenues exceeded Government expenditures was fiscal year 1960, and there have only been 3 such years in the last two decades.

The effects of an expansionary fiscal policy can most readily be seen by reviewing the increases in disposable income. In terms of current dollars, the 1965 per capita disposable income was \$2,432. By 1971, it had leaped 48 percent to \$3,595. The 1973 per capita disposable income—most current figure available—is \$4,295, a 76-percent increase from 1965.

What about taxes? Pollster Lou Harris reported on July 22 that the public is willing to have a tax cut to stimulate consumer spending, but was not willing to admit that a tax increase might dampen inflationary pressures. However, the painful fact remains that inflation is eroding the taxpayers' purchasing power while his cost-of-living pay increases are boosting him to the next higher income tax bracket. In 1965, per capita Federal income taxes were \$577. Although there was a tax cut in 1970, the per capita income tax had risen to \$963 in 1972. The taxpayer loses either way.

One final myth needs to be dispelled, and that concerns defense spending. Many advocates of social reform have attempted to distort the issue and blame huge Federal deficits on defense spending, but the facts do not support this conclusion.

In 1965, defense spending accounted for 41.9 percent of the national budget. Human resource programs—education and manpower, health, income security and welfare, veterans benefits, et cetera—accounted for 27.6 percent. In fiscal year 1973, only 31.2 percent of the budget was allocated for defense spending while 47.75 percent went for human resources. The fiscal year 1974 defense spending was held to 29 percent while human resource spending soared to nearly 50 percent of the national budget.

There are no easy answers, but the alternatives are limited. Clearly we need the best cooperative effort from the executive and legislative branches. Further, we need restraint and understanding by all Americans in reducing demand for goods and services where possible, reducing demands for further Government services, and reducing upward pressures on wage and interest rates. We need more productivity—more goods to satisfy our needs and to absorb greater purchasing power.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of July 22, 1974, accurately describes the alternative courses that lie ahead for the Congress. The power to spend is the power to tax. The Congress has demonstrated its ability to spend, but the Congress has been irresponsible for too long. Now it is time for Congress to demonstrate that it is capable of controlling its appetite to

spend in the overwhelming need to contain destructive inflation.

The editorial follows:

THINKING ABOUT DEPRESSION

Herman Kahn, the physicist and thinker who runs the Hudson Institute, believes there is one chance in six of a depression in 1974–75, and if it doesn't occur in this period, one chance in six that it will occur in 1976–80. In other words, he sees one chance in three that in this decade we will experience depression, by which he means a 10% unemployment rate lasting at least 18 months. There are those who believe Mr. Kahn is being pessimistic; there also are some we talk to who think the chances are higher.

Those who dismiss such talk as being unrealistic generally do so by arguing that "the government will not permit it to happen." During the past quarter-century of global prosperity, the idea has taken root that governments know enough about the manipulation of monetary and fiscal policies to prevent serious economic disruptions of the kind experienced in the 1930s. Certainly, as Paul McCracken explains nearby, they know more now than they did then.

This thought is comforting, but not that comforting if it merely means that the Federal Reserve will gun the money supply to counter every conceivable deflationary pressure that might be arrayed against it. For what Mr. Kahn imagines, a short piece down the road, is a U.S. government faced with choosing between a depression of this definition and an annual inflation rate of 30% or 40%. At some point, he argues, a government will have to pick the depression.

We see no reason why a future U.S. government has to be faced with that kind of choice. With a nation as educated and, at least at the grass roots, as sensible as ours, there still should be will enough to make the corrections before the collapse, and thus avoid it. The key to this is for policy-makers to recognize, as Mr. Kahn does so clearly, that the current fears and risks of depression tomorrow are created by the inflation today. Depression will come only if inflation and inflationary expectations are so high they can be cured no other way.

In other words, the way to head off depression is to get inflation under control. This in turn means slowing monetary growth. And realistically this cannot be done until monetary policy is freed of the burden of government borrowing and government deficits. So to get the correction under way now, while there is still time to avoid depression, it is clear what must be done.

Government spending at all levels must be reduced and the federal government has to lead the way. Government spending is draining the productive base of the economy of the resources it needs to renew itself. What is truly frightening are the budget projections for the future, based on promises the politicians have been making in the past. Unless there are sharp reductions in the \$305 billion budget, of the kind proposed by Treasury Secretary Simon, the budget next year will be wildly uncontrollable and heading to \$1 trillion by the 1980s. It will never again be as "easy" for Congress and the administration to get the budget under control as it is right now.

Instead, both Congress and the White House, Democrats and Republicans, are jockeying for position so each will be able to blame the other. At the same time, Washington is mesmerized by the increasing flow of tax revenues into the Treasury. Corporations are paying ever higher taxes on mythical inventory profits; wage earners are paying ever higher taxes as the progressive tax structure pushes them into higher tax brackets with no real increase in earnings.

But if the Fed maintains any kind of restraint in money growth, the profit illusion

will evaporate and unemployment will climb rapidly. Tax revenues, of course, will plummet in that case. We can easily imagine a \$25 billion deficit in the current fiscal year ending next June, and the government forced to propose either a huge tax increase or a \$50 billion deficit for fiscal 1976 in order to meet existing government obligations.

President Nixon, who is scheduled to make an economic address to the nation this week, must at least attempt to lay out the alternatives to the people who elected him. Not by complaining about congressional spending. But by beseeching the people and their representatives to work out a joint effort to do what has to be done. Just as it is no longer unthinkable, that a President may be impeached, no longer unthinkable we may be hit with an economic depression, it should no longer be unthinkable that the federal budget should be cut.

LABOR UNIONS AND OUR ANTI-TRUST LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today a great hue and cry is being raised in this country against big business. Self-proclaimed consumer advocates, some academicians and Members of Congress are conducting a vociferous campaign for breaking up large corporations in the name of preserving free and open competition and protecting the consumer's interests.

In this litany against the evils of corporate bigness, of "shared monopoly" and "excess profits," the voices of labor union officials often are among the loudest heard. Completely ignored, however, are the evils flowing from monopolistic practices of giant labor unions. They are the only participants in the private sector of our economy that have been granted statutory exemption from the application of the antitrust laws, being subject to those laws only in certain very limited areas.

The effect of this exemption has been to award to labor unions an all but unlimited right to restrain trade and commerce. A labor union is free to create and maintain a monopoly of the labor supply of a given industry, craft, or occupation; it can fix prices by imposing uniform wages in the labor market through the compulsory union shop; and it can form conglomerates by unionizing workers in either related or unrelated occupations.

Unions are free to do these things to the detriment of all concerned—of business, of the consumer, and even of labor in general. The long-range effects on our economy are extremely serious.

Most people see danger in allowing a single firm to monopolize the steel industry, the automobile industry, or any other vital industry, but a surprising number of people see nothing wrong in permitting a single union to monopolize the labor supplies of such industries.

Union chieftains, of course, argue that they need the exemption from the antitrust laws so that they may be able to protect the interests of "labor" in general. Such argument, however, simply does not fit the facts.

In the first place, although union pro-

fessionals regularly claim to speak for labor and labor's interests, they can speak only for unions, which represent a bare 25 percent of the American work force. The power they exercise in proportion to their minority status is due to union concentration in key industries such as basic metals and the automotive industry. In the second place, labor unions exploit their monopoly status exclusively to their own benefit, to the detriment of nonunion workers and often even of their own membership.

Through their enormous power, unions are frequently able to force wage increases throughout an industry which are so large as to be economically unjustifiable. In so doing, they make the amount of employment available in that industry less than it would be otherwise. The effect is an increased number of people seeking employment in other occupations. Excessive wage increases which far outrun productivity, reduce the number of available jobs, and produce unemployment are hardly in the interest of "labor."

A member of the Federal Trade Commission, Mayo J. Thompson, in a recent speech outlined how labor union monopolies are simultaneously creating inflation and unemployment. Commissioner Thompson said:

Many labor unions in the United States and other industrialized countries of the world clearly exercise a degree of monopoly power over the world's economies that is grossly inconsistent with the welfare of the great bulk of its citizens.

He pointed out that the FTC is supposed to see that the country's economic system is kept free of monopoly. He said:

Our problem is that we've been authorized to clean only one of the tracks in the country's two-rail economic system. We can and do investigate monopoly on the corporate side of the road but monopoly on the labor side is off-limits to us.

Commissioner Thompson also made the important point that toleration of labor union monopolies encourages the toleration of monopolies in other segments of the economy. He said:

Most fair-minded people recognize the inconsistency and injustice of a law that makes a situation illegal if it is created by one group of people and perfectly lawful if it happens to be the work of some other group of people.

Since labor unions are free to, and do, build up and exercise vast amounts of monopoly power in their markets, a lot of our citizens are unable to work up much enthusiasm for reducing whatever monopoly power might be found in our various product or corporate markets. Once the law has given its blessing to monopoly and all its wide ramifications in one area of our economic life, the temptation is very strong to give it a similar blessing in all other areas as well.

Chairman Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve Board has stated that structural changes in the antitrust laws are needed so as to apply them effectively to labor unions as well as business firms. Testifying last year before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress on the imperative need for bringing inflation under control, Chairman Burns said:

Not a few of our corporations and trade unions now have the power to exact rewards that exceed what could be achieved under conditions of active competition.

He added that genuine progress in curbing inflation "would require that we undertake to curb abuses of economic power by both business firms and trade unions, besides reappraising a host of laws and governmental regulations that interfere with the competitive process."

Dual standards for labor unions and corporate enterprises in monopolistic practices and restraint of trade have not always been public policy. Under common law it was an offense both for manufacturers to combine to fix prices and for employees to combine to fix wages. This was incorporated into our Federal law in the Sherman Antitrust Act, and the Supreme Court in the famous *Danbury Hatters* case of 1908 quite naturally declared that the act applied equally to both business and labor. But unfortunately the evenhandedness of the common law tradition did not long survive the *Danbury Hatters* decision. The displeasure of union officials caused Congress in the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914 to declare that "the labor of a human being is not a good or article of commerce" thereby removing organized labor from most areas of antitrust regulation. The Clayton Act exemption, which also limited the use of Federal injunctions against organized labor, was reinforced by the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts and by subsequent Supreme Court decisions.

As the dangers of union monopoly became more apparent, however, efforts were made to curb this exemption or at least limit its effect. The original version of the Taft-Hartley Act, as passed by the House in 1947, contained a provision amending the Clayton Act so as to withdraw labor's antitrust exemption and a Justice Department study in 1955 made the same recommendation to the Attorney General. Both proposals unfortunately failed, yet as recently as 1965 the Supreme Court ruled that labor's exemption did not apply when it could be "clearly shown" that union had conspired with certain employers to eliminate competition from the industry. This decision, however, was ambiguous and has not proved to have had any great deterrent value. Union monopoly has continued unchecked.

The effort to further narrow the union exemption from the antitrust laws through court rulings continues. In one major pending case, the plaintiffs in a lawsuit against several unions assert that unions are subject to the antitrust laws when they engage in violent and coercive conduct in an attempt to deny nonunion firms access to the market and drive them out of business. The plaintiffs are confident that ultimately the courts will rule in their favor.

This court attack on union monopoly power is important and I sincerely hope it is successful. However, I believe that the Congress need not wait on the courts and litigation which may take several years to correct this serious problem. The time has come, in fact it is long overdue,

for Congress to make it completely clear in every respect that when labor unions engage in monopolistic practices and restraint of trade they are subject to prosecution under the antitrust laws. The evidence is abundant that union monopoly power is a major cause of high prices. The need for controlling inflation has become so critical that the Nation's economic health is seriously endangered. The public is being hurt badly and the public interest demands that something be done.

I am today introducing a bill to amend our antitrust laws so as to make them fully applicable to labor unions in the same manner as they apply to business enterprises. My bill would do this by striking the exemptions for labor unions from the Sherman, Clayton, and Norris-La Guardia Acts. It would not impair the fundamental right of American workers to organize in their own self-interest, to bargain collectively with their employers, or to strike. It would simply insure that those rights are not abused in such a way as to establish monopolies and restrain trade.

The legislation I am offering is simple and uncomplicated. It does not attempt to spell out the particular practices that would make unions subject to prosecution under the antitrust laws but leaves that determination up to the courts. This is exactly the way our antitrust laws are drawn up and the way they have been applied to business firms. As the Federal courts through their decisions over the years developed standards as to what constitutes a monopolistic business practice, so will the courts set the standards for determining what constitutes a monopolistic union practice.

I believe this legislation is eminently fair and that it is long overdue. If corporate monopolies are detrimental to the public interest, labor monopolies are no less so. My bill places unions and management on an equal footing before the antitrust laws of this country.

It is anticipated that union officials will attack the intent of the legislation I am offering and will endeavor to portray it as harsh and punitive. Unfortunately, union officials have been quite successful in making it appear that questioning the virtue of almost any activity undertaken by unions is equivalent to casting aspersions on God, home, and motherhood. Yet there is no good reason that union monopoly should be any less suspect than corporate monopoly.

I also anticipate broad support for my bill from the general public and from rank-and-file union members. A recent public opinion survey by Opinion Research Corp. revealed that 70 percent of the people believe too much power is concentrated in the hands of leaders of the big unions of this country. That view is shared by 60 percent of union members and 76 percent of nonunion workers who, as we pointed out earlier, constitute the great majority of our work force. My bill will get to the root of monopolistic union power which harms almost everyone but will not interfere with those union functions which truly benefit working men and women.

CONGRESS MUST REESTABLISH THE FISCAL INTEGRITY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the Congress must take the leadership in immediately reestablishing the distressed fiscal integrity of the Government. The time has come for the Congress to match its words in this regard with action.

I have today introduced a bill to provide the Congress with the vehicle for honoring a commitment to restoring that integrity—and, in the process, to help pick the economy up out of the slump in which we now find it.

The bill, the proposed Fiscal Integrity Act, would reestablish our Government's fiscal integrity and its monetary policy through the establishment of ceilings on both revenue and budget outlays, through tightening the issuance of additional money, and through requiring the disclosure of the costs of programs proposed to be enacted.

Why is the Fiscal Integrity Act necessary?

The proposed Federal budget for 1975, forecasting expenditures of over \$304 billion, exceeds the previous year's budget by a full \$20 billion. In 1940 our Federal budget was only \$10.1 billion.

It took this country 185 years to get to an annual Federal spending level of \$100 billion, but it took only 9 more years to double that to the \$200 billion level, and then only 4 more years to reach the \$300 billion level.

The mushrooming national public debt will soon be at nearly \$500 billion—half a trillion. It took us over 150 years after 1789 to reach the \$200 billion debt mark, then less than 20 years to double it to \$400 billion, and then only 10 more years to add another \$100 billion.

The spiraling rate of inflation is now projected to be nearly 14 percent this year. Only 10 years ago it averaged around 3 to 4 percent, a manageable figure.

The amount of taxes the Federal Government will have to collect from every man, woman, and child in the Nation to meet expenses this year is \$1,492 per person—or \$5,768 for the average family of four. In 1940 it was \$77 per person—or \$308 for that average family of four.

The ever-increasing printing of paper money is now estimated to be at between 7 and 8 percent of the total money supply for this year—a factor greatly contributing to the erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar.

And, recent analysis shows that the total sum of new funds which would be authorized by only 400 bills introduced this Congress would be in excess of \$873 billion. And, nearly 15,000 bills have been introduced this Congress—and we still have half a year to go. These dangerous economic policies must be halted.

Government spending—and the raising of revenue requisite to that spending—has a historical ceiling beyond which it invites either or both the collapse of the economic strength of a na-

tion or political and economic freedom. The statistics prove the tendencies of Government to siphon off ever greater shares of the people's income for itself.

Government must realize that it cannot indefinitely tax the people at constantly increasing levels without destroying the people's ability to support themselves and their families.

The Congress has not done its fair share of the job of maintaining a growing economy, halting inflation, keeping the budget under control and establishing national priorities in a consistent manner.

Where, then, do we start in coming to grips with these problems?

I think the place to start is, first, recognizing that the Congress has contributed to the problem, not to its resolution. We have spent too much money, not raised enough to meet the costs of government, have allowed the issuance of paper money to go unabated, and have inadequately reformed our own internal procedures for showing how much money is proposed to be spent by new bills.

We must determine, as a matter of congressional policy, that it is the joint and several responsibility of the legislative and executive branches to reestablish our fiscal integrity through the imposition of a requirement that budget outlays not exceed revenue—that there be balanced budgets, that the issuance of additional money not contribute to inflation, and that each branch have adequate capability to prepare the budget in a manner consistent with those policies. By establishing, at law, a recognition that it is a joint and several responsibility of these two branches, we will stop much of the buck-passing which goes on as to which branch is responsible for our economic woes. If we assume the responsibility, we are guilty of not properly exercising it.

What would the Fiscal Integrity Act do about these problems?

REVENUE AND BUDGET OUTLAYS CONTROL

Title I of the Fiscal Integrity Act would establish for each fiscal year a revenue and budget outlays limit for the Government. No appropriation shall be made for any fiscal year by the Congress in excess of the revenue and budget outlays limit for such fiscal year.

This revenue and budget outlays limit is the next, logical step which should have been included in the recently passed Budget Reform Act. That Budget Reform Act established an initial spending ceiling each Spring only as a goal, with the final ceiling established in the Fall as an after-the-fact ceiling, meaning that expenditures can still exceed revenue and add to the debt. A balanced budget requirement should have been in that Act; it wasn't. But, it is in my bill.

How would the limit work?

The revenue and budget outlays limit for each fiscal year shall be the amount derived by multiplying the estimated aggregate national income for such fiscal year by a "Federal revenue factor".

Thus, from the first year of the operation of this provision, a ceiling in relation to national income is established on government revenue and spending. As

the economy grows, new dollars would be available for existing or new programs, but a greater percentage of the people's income would not be available.

Once that computation is made for the first year, it will—in that first year only—be reduced by 2½ percent in order to cut off the top the excessive spending which we now have. Thereafter—for the next 20 years—it will be cut by one-fourth of 1 percent each fiscal year, a more gradual reduction, but one eventually leading to another reduction in excess of 5 percent.

One should note that a cut in outlays is accompanied by a cut in revenue—and vice versa—so that cutting revenue will not result in creating more of a deficit—as is now a danger—and cutting outlays should result in a cut in taxes.

The bill specifically requires that, if during any fiscal year the revenue of the Government exceeds the established limit for that year, the amount in excess shall be used for the payment of the public debt of the Government.

The limitations, determinations, estimates, and calculations required to be made by this title shall be made by the newly created Congressional Budget Office, acting through its Director.

What if an emergency arises—such as a large-scale war or economic crisis—which absolutely requires spending beyond the revenue level?

In that case—that emergency—a resolution passed by at least two-thirds of each House of Congress shall suspend the limitation, but only to the extent necessary to meet that particular emergency and only for that fiscal year within which the resolution was passed. If it is to be continued beyond that fiscal year, the Congress must pass a new resolution. I do not want to see a vague, general, times-are-tough emergency resolution passed, thereby voiding the intent and letter of the limitation; the provisions of the bill guard against that happening.

It should also be made clear, from the outset, that the power of the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance is not impaired by this bill. Within the overall revenue limitation, those committees can carry out any degree of tax reform, increasing certain taxes, reducing others—eliminating old taxes, imposing new ones deemed necessary. The only limitation is that the total revenue collection not exceed that percentage established in relation to aggregate national income for that period.

This Congress has tried for nearly 200 years to control spending by controlling appropriations. It simply has not worked. The figures I have just cited on the growth of taxes, expenditures, debt, and inflation attest to the failure of this institution to hold the line.

What we must do, if we are to give action to our words and not just propound rhetoric, is to institute a mechanism—a device—for establishing a known standard—set here in relation to aggregate national income—for raising the revenue from which those expenditures are made.

If revenue cannot exceed a certain percentage, and if expenditures cannot exceed that revenue, then we have found the device for which we have looked for

the past two centuries. I think my bill contains that device.

CONTROL OF THE GROWTH IN THE MONEY SUPPLY

When money is printed and there is no increased productivity to stand behind that new money, it robs each of us that holds a dollar of some of the purchasing power of that dollar.

The short term gains of pumping more money into the economy—which is principally a device allowing Government to pay for much of its debt without borrowing funds for it—produce long term losses for us all. We are each a little poorer when new money is printed and no productivity accompanies it.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System now has the power to issue new money supply. Congress gave it that power long ago. It was a mistake.

When new money supply is kept at about 3 or 4 percent, it is at least manageable—even though it still contributes to inflation. But, when that new supply is up around 7 or 8 or even more of a percentage, it results in the 11, 12, 13, even 14 percent inflation we have been experiencing. The charts are clear on this phenomenon: The increase in money supply produces an increase in prices. There is a direct, commensurate correlation between additional money supply and higher prices. That fact cannot be denied.

It is contended by some that there needs to be some increase in money supply—unaccompanied by additional productivity—to keep the Federal Government from having to borrow all of its funds for deficit financing from lending institutions at high interest rates. The answer to that is not to print more money; the answer is to stop deficit spending.

It is contended by others that there needs to be some increase in money supply—unaccompanied by additional productivity—to help boost a sagging economy and not to result in such restrictive lending policies as to jeopardize jobs. The answer to that is to find a level at which a sagging economy can be boosted, but not at the expense of the purchasing power of all those who have jobs or who are on fixed incomes and pensions.

Title II of the Fiscal Integrity Act provides that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System must keep additional issuance of money at no more than 1¼ percent per fiscal quarter during ordinary times and 1½ percent per fiscal quarter during extraordinary times—with Congress having to specifically act upon allowing that 1½ percent level.

The Board can tie the issuance of new money to productivity, nonetheless, if it is less than either 1¼ or 1½ percent per fiscal quarter, because the bill does not require any new issuance of money at all, if the Board is so inclined.

As a matter of both philosophy and theoretical economics, I do not believe there should be an additional increase in the money supply which is not coupled with a like increase in national productivity. That is the only way to insure that the printing of additional, new money will not contribute to inflation.

We do not, however, live today under

either normal or particularly healthy economic conditions. To insist that we immediately require by law that increases in the money supply be coupled with productivity is to put an additional pressure, potentially counterproductive at this time, upon the economic recovery capabilities we now have. It would switch us from one policy immediately 180 degrees in favor of another. I think that would be too drastic and would incur too many risks.

We should, therefore, take a halfway step, and that is what title II of the Fiscal Integrity Act is; it is a step in the right direction but one which would not require an immediate and total reversal in prior policy. As a step in the right direction, once we have reached a stage of economic recovery adequate to take the other step without running unnecessary economic risks, then we can amend the law to do so.

ADDITIONAL FISCAL DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT

The Congress has taken an important first step—in the enactment of the Budget Reform Act—toward reestablishing its authority with respect to the preparation of the budget for the Government. The motives which underlay the enactment of that act are praiseworthy. Let us hope that the Budget Reform Act does work, and if it does not, as enacted, let us hope we will move quickly to rectify its weak provisions.

An important aspect of budget control was left off the Budget Reform Act as it worked its way through Congress. I speak of a requirement that each bill introduced or reported—which would authorize the expenditure of money—contain at the bottom of the first page of that bill the exact costs of implementing its provisions.

Let us be frank with ourselves. Too many bills are introduced without any real knowledge—even among its sponsors—of the total eventual costs of implementing its provisions, if enacted.

I think it would make all of us stop and think twice about introducing a bill to expand an existing—or enact a new—program, if we knew how much it would cost the taxpayers. At this initial level—this first step—in the process of how our laws are made, it would be a good thing for us to require—of each other and of ourselves—to disclose how much these bills would cost the taxpayers.

Similarly, title III of my bill would require a bill which would save money to show how much money would be saved.

Title III establishes a fairly simple procedure for obtaining the figures for these fiscal notes—one which ought to be able to be done with existing staff of the departments and agencies.

THE TEXT OF THE FISCAL INTEGRITY ACT

With the explanation which I have just given of the proposed Fiscal Integrity Act, I think its provisions ought to be more understandable to each of us. The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 16111

A bill to reestablish the fiscal integrity of the Government of the United States and its monetary policy, through the establishment of controls with respect to the levels of its revenues and budget outlays, the issuance of money, and the preparation of the budget, and for other purposes

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 "Fiscal Integrity Act".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2 (a) The Congress hereby determines that—

(1) it is the joint and several responsibility of the legislative and executive branches of the Government of the United States to reestablish the fiscal integrity of the Government through the establishment of requirements that budget outlays not exceed revenue, that the issuance of additional money not contribute to inflation, and that each such branch have adequate capability to prepare the budget of the Government in a manner to insure the reestablishment and maintenance of such fiscal integrity;

(2) the Government has been, and is now, making budget outlays for nontrust budget items in excess of revenues received from all nontrust sources;

(3) such existing fiscal policy has resulted in substantial borrowing by the Government from both public and private sources, an increase in the public debt of the Government and the interest payments required to carry such debt, and an increase in the insurance of additional money;

(4) such deficit spending has contributed to inflation in the economy and an attendant lessening of the value of the dollar in terms of its ability to purchase goods and services in both domestic and foreign markets;

(5) allowing the continuation of policies and activities which lessen the fiscal integrity of the Government is detrimental to the general welfare of the people and ought, therefore, to be ended.

TITLE I—REVENUE AND BUDGET OUTLAYS CONTROL

SEC. 101. (a) There is established for each fiscal year a revenue and budget outlays limit for the Government. Budget outlays shall consist of the total of expenditures and net lending of funds under budget authority. No appropriation shall be made for any fiscal year by the Congress in excess of the revenue and budget outlays limit for such fiscal year.

(b) If during any fiscal year the revenue of the Government exceeds the limit established by subsection (a) of this section, the amount so in excess shall be used for the payment of the public debt of the Government.

(c) The revenue and budget outlays limit for each fiscal year shall be the amount derived by multiplying the estimated aggregate national income for such fiscal year by the Federal revenue factor for such year.

(d) For the fiscal year beginning more than one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the term "Federal revenue factor" shall mean the number derived by dividing the estimated aggregate revenue of the Government for the preceding year by the aggregate national income for such year, reduced by 0.025 per centum.

(e) For each of the following years, the term "Federal revenue factor" shall mean the number equal to the Federal revenue factor for the preceding fiscal year; except that for each of the twenty fiscal years beginning after the fiscal year to which this Act shall first apply, such term shall mean the number equal to the Federal revenue factor for the preceding fiscal year, reduced by an additional 0.0025 per centum.

(f) The limitations, determinations, estimates, and calculations required to be made by subsections (a), (c), (d) and (e) of this section shall be made by the Congressional Budget Office, acting through its Director.

SEC. 102. Upon an emergency, determined by a resolution passed by at least two-thirds of each House of Congress, the provisions of section 101 of this Act may be suspended, but only to the extent necessary to meet such particular emergency, and in no event shall such suspension apply to any fiscal year other than that fiscal year in which the reso-

lution determining the existence of such emergency was passed.

SEC. 103. The provisions of this title shall apply to fiscal years beginning after the one hundred and eighty day period following the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—MONETARY SUPPLY CONTROL

SEC. 201. (a) In carrying out its functions under section 324 of the Revised Statutes and under the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall insure that any rate of increase in the amount of currency in circulation and demand deposits is not greater than 1½ per centum per quarter fiscal year.

(b) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, upon a finding and a report to the Congress by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System that an extraordinary economic condition exists, the Board may exercise its functions so as to insure that the rate of increase in the amount of currency in circulation and demand deposits is not greater than 1½ per centum per quarter fiscal year during any fiscal year following the end of the first sixty days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the report is transmitted to it unless, between the date of the report and the expiration of the sixty-day period, either House passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not agree with the findings of the Board.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection—

(A) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die; and

(B) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the sixty-day period.

(3) The provisions of sections 910 through 913 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to the procedures applicable to the consideration of any resolution of disapproval under this subsection.

TITLE III—FISCAL DISCLOSURE

SEC. 301. A bill or joint resolution of a public or private character which has been introduced in either House of Congress or received by it from the other House shall be printed only when there appears at the bottom of the first page thereof a fiscal note. Such fiscal note shall state the amounts estimated to be the direct and indirect costs likely to be incurred or the direct and indirect savings likely to be achieved in carrying out the provisions of such bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is introduced or received and in each of the five fiscal years following such fiscal year, or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by such bill or joint resolution if less than five years, except that in the case of measures affecting revenue, the fiscal note shall state only the estimate of the change in revenues for a one-year period.

SEC. 302. (a) A copy of each bill or joint resolution required by section 301 to have printed on its first page a fiscal note shall, upon introduction or receipt, be transmitted immediately to the instrumentality of Government which will carry out the provisions of such bill or joint resolution.

(b) Not later than seventy-two hours following the receipt of any bill or joint resolution transmitted under subsection (a) of this section, such instrumentality shall transmit the text of the fiscal note for that bill or joint resolution to the Public Printer for printing by him.

(c) If a Member of Congress notifies the instrumentality of government which will carry out the provisions of the bill or joint resolution that he intends to introduce a bill or joint resolution required under section 301 to be printed with a fiscal note, and submits a copy of the bill or joint resolution to such instrumentality, such instrumentality shall provide such Member with the

text of the fiscal note for that bill or joint resolution. Such fiscal note shall be placed at the bottom of the first page at the time of introduction. A copy of any bill or joint resolution introduced with a fiscal note in accordance with this subsection shall be transmitted to the Public Printer for printing, and the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not apply to any bill or joint resolution so introduced.

SEC. 303. A bill or joint resolution ordered reported by a committee of either House which authorizes a budget outlay shall be printed only when there appears at the bottom of the first page thereof a fiscal note consistent with the requirements of, and prepared in a manner consistent with, sections 301 and 302 of this title.

CALL FOR ACTION

Mr. Speaker, I believe more effective budget control and monetary supply control are ideas whose times have come.

Whether they are enacted this year, or at some subsequent point, they will be enacted. If not, we run the risk of destruction of our still free economy, our political system, and our free society.

The time is now for this body to exert leadership. It should do so. I am committed to that.

CONGRESS MUST ACCEPT AND EXERCISE ITS AUTHORITY OVER THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. COHEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body are acutely aware of the unease and frustration pervading this Nation because of our present economic woes. The hitherto unknown combination of double-digit inflation and the threat of recession has created great concern among our Nation's citizens. Understandably they feel that their lives, fortunes, and futures are more and more beyond their own control and subject to the decisions of their Government. Unfortunately, many Americans also believe that their Government lacks the knowledge or ability to correct the problems now plaguing us and make good on the promises it has held out to the people.

In this atmosphere I consider it absolutely imperative that Members of Congress, who collectively have the constitutional responsibility for determining our fiscal policies, be honest with the American people about the authority they can exercise to correct them. I have been very disturbed in recent weeks to hear respected leaders of this body blame the administration for overspending and declare that the President must impound funds in order to bring Federal expenditures to an acceptable level.

Surely, after the thousands of words spoken by Members of Congress on the impropriety if not illegality of executive impoundment and after the great expense in time and effort involved in enacting the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, we are not going to be so hypocritical as to insist that the Congress has neither the responsibility nor the authority to control the Government's purse. I have heard calls for the President to veto all appropriations bills and send them back for congressional action. Have we forgotten

that before virtually any of our fiscal year 1975 appropriations bills go to the President for signature they must still gain the final approval of both this and the other body?

If the Members are concerned, as we must be, with reducing Government spending and thus helping control inflation, then certainly a vote can be taken to recommit these bills to conference or committee with instructions that the reductions be made. And while, admittedly, the procedures established in the Budget Control Act do not become formally effective until next year, there is no reason why a similar approach cannot be informally utilized to determine a viable budget ceiling and the priorities necessary for readjusting our appropriations.

I would urge my colleagues to be absolutely honest also about both the complexity of the economic problems and the implications of a large budget cut. The severe inflation of this past year has been a worldwide problem brought on in considerable measure by the sharp increases in oil and food prices. These price increases were the result of sudden shortages and the scramble of nations to obtain enough of these materials to maintain their economic production. In the end, such problems will only be corrected by increasing our agricultural and energy supplies.

Further, a large portion of the present Federal budget, including revenue sharing, highway funds, and social security is already committed by law and cannot be included in any budget reduction efforts. This means that a 10-percent reduction will necessitate very deep cuts in the smaller, controllable section of the budget. A number of programs for which Congress has expressed great support may, therefore, be jeopardized. Obviously, then, Congress will have to make some very difficult decisions about its priorities.

But that, after all, is our function. We have the authority and responsibility to do so, and it is incumbent upon us to demonstrate to this Nation that we have the will. Instead of trying to point the finger of blame at another branch of Government, let us square our shoulders and assume the task for which we were elected. Until we do so, the crisis in confidence will continue, and it will not just be the Congress or the administration, the Democrats or the Republicans who will lose, but the entire Nation.

INTOLERABLE LIFE FOR SYRIAN JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the various agreements made by the United States with the Syrian Arab Republic between 1946 and 1972, roughly \$60 million has been extended to that nation in addition to the \$50 million in military and economic assistance doled out until 1965.

In light of the resumption of diplomatic relations between the two nations at the ambassadorial level and the new educational and cultural agreements, we

may expect more demands for assistance from Syria. In considering these requests, we ought to show our concern for a community held captive in Syria, much as we have done for the Jewish community in the Soviet Union, and as we failed to do for European Jewry under Hitler.

The parallels between the state of Syrian Jewry today and that of Jews of other times and places are all too clear. Like their European counterparts of the thirties, they are now required to carry identity cards stamped in yellow. Like the Soviet Jews of today, they are persecuted and forbidden to emigrate. These prejudices reflect themselves in a multitude of conscious policy measures that the Syrian Government directs toward its captive Jewish population.

The severe discriminations that the Jews in Syria have been subjected to have become draconian since the 6-day war. The Jewish community is being forcibly isolated. Soldiers and other civil servants are forbidden to trade in Jewish shops. Curfews are announced to confine Jews to their homes for lengthy periods. The Jewish populations of Aleppo and Damascus are never allowed to leave the city limits.

Not only are Jews set apart, they are subjected to harassment. As part of a deliberate effort to plague its Jewish population, the pieces of real estate that Jews are forbidden to transfer to their heirs are given to Palestinians, the very people who perpetrate malicious acts against their Jewish neighbors under the sanction of the police.

These deplorable conditions are rendered intolerable by the absolute refusal of the Syrian Government to permit Jewish emigration. The Jewish men and women who sought to make their way out of the country have received lengthy prison sentences. Of late, Syrian police are cracking down on relatives of Jews who have succeeded in leaving the country, subjecting them to reprisals, including arrest and torture.

Even as I speak, these Syrian Jews are suffering in the purgatory that the perversions of justice, unabashedly committed by the Syrian Government, have given rise to.

Mr. Speaker, to assure the dedication of the United States to fundamental human rights, to give these unrepresented people their only opportunity to live in freedom and dignity, I propose that the Vanik amendment to the trade bill be amended to extend the proscription of the most-favored-nation status to any and all nations which deny to their citizens the right to emigrate.

Mr. Speaker, I mean that specifically to include Syria.

RESOLUTION ON THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the American economy is currently teetering on the brink of disaster. Nonetheless, the Nixon administration persists in its cruel and inhuman pursuit of outmoded, traditionally Republican, economic policies.

Today the Democratic caucus adopted

a resolution recommending alternative approaches to strengthening our economy. In doing so, the caucus acted on the basis of advice recently offered to the steering committee by some of our Nation's leading economists.

The President would do well to adopt these recommendations. And the Nation would be the chief beneficiary.

The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE ECONOMY OF THE HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

Whereas the American economy is in its worst overall condition since the Great Depression, and,

Whereas the American people are suffering the ill effects of rapid and persistent price inflation: high and rising unemployment; chronically low levels of production and, currently, a severe economic recession; extremely high interest rates which are causing serious dislocations of financing in the housing industry, small business, utilities, state and local governments, and other sectors of the economy; budget deficits resulting from shortfalls in Federal revenues caused by lost economic production; supply bottlenecks and shortages of basic resources; growing unfairness in the distribution of income; and lack of integration of governmental policies which, in itself, contributes to the foregoing problems, and,

Whereas the current Administration has, over more than five years, proved itself incapable of working effectively to solve our nation's economic problems and has, in fact, measurably contributed to these economic difficulties through its failure to fashion and to implement policy correctly, and,

Be it therefore resolved, That the Democratic Caucus of the United States House of Representatives recommends (1) the adoption of a balanced tax reform package, including measures to offset the harm done by inflation to the purchasing power of middle- and lower-income families, who have suffered most from inflation; (2) cutting out of waste and unnecessary expenditures wherever found; (3) improved and expanded public employment and unemployment compensation programs to combat the rising tide of joblessness and increased efforts to solve the specific problems of the marginally employable; (4) cushioning the impact of monetary restraint and bringing down high interest rates by channelling credit toward credit-starved areas of the economy, such as productive capital investment, housing, state and local governments, and small business, and away from speculative and inflationary use of credit; (5) increasing the supply of scarce materials and forestalling future shortages through advanced planning and sensible import, export, subsidy and market policies; (6) consideration and implementation of new policies to place all governmental economic policy machinery on a longer-range basis, including review of government policies in such areas as agriculture, energy, transportation, health, defense procurement, and antitrust policy, and development of the Congress' own new budgetary system for long-range purposes, such as the evaluation of long-range effects of changes in taxes and expenditures; (7) efforts by business, labor and government to achieve responsible wage and price behavior; (8) adequate support for badly-needed social programs, such as education, health, housing, and anti-pollution efforts through the increased federal revenues which will automatically result from a healthy economy, and

Be it further resolved, That the appropriate committees of the House be urged to report legislation to implement these recommendations, where possible, in this Congress and, where not, in the 94th Congress.

EXIMBANK: EXPORTING AMERICA INTO ENERGY EQUIPMENT SHORTAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation drifts with uncertain energy supplies, while the growth of American industry pauses because of energy short-fall, while citizens remain concerned because of inadequate and high-priced electricity and oil, the taxpayer funded Export-Import Bank continues on its merry way, funding the sale of energy-related equipment all over the world at subsidized interest rates. The taxpayer-backed industry subsidy for energy development and production outside the United States and for other nations approximates \$60 million per year.

Developers of energy have the option of creating new energy in the United States at interest costs of 12 to 15 percent—or developing energy abroad with the aid of the Eximbank and its 6 to 8.5 percent loans.

The record which I submit with this statement clearly indicates that the American taxpayer provided massive long term loans at 6% to develop the North Sea oil for the European market. Another Export-Import Bank loan for \$172,350,000 at 6 percent will build a pipeline in Norway. In the past 3 fiscal years, the total of North Sea related development loans to England, Norway, and Denmark appears to be in excess of \$347 million.

Other Exim loans have been to the oil producing countries which rewarded the lender by multiplying the price of the product to Americans.

Some of these credit arrangements include recipients involved in the oil boycott against the United States:

First, \$6 million for an offshore oil rig to be used in the Arab emirate of Abu Dhabi; and

Second, \$50 million to build an oil pipeline from the Gulf of Suez to Alexandria, Egypt. The line will be owned 50 percent by Egypt, with the remainder shared by Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Abu Dhabi, and other OPEC members.

Where is our national interest in the policies of the Export-Import Bank, which has dramatically and continuously encouraged the exportation of energy producing equipment which is often in critically short supply in America. In the area of oil production, the Bank has encouraged a domestic shortage of drilling, refining, and pipe equipment by granting low-cost, 6 to 8.5 percent loans to foreign oil producers for their purchase of American equipment. The export of these materials hurts U.S. producers, who can obtain needed equipment only with long delays and high interest rates of 12 to 15 percent.

The International Association of Oil Well Drilling Contractors reports that there is a 2-year wait for drilling pipe and a 3-year delay for drilling rigs. On April 1, 1974, the Assistant Administrator for Policy, Planning, and Regulation of the Federal Energy Office, stated that—

The general uncertainty as to the avail-

ability of tubular goods has apparently already delayed the drilling of some wells which should be drilled now.

Yet, since June of 1973, the Eximbank has made available to other countries—in the petroleum energy area alone—well over \$200 million for financing the export of exploratory, production, transport, and refinery materials.

Mr. Speaker, how can we hope to be independent in energy while we create more favorable conditions for energy development abroad than at home? By rough estimate, I have found that within the past 5 years alone, the Eximbank has granted over 200 loans for all forms of energy development—loans amounting to nearly \$3 billion. Because the Bank provides a loan for only about half the value of the export, it appears that the Bank has helped export more than \$6 billion in energy equipment. How much more successful would Project Independence become, if the Bank's guaranteed and subsidized loans could be made available for domestic energy investments? In light of energy needs at home, the export of capital for foreign energy development can no longer be considered a valid function of the Eximbank.

I urge the House Banking and Currency Committee, which is currently considering legislation to extend the life of the Bank, to place restrictions on the power of the Bank to encourage energy equipment sales. The Bank must be prevented from exporting us into brown-outs, blackouts, and energy-related unemployment.

Below are listed my own estimates—developed from the Bank's annual reports—of the total amount of all energy development loans granted by the Eximbank during the past 5 fiscal years.

Fiscal year and amount

Number of loans granted:			
24	1970 (7/69-6/70)	-----	\$310,921,220
30	1971 (7/70-6/71)	-----	287,444,760
50	1972 (7/71-6/72)	-----	816,585,430
55	1973 (7/72-6/73)	-----	669,123,090
42	1974 (7/73-6/74)	-----	889,927,610

Following is the table of Export-Import Bank loans for fiscal year 1974. The level and type of loans made in fiscal 1974 is typical of those made in fiscal years 1972 and 1973:

FISCAL YEAR 1974

OBLIGOR, PURPOSE, RATE, TERMS, AND AMOUNT

Bahamas

Deutag International (C Deilman AG): oil drilling; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 12-31-76; \$1,521,580.

Brazil

Sociedade Anonima White Martin: Expand facilities for gas & liq.; 6.000% payable in 9 SA.; beginning 11-10-81; \$4,693,500.

Dow Quimica Do Nordeste SA (Dow Chemical Co.): Construct petrochemical plants; 6.000% payable in 8 SA.; beginning 11-10-80; \$5,145,000.

Canada

Irving Oil Co.: Oil refinery expansion; 6.000% payable in 10 SA.; beginning 5-10-81; \$24,750,000.

China, Republic of (Taiwan)

Taiwan Power Company (Ministry of Finance): Increase in financing for 5-50 MW Gas turbine units; 6.000% payable in 10 SA.; beginning 2-05-80; \$10,980,000.

Taiwan Power Company (Republic of China): Two nuclear power plants; 6.000%

payable in 15 SA.; beginning 5-20-89; \$199,498,800.

Colombia

Corporacion Electrica de la Co. (Republic of Colombia Ministry): Generators; 6.000% payable in 15 SA.; beginning 5-30-84; \$10,577,700.

Costa Rica

Instituto Costa de Electricidad (Ministry of Finance): Two gas turbines power plants; 6.000% payable in 8 SA.; beginning 6-05-78; \$2,123,863.

Denmark

Corino Shipping A/S et al. (Dampskibsselskabet AP 1912 et al.): Increase in financing for two drilling vessels; 6.000% payable in 7 SA.; beginning 9-15-77; \$337,586.

Maersk Borentreprise (Dampskibsselskabet Incorp.): Increase in financing for one offshore drilling rig; 6.000% payable in 7 SA.; beginning 7-10-77; \$450,000.

Steamship Co.: Steam turbine units; 6.000% payable in 8 SA.; beginning 12-05-79; \$1,760,000.

Dominican Republic

Corp. Domicana Electricidad (Dominican Republic): Electric power expan. program; 6.000% payable in 14 SA.; beginning 8-10-84; \$18,000,000.

Ecuador

Empresa Electrica del Ecuador: Thermal power station expans.; 6.000% payable in 6 SA.; beginning 5-05-79; \$2,660,850.

Egypt, Arab representative of

Suez-Mediterranean pipeline pe.: Pipeline construction project; 6.000% payable in 16 SA.; beginning 8-10-77; \$50,000,000.

Finland

Neste oy: Gas turbine power pac.; 6.000% payable in 7 SA.; beginning 2-10-78; \$855,260.

Iran

Intairdril limited (Intairdril): Oil drilling equip.; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 11-05-76; \$1,620,000.

Israel

Bank Hapoalim—BM.: Increase in financing for 3 gas turbine generators; 6.000% payable in 10 SA.; beginning 11-15-78; \$1,350,000.

Italy

Sub Sea Oil Services SPA (Shell Petroleum NV): Submarine and related equipment; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 4-10-77; \$529,650.

Japan

Atomic Power Company (Japan Development Bank): Increase in financing for nuclear fuel; 7.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 11-01-73; \$1,000,000.

Mexico

Com. Federal de Electricidad (Nacional Financiera SA): Nuclear power plant const.; 6.000% payable in 20 SA.; beginning 5-10-82; \$25,515,000.

Nigeria

Ashland Oil Co. oil exploitation equip. & servi.; 7.000% payable in 10 SA.; beginning 10-05-74; \$1,800,000.

Norway

Ugland Shipping Company A.S. (Den Norske Credit Bank): Increase in financing for semisubmersible oil driller; 6.000% payable in 7 SA.; beginning 9-15-77; \$461,250.

Norskald (Gotaas-Larsen Shipping Corp.): Increase in financing for semi-submersible drilling rig; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 2-05-77; \$900,000.

Nordic Offshore Drilling Co. (Other): blow-out preventor; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 8-05-76; \$900,000.

Gotaas-Larsen Drilling A/S Co. (Hambros Bank Ltd): Increase in financing for drilling equipment; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 8-05-77; \$315,000.

Skaugen-Offshore Co. (The Offshore Co.): Increase in financing for drilling equipment;

6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 2-05-78; \$225,000.

Ekofoisk Co-Venturer (Parents of Co-Venturer): oil & gas field developmt; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 7-10-78; \$22,500,000.

Ekofoisk Co-Venturers (Parents of Co-Venturers): construct oil pipeline; 6.000% payable in 8 SA.; beginning 7-10-80; \$172,350,000.

Ks A. S. Viking Offshore (Den Norske Creditbank): semisubmersible drilling rig; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 11-10-77; \$2,250,000.

Ks Dyvi Drilling As (Various): offshore drilling equip.; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 11-30-77; \$2,700,000.

Sweden

Sydsvenska Varmekraftaktiebol (Sydkraft & Skandinaviska): nuclear fuel load; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 8-20-80; \$6,570,000.

Thailand

Ednasa Co. Ltd.: one drilling rig; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 8-10-74; \$1,800,000.

Ednasa Co. Ltd.: one drilling rig; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 8-10-73; \$1,080,000.

United Kingdom

Salvesen Offshore Drilling Ltd. (Christian Salvesen Ltd.): increase in financing for cargo vessel for drilling oper.; 6.000% payable in 7 SA.; beginning 10-31-77; \$900,000.

Geoprasco Overseas Ltd. (Trafalgar House Investment Ltd.): oil drilling equip.; 6.000% payable in 4 SA.; beginning 6-05-76; \$742,500.

Kingsnorth Marine Drilling Ltd. (various): oil drilling equipment; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning 2-05-78; \$6,300,000.

Four Millbank Investments Ltd. (four Millbank holdings Ltd.): oil drilling rig; 6.000% payable in 5 SA.; beginning February 5, 1978; \$2,703,688.

Venezuela

C. A. De Admin Y Fomento Electri (Corp. Venezolana De Fomento): two gas turbines; 6.000% payable in 8 SA.; beginning May 10, 1978; —.

C. A. Energia Elec. Venezuela: gas turbine power plant; 6.000% payable in 8 SA.; beginning November 10, 1978; —.

Yugoslavia

Elektrarna Sostanj (various): thermal power plant and equip.; 6.000% payable in 12 SA.; beginning May 10, 1984; \$18,000,000.

Various (various): construct nuclear power plant; 7.000% payable in 20 SA.; beginning June 10 1979; \$176,019,000.

Zaire

Soc. Nationale D Electricite (Min. Finance Govt. of Zaire): electric power line construction; 6.000% payable in 15 SA.; beginning August 10, 1985; \$102,240,000.

WHAT IF WE DON'T IMPEACH HIM?

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have just reread Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.'s May 1974 Harper's Magazine essay, "What if We Don't Impeach Him?" Schlesinger, now Albert Schweitzer professor of humanities at the City University of New York and author of "The Imperial Presidency," answers his own question: failure to impeach will consolidate the "imperial Presidency," possibly diminish the Presidency in other areas as ill-advised restrictions are placed on Nixon and, finally, hold up to the Nation and the world a moral model not even the President's defenders defend.

But what if the House impeaches the President and the Senate fails to convict?

I agree with Arthur Schlesinger's view:

Even if Mr. Nixon should eventually beat the rap, the experience of trial before the Senate would inescapably have a chastening effect. The readiness of Congress to carry things that far must surely reinvigorate the system of accountability—not so much as conviction and removal but a good deal more than acting as if Mr. Nixon had done nothing out of the ordinary. The worst thing, it seems to me, would be to register Congressional acquiescence to Mr. Nixon's theory of Presidential accountability. It is better to have impeached and lost than never to have impeached at all.

The article follows:

[From Harper's Magazine, May 1974]

WHAT IF WE DON'T IMPEACH HIM?

(By Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.)

We hear a great deal today about the presumably grim consequences of the impeachment of the President—an endless public trial, a people divided, a government paralyzed, a nation disgraced before the world. But suppose the House of Representatives should decide not to impeach Mr. Nixon. This would have its consequences, too—consequences that deserve at least as careful an examination.

For the refusal to impeach would be a decision as momentous as impeachment itself. It would and could be interpreted only as meaning that Congress does not think Mr. Nixon has done anything to warrant impeachment. It would alter the historic relationship of Presidential power to the constitutional system of accountability for the use of that power. The message our generation would send to posterity would be that Mr. Nixon, whatever his other disasters, had conceived and established a new conception of Presidential accountability, and that his successors, so long as they take care to avoid the crudities of a Watergate burglary, can expect to inherit Mr. Nixon's conception of inherent Presidential authority and to wield the unshared power with which he will have endowed the Presidency. Failure to impeach would be a vindication of a revolutionary theory of Presidential accountability.

The traditional theory, the theory that prevailed from 1789 to about 1966, was sufficiently clear. The President, as Andrew Jackson put it, must be "accountable at the bar of public opinion for every act of his Administration." "I have a very definite philosophy about the Presidency," said Theodore Roosevelt. "I think it should be a very powerful office, and I think the President should be a very strong man who uses without hesitation every power that the position yields; but because of this fact I believe that he should be sharply watched by the people [and] held to a strict accountability by them."

It is precisely such a system that Mr. Nixon has seemed determined to reject, one that manifestly drives him, as he would say, "up the wall." In his view, the requirements of accountability are sufficiently fulfilled every four years. Each Presidential election confers a mandate, which empowers the President to do whatever he thinks best for the safety and welfare of the republic. Between elections the President has the right to be left alone to carry out his mandate. The mandate, if there were proper "respect for the Presidency," should shield the President from the harassment of a nosy Congress, an unscrupulous opposition, and a disrespectful press. All these egregious institutions must "get off his back" and let him do his job.

For better or worse, however, this conception of Presidential accountability does not happen to be the one embodied in the American Constitution. It may well be embodied in the last constitution of General de Gaulle. But Mr. Nixon, alas, is not the President of France. And his novel theory of Presidential accountability, applied to the American scene, has led to a variety of unprecedented

executive actions, some of which, in my judgment, are impeachable and some of which are not.

Mr. Nixon moved rather systematically, for example, to deprive Congress of the three historic powers that enabled it during most of American history to play its role in the system of accountability. One of these is the power of the purse—the power to decide how public money should be spent. *The Federalist*, No. 58, called this "the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure." The second is the power of oversight and investigation—the power to monitor and disclose the activities of the Executive branch. "The informing function of Congress," said Woodrow Wilson, "should be preferred even to its legislative function." The third is the power to declare war—the power specifically reserved by the Founding Fathers for Congress so that, as Lincoln said, "no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us."

These are the powers that had above all preserved the balance of the Constitution—and these are the powers that Mr. Nixon set out methodically to nullify. Through his doctrine of unlimited impoundment, he sought to nullify the Congressional power of the purse. Through his doctrine of unreviewable executive privilege, he sought to nullify the Congressional power of oversight and investigation. Through his doctrine of the unlimited power of the Commander in Chief to take preemptive action to protect American troops from the threat of attack, he sought to nullify the Congressional power to authorize war. If he had succeeded in imposing these three doctrines in the absolute form in which he presented them, he would have effectively ended the power of Congress as a partner in the constitutional order.

I do not propose, however, that these doctrines, wrongheaded as they may be and ominous as would be their consequences, constitute per se grounds for impeachment. Mr. Nixon has been perfectly open and aboveboard about these claims. He has avowed his doctrines publicly and given Congress and the people full and fair warning. Moreover, as we should have learned from the Andrew Johnson case, impeachment is not the way to settle arguable constitutional differences in advance of final decisions by the Supreme Court. Of course, if Mr. Nixon persisted in such doctrines in defiance of court orders, this would be another question and would obviously carry him into the zone of impeachability.

What matters here is that these doctrines express a state of mind. They express a rejection of Lincoln's view that under the Constitution "no one man" should exercise excessive power. And this same state of mind, the same resentment of challenge and scrutiny, the same effort to break the Presidency out of the historic system of accountability has led Mr. Nixon into other claims and deeds that fall much more probably into what Hamilton, explaining the necessity for impeachment, called "the abuse or violation of some public trust."

Foremost among the public trusts conferred by the people to the President is the constitutional command that "he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed." A crucial question in regard to the Watergate matter is whether Mr. Nixon has obeyed this command. One reading of the record would suggest, for example, that, instead of pressing for the detection and punishment of lawbreakers, Mr. Nixon has continuously resisted inquiry into Watergate: first trying to limit the FBI investigation; then failing to report to law-enforcement officials crimes of which he had admitted knowledge after March 21, 1973; then withholding evidence from the courts; then firing the Special Prosecutor,

who seemed too ardent about the faithful execution of the law; then, when forced by the courts to produce tapes he had attested on July 23 last as being "under my sole personal control," denying that some ever existed and turning over others in a form so damaged and defective as to destroy their evidentiary usefulness; most recently, declining to submit further evidence to a new Special Prosecutor. When the board of technical experts concluded that one of the most critical tapes had been deliberately obliterated, Mr. Nixon, far from showing constitutional zeal about ferreting out the obliterators, revealed no public concern or even curiosity.

This would not seem a convincing portrait of a President taking care that the laws be faithfully executed. Of course, it may well be an incorrect reading of the record. Still, there is surely enough in that record, however read, to raise the question of whether Mr. Nixon's interest in Watergate has been in the faithful execution of the law or in the sabotage of a criminal inquiry. In a constitutional order, above all when the probity of the President himself is under challenge, that question demands an answer. The Founding Fathers anticipated that such questions might arise and laid down in the Constitution a way by which answers could be found.

For no President can withhold evidence in an impeachment inquiry. Whatever standing the claim of executive privilege may have in other circumstances, it has none here. James K. Polk was the only President between Jackson and Lincoln to enhance the power of the Presidency; but Polk conceded with utmost clarity in a message to the House of Representatives in 1846 that, if the House were looking into executive misconduct with a view to the exercise of its power of impeachment, "the power of the House in the pursuit of this object would penetrate into the most secret recesses of the Executive Departments. It could command the attendance of any and every agent of the Government, and compel them to produce all papers, public or private, official or unofficial, and to testify on oath to all facts within their knowledge."

Impeachment, it must be emphasized, is not a judgment on a public official; it is a process by which a judgment can be reached on the basis of evidence. And this process offers the most expeditious as well as the constitutional way to resolve the question of whether Richard M. Nixon has faithfully executed the laws of the United States. It is a procedure, moreover, that should commend itself quite as much to the friends of the President as to his critics. For, if Mr. Nixon is indeed guiltless, if he is the victim, as Vice-President Ford assures us, of a left-wing cabal organized, according to Senator Goldwater, by "people dangerous to the American way of life," then what better way to expose the conspiracy and confound the conspirators than to give Mr. Nixon a fair and open trial? Whatever constitutional scruples may have constrained the President from making public the documents that Senator Scott tells us, would clear him if only they could be released, would necessarily be overborne in the case of impeachment. Do not these true believers wish to dispel all uncertainty and give the President in whom they profess such boundless faith the opportunity to vindicate his character?

This is precisely the ground on which Benjamin Franklin argued in the Constitutional Convention. Impeachment, he said, was the best way to assure not only "the regular punishment of the Executive where his misconduct should deserve it" but equally "his honorable acquittal when he should be unjustly accused." Dr. Franklin cited the case of the Prince of Orange, who was blamed for the failure of the Dutch fleet to carry out an agreement to meet the French fleet at a

stated rendezvous. Because the *Stadtholder* could not be impeached, suspicions were permitted to flourish and ended in "the most violent animosities and contentions" against him. "Had he been impeachable," Franklin observed, "a regular and peaceable inquiry would have taken place and he would if guilty have been duly punished, if innocent restored to the confidence of the public." When there was no process of impeachment, Franklin noted, this might leave a desperate people no alternative but assassination, in which case the leader under fire would be "not only deprived of his life but of the opportunity of vindicating his character."

Worst of all is the signal transmitted to posterity if Congress decides that the question of whether Mr. Nixon has faithfully executed the laws is not worth bothering to answer. Such a considered expression of Congressional indifference could not but invite Mr. Nixon's successors to be equally cavalier about their constitutional responsibilities in the assurance that, unless a President, say, murders his wife in the presence of his Cabinet, Congress will be unlikely to insist that he need worry about his obligation to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. Thus refusal to impeach Mr. Nixon would widen the breach in the system of accountability. And that breach would be widened still further if a Congressional failure to act established the view espoused by the new Attorney General and some Republican members of Congress that a President is not to be held accountable for the deeds of his closest subordinates.

Obviously a President need not be impeached because an obscure official buried deep in the endless bureaucracy, someone he does not know and probably has never heard of, does something wrong. But it is an extraordinary idea that a President is not responsible to some degree for the behavior of those intimates with whom he chooses to surround himself in the White House and the Cabinet. No doubt many of the Republicans who deny that Mr. Nixon should be held accountable for Messrs. Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Mitchell, Stans, Dean, Krogh, Chapin, et al. are stockholders in great corporations. One hardly supposes that they would be equally permissive if the top man in one of these corporations disclaimed all responsibility for a persisting and cumulative pattern of offenses that had wrecked the public credit of the firm and had been committed by people he personally brought into the business. On the contrary: they would hasten to vote him out of office at the next stockholders' meeting. It is hard to see why Republican Congressmen should have higher standards for the president of a corporation than for the President of the United States.

The practical point is irresistible. If Mr. Nixon did not know what his right-hand men were doing, it was only because he did not wish to know. He had every facility in the world for finding out. And if Congress should decide that a President is no longer to be held broadly accountable for the conduct of his most personal appointees, it would obviously encourage future Presidents to wink at every sort of skulduggery so long as nothing could be traced to a specific directive from the Oval Office.

The constitutional point is equally irresistible. Madison was the father of the Constitution. The First Congress, because it contained so many men who had been at Philadelphia in the summer of 1787, has been called an adjourned session of the Constitutional Convention. Madison in the First Congress successfully argued that the President must have power to remove his appointees. Assuring the President this power, Madison said, would "make him, in a peculiar manner, responsible for their conduct, and subject him to impeachment himself [my emphasis], if he suffers them to perpetrate with impunity high crimes and misdemeanors against the United States, or neglects to

superintend their conduct, so as to check their excesses. On the Constitutionality of the declaration I have no manner of doubt." If the Ninety-third Congress should now decide that it understands constitutionality better than Madison and the First Congress, if it concludes that Mr. Nixon has no responsibility for the conduct of his closest associates, it would confirm Mr. Nixon's success in breaking the Presidency out of the historic system of accountability and in fashioning a new conception of Presidential responsibility on the American republic.

The refusal to impeach Mr. Nixon would in addition fix on the hapless republic the idea of "national security" which he invoked—and apparently still invokes—as justification for secret and lawless behavior on the part of a President and his agents. No doubt Mr. Nixon's defenders will claim that he did no more than other Presidents—notably Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt—in moving beyond the Constitution to protect the safety of the nation. They will point out that neither Lincoln nor Roosevelt was impeached; therefore, Mr. Nixon must be in the clear. And certainly one cannot deny Presidents the power to take drastic actions at their own peril when the life of the nation is at stake. Madison himself wrote in *The Federalist*, No. 48, that it was vain "to oppose constitutional barriers to the impulse of self-preservation." But there remain signal and decisive differences between the actions of Lincoln and Roosevelt and the actions of Mr. Nixon.

The life of the nation, after all, was truly at stake during the Civil War and again during the second world war. Moreover, Lincoln and Roosevelt carefully explained to Congress and the people why they thought the emergency so critical and thereby enabled Congress and the people to be the judge of their actions. Time in their cases was unquestionably of the essence. Their Congresses were unwilling or unable to devise policies of their own. And none of their acts was directed against the internal political process. Indeed, both Lincoln and Roosevelt held Presidential elections in the midst of their supreme national crises—and did not try to cook the results.

Moreover, where Lincoln and Roosevelt did their best to account for their actions to Congress and the people, where Mr. Nixon himself had expounded with relish his theories of impoundment, executive privilege, and the Presidential war-making power, Nixon never let Congress or the people on his notion that "national security" gave the President the right to break the law; this had to await John Ehrlichman's testimony before the Watergate Committee. Nor did he vouchsafe any public explanation of the national emergency of 1970, any argument that the Weathermen and the Black Panthers posed a threat to the republic comparable to that posed by civil war or by Nazism. Instead, behind closed doors, he authorized illegal actions—actions in many cases beyond anything undertaken by Lincoln or Roosevelt in times of authentic and indisputable crisis. Most indefensible of all was the Nixon Presidency's subversion of the political process itself. Whether this was authorized in advance or covered up afterward, it represented an attempt to deny the American people one of the two constitutional remedies for the abuse of Presidential power. The other remedy, of course, is impeachment; and, if Congress chooses to deny us this as well, where would it leave the constitutional order?

Mr. Nixon's all-purpose incantation of national security as an inherent and absolute Presidential right, whatever the surrounding circumstances, a right to be exercised in secret at Presidential pleasure without accountability to Congress and the people, surely represents an extraordinary violation of public trust. Some of his own people have begun to understand this now, even though Mr. Nixon himself thus far has shown not

the slightest evidence of comprehension, repentance, or even passing regret. "The key," the penitent Egil Krogh recently said, "is the effect that the term 'national security' had on my judgment. The very words served to block critical analysis. It seemed at least presumptuous if not unpatriotic to inquire into just what the significance of 'national security' was." If Mr. Nixon is not impeached, it will be a message from Congress to future Presidents that they can define national security as they wish, share their definition with no one, and do whatever they claim national security requires. It will be difficult for future Congresses to object when future Presidents act upon the powerful precedent Mr. Nixon will thus have established.

Future Presidents will be tempted most of all to assume that the American people in the end really prefer a regime based on and limited to the idea of quadrennial accountability so long as it is divorced from the stupidity of a Watergate burglary. And Watergate is precisely the sort of excess that more intelligent or less deluded Presidents than Mr. Nixon would take every care to avoid. If Mr. Nixon is still in office in January 1977, even though his personal reputation may be shattered beyond repair he will very likely have succeeded in consolidating the imperial Presidency.

There may be still another institutional consequence. There are two ways to deal with the abuse of Presidential power. One is to re-establish and enforce the system of accountability. The other is to reduce the powers of the President. Having failed to do the first, Congress would no doubt attempt the second. Since no one in Congress really trusts Mr. Nixon an inch, if he is not impeached there will be a continuing campaign till January 1977 to clip his wings through restrictive legislation. Already Congress has under consideration proposals giving itself the last word on questions like impoundment, executive privilege, executive agreements—questions that, before the Nixon Presidency, were worked out by accommodation and comity between the executive and legislative branches.

The trouble with wing-clipping legislation is that it would not only restrain Mr. Nixon in his last two years but could do injury, perhaps lasting injury, to the Presidency as an institution. But the Presidency as an institution is really not the cause of our trouble. As an institution, the Presidency has served the republic well during most of the course of American history. It would be fallacious to eviscerate the institution because a recent President or two abused the trust—or because Congress and the people allowed the system of accountability to fall into decay. The great virtue of impeachment is that it punishes the offender without punishing the office. It would permit future Presidents to use legitimate powers to the full while warning them in an emphatic way that they had better not usurp illegitimate powers or ignore the system of accountability.

Impeachment is, after all, the constitutional remedy. It is not, as some citizens seem to suppose, a form of *lèse majesté*. The Founding Fathers prescribed it in the full expectation that it would be used. Madison deemed it "indispensable" that the Constitution contain a provision "defending the Community against the incapacity, negligence or perfidy of the chief Magistrate." Monroe called the impeachment clause "the main spring of the great machine of government," the method of keeping the machine "in motion by its own powers and on a proper balance." There can be no better means than this of making future Presidents sensitive to the system of accountability—and of making future Congresses remember that they too have a responsibility in the constitutional order. If there was ever a time when the community needed defense against Presidential incapacity, negligence, and perfidy, it is surely today. If Congress does not act in

1974, the deterrent effect of the impeachment clause will thereafter be nonexistent.

The constitutional side of the story is not all, nor is it even perhaps the more important side. A Congressional decision to excuse Mr. Nixon's transgressions would create more than a constitutional model. It would create a moral model.

The President of the United States occupies a peculiar but recognized place in the moral organization of American society. Theodore Roosevelt called the Presidency a "bully pulpit." Franklin Roosevelt said it was "preeminently a place of moral leadership." Parents used to hope their children would grow up to be President. Children like to see the President, whoever he is, as benign and wise, the national father to whom they can safely entrust their lives and their destinies.

What happens to this bond when a President no longer sets a particularly edifying example? No doubt it is healthy not to see a President as a superhuman figure. Yet it troubles the whole society when he can no longer be seen as any sort of example at all. Few among us can hate our children enough to urge them to model themselves on Mr. Nixon. "He is the most visible and instructive father figure we have," Gurt Vonnegut, Jr., recently wrote, "our most impressive teacher. What does he teach our children? To give almost nothing to charity, to cheat in money matters at every opportunity, to lie, to reject all criticism, to be indifferent to the needs of strangers, to treat laws disrespectfully, to love only close friends and relatives and sports on television, and to carpet-bomb at Christmas." How to convey the ideals of American life in the face of such a moral example?

Mr. Nixon has succeeded for the moment in turning the Presidency into preeminently a place of immoral leadership. This is not only confusing for children and demoralizing for parents but it spreads its contamination well beyond the White House, bringing American politics in general into discredit. Nothing has been more marked after Watergate than the indiscriminate national revulsion against all politicians. I saw a bumper sticker the other day: BE A PATRIOTIC AMERICAN—VOTE AGAINST ALL INCUMBENTS. All this is manifestly unfair. Mr. Nixon's chums were, in the main, not politicians at all. They were public-relations men, bond lawyers, and the like, with little knowledge of and no respect for the political process. They never understood that democratic politics is a conflict of limited liability in which the opposition must always be permitted to live to fight another day. The crassness and stupidity of their tactics appalled the professionals, including those in Mr. Nixon's own party. And it was seasoned professionals like Senator Ervin who took the lead in exposing them. But if members of Congress should say, in effect, that Mr. Nixon and his men did not after all transgress the bounds of traditional politics, that none of their dirty tricks rouses serious Congressional objection, then Congress will only strengthen the popular cynicism about politicians. All politicians will be perceived as more or less out of the same can. Only Congress can redeem the reputation of politics by enforcing a distinction between Watergate politics and the politics of a constitutional democracy.

The shrinking from impeachment probably arises from the novelty of abuse of power, from the remoteness of contemporary Presidents, and from the difficulty of visualizing the offenses of the Nixon Administration. Perhaps the situation can be more easily conceived if put in terms more homely and local. A letter in the *Ann Arbor News* of December 19, 1973, did this rather well. The author, Robert P. Weeks, wrote:

"What would you do, as a citizen of Ann Arbor, if you learned that the Mayor of Ann Arbor . . . had done the following:

"1. Approved a plan by which the Chief of

the Ann Arbor Police Department could illegally tap your phone, open your mail, and burglarize your apartment, office or house;

"2. Directed the Ann Arbor Police and FBI agents to tap the phone of the Ann Arbor *News* reporter who covers city hall; directed the FBI to investigate a newscaster for the local radio station;

"3. Withheld knowledge of a burglary from a local judge trying a case in which that knowledge was crucially important;

"4. Secretly taped conversations held in the mayor's office in city hall between himself and citizens like you as well as public officials, then when a confirmed court order required him to turn over nine of these tapes, refused to obey; then, reversed himself; then, announced that the two tapes containing perhaps the most critically important material never existed;

"5. Tripled his wealth while serving as Mayor of Ann Arbor;

"6. Paid practically no Federal income taxes for several years because he claimed huge and legally dubious deductions for turning over his official papers to the Ann Arbor Historical Commission;

"7. Surreptitiously used Ann Arbor taxpayers' funds to make major improvements on two private dwellings of his;

"8. Twice selected personally as mayor pro tem a man who had bribes delivered to him in city hall and then had to resign to avoid going to jail;

"9. Selected and supervised as trusted top officials of his administration seven men who were indicted, convicted or have pleaded guilty—including the city attorney."

The citizens of Ann Arbor, Mr. Weeks suggested, would very likely not be altogether complaisant about such matters. "Should we hold Ann Arbor elected officials to one high standard of conduct but have a much lower, much more lax standard for the President? . . . Our silence is a way of saying to this President and future Presidents, 'There's practically no limit to the corruption we'll put up with in the White House.'"

It may well be that, even should a majority of the House vote to impeach Mr. Nixon, one-third plus one of the Senate would block his conviction and removal. Some people would feel that this would be the worst outcome of all, that Mr. Nixon would construe acquittal as triumphant vindication, that he would return with righteous vigor to his course of aggrandizement, that he would even reinstitute the enemies list and use all the resources of government to conduct reprisals against all who had dared challenge and criticize him.

This is not impossible, though it does not seem likely. Even if Mr. Nixon should eventually beat the rap, the experience of the trial before the Senate would inescapably have a chastening effect. The readiness of Congress to carry things that far must surely reinvigorate the system of accountability—not so much as conviction and removal but a good deal more than acting as if Mr. Nixon had done nothing out of the ordinary. The worst thing, it seems to me, would be to register Congressional acquiescence to Mr. Nixon's theory of Presidential accountability. It is better to have impeached and lost than never to have impeached at all.

Some dream of milder alternatives—a resolution of censure, for example, that both houses would pass by majority vote. But this would be a cop-out and readily identifiable as such unless the resolution managed to specify exactly why the deeds condemned were censurable but not impeachable. Another suggestion is a resolution calling for the President's resignation. But this would be purely hortatory, and, if more than that, would introduce an indigestible parliamentary element into a nonparliamentary system. I hardly think it would be wise in the long run to confer on Congress the power to dismiss Presidents without investigation and trial. Think what might have happened, for ex-

ample, in the fortnight of Congressional indignation after President Truman fired General MacArthur, or in the period when John Adams was standing up against Congressional agitation for war with France. Yet everyone now agrees that these two doughty Presidents never had finer hours.

The Founding Fathers were prescient in making impeachment the constitutional remedy. They did not want to make it easy to get rid of Presidents but they were determined to make it possible to do so. If members of Congress really want to restore the historic system of accountability, the means are at hand. If they decide not to hold Mr. Nixon and his successors accountable except once every four years, they will license the imperial Presidency, usher in a new and ominous time for the republic, and transform the balance and character of our constitutional order. Impeachment may have grievous consequences. Refusal to impeach the President will have consequences even more grievous and far more enduring.

LABOR SUPPORT FOR RHODESIAN SANCTIONS

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will be asked to vote on S. 1868, the bill to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome and ferrochrome; and restore the United States to full compliance with United Nations sanctions against the white minority regime of Ian Smith. Some elements of the stainless steel industry would have us believe that Americans will lose jobs if Congress decides that this country should honor its legal treaty obligation. But labor unions deny such assertions.

Most recently, the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union stated its position in a letter to Members of the House. Mr. Anthony Mazzocchi, director of the union's citizenship-legislative department, states:

The OCAW organizes many of the workers in this country's ferrochrome industry and their jobs may be threatened if the United States does not renew its compliance with sanctions.

The letter from the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers notes the trend in other nations toward tighter enforcement of the United Nations sanctions and concludes with the following strong point:

The United States should not stand alone in violation of its treaty obligation to comply with United Nations sanctions and its opposition to the interests of the majority of Rhodesians who will soon rule their own country.

Mr. Speaker, U.N. sanctions offer a practical means by which the international community can induce political change without resort to violence. Our country's foreign policy should always reflect support for peaceful change in the world. I place the full text of the letter from the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers be printed in the Record at this point:

OIL, CHEMICAL AND ATOMIC
WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1974.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The House of Representatives will soon consider S. 1868, a bill to renew United States compliance with the United Nations sanctions program against

Rhodesia. The Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union wholeheartedly supports this bill, and we urge you to vote for S. 1868 when it comes to the House floor.

There has been considerable debate about the economic effects on the workers of the United States if sanctions are reimposed. The OCAW organizes many of the workers in this country's ferrochrome industry and their jobs may be threatened if the United States does not renew its compliance with sanctions.

Since passage of the sanctions-breaking Byrd Amendment in 1971, Rhodesia has exported to the U.S. processed ferrochrome, not chrome ore, at prices in some cases below even the cost of production in this country. One factor in the cheaper price of Rhodesian imports is the low cost of labor in Rhodesia, where severe restrictions are placed on collective bargaining by African workers and where strikes by African miners are specifically prohibited.

The tide in southern Africa is turning, especially following the Portuguese coup. The Rhodesian minority regime will not be able to survive much longer. Mozambique may be independent within a year, and Rhodesia will probably lose its main access to the sea. South Africa is becoming less willing to throw in its lot with a Rhodesian regime which is losing ground. Japan and the European Economic Community are taking steps to strengthen their compliance with sanctions. Even Portugal is discussing sanctions implementation with Great Britain. The United States should not stand alone in violation of its treaty obligation to comply with United Nations sanctions and in opposition to the interests of the majority of Rhodesians who will soon rule their own country.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee recently voted in favor of the Rhodesian sanctions bill by a vote of 25 to 9. We hope that you will join them in supporting S. 1868.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY MAZZOCCHI,
Director, Citizenship-Legislative Department.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15264

(Mr. YOUNG of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I include an amendment that I intend to offer under the rule:

Page 2, immediately after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. Section 4(b)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In curtailing the exportation of any articles, materials, or supplies to effectuate the policy set forth in section 3(2)(A) of this Act, the President is authorized and directed to allocate a portion of export licenses on the basis of factors other than a prior history of exportation."

Redesignate succeeding sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 11500

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the following amendment to section 709 of H.R. 11500 is printed in the Record for entitlement of 5 minutes time under the rule:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 11500, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

Page 287, line 16, strike all through page 288, line 2, inclusive, and insert therein the following:

"(b) All coal deposits, title to which is in the United States, in lands with respect to which the United States is not the surface owner thereof and hereby withdrawn from all forms of surface mining operations and open pit mining except surface operations incident to an underground coal mine."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PHILLIP BURTON (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today through Monday, July 29, on account of official committee business.

To Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today and Thursday, July 25, on account of death in the family.

To Mr. SYMINGTON (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness.

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. KETCHUM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CRANE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KEMP, for 30 minutes today.
Mr. QUIE, for 35 minutes, today.
Mr. COHEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ABDNOR, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. YOUNG of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PODELL, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. O'NEILL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EILBERG, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. VANIK, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DULSKI, for 10 minutes, on July 25, 1974.

Mr. VANDER VEEN, for 20 minutes, on July 29, 1974.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FRASER, and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the Record, and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$834.

Mr. VANIK, and to include extraneous material, in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, to revise and extend his remarks during general debate on H.R. 11500.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, his remarks during consideration of H.R. 11500 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SEIBERLING, on H.R. 16027, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KETCHUM) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. McCLODY.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. RHODES.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
Mr. WALSH.
Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO.
Mr. MAYNE.
Mr. HUBER.
Mr. RUPPE.
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.
Mr. SYMMS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. YOUNG of Georgia) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. ROONEY of New York.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania in 10 instances.
Mr. MCFALL.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.
Mr. REUSS in five instances.
Mr. ASHLEY.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. RANGEL in 10 instances.
Mr. ALEXANDER in five instances.
Mr. WALDIE.
Mr. HARRINGTON.
Mr. EILBERG in five instances.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. WOLFF in five instances.
Mrs. MINK in three instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3782. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for one year the authorization of appropriations for Federal capital contributions into the student loan funds of health professions education schools; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 39. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft; to provide a more effective program to prevent aircraft piracy; and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 25, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

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. HEBERT: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 14592 (Rept. No. 93-1212). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11796. A bill to provide for the free entry of a 3.60 meter telescope for the use of the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope project at Mauna Kea, Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 14718. A bill to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 14167. A bill to amend the act of October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92-578); with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1250. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14780. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1975 for carrying out the provisions of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 (Rept. No. 93-1216). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1251. Resolution providing for the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 93. Concurrent resolution relating to an inflation policy study (Rept. No. 93-1217). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1252. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9989. A bill to further the national housing goal of encouraging homeownership by regulating certain lending practices and closing and settlement procedures in federally related mortgage transactions to the end that unnecessary costs and difficulties of purchasing housing are minimized, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 93-1218). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1253. Waiving certain points of order against the conference report on S. 386. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1219). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1254. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15736. A bill to authorize, enlarge, and repair various Federal reclamation projects and programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1220). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRINKLEY:
H.R. 16087. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable at age 60 (with such benefits being payable in reduced amounts at age 57 in most cases); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE:
H.R. 16088. A bill to remove statutory limitations upon the application of the Sherman Act to labor organizations and their activi-

ties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:
H.R. 16089. A bill to amend section 5051 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the Federal excise tax on beer); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. WARE, and Mr. FROELICH):

H.R. 16090. A bill to impose overall limitations on campaign expenditures and political contributions; to provide that each candidate for Federal office shall designate a principal campaign committee; to provide for a single reporting responsibility with respect to receipts and expenditures by certain political committees; to change the times for the filing of reports regarding campaign expenditures and political contributions; to provide for public financing of Presidential nominating conventions and Presidential primary elections; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS (for herself, Mr. CORMAN, and Mr. RANGEL):
H.R. 16091. A bill to create a national system of health security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 16092. A bill to establish a National Resource Information System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. GRAY, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. ZION, Mr. DORN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ROE, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming):

H.R. 16093. A bill to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (for himself, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. ABDONOR, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. STODDS, Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. GINN, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. VANDER VEEN, and Mr. TRAXLER):

H.R. 16094. A bill to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:
H.R. 16095. A bill to provide for a multimodal transportation study in accordance with provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MCKINNEY (for himself, Mr. DRINAN, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 16096. A bill exempting State lotteries from certain Federal prohibitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:
H.R. 16097. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the education of persons for coal production, conversion, utilization, and conservation and related activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16098. A bill to improve national reading skills; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16099. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973, and other related provisions of law, to increase safety on the Nation's highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 16100. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income taxation for cooperative housing corporations, condominium housing associations, and certain homeowners' associations and to tax the unrelated business income of such organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 16101. A bill to repeal the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 16102. A bill to amend the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973 to exempt from its provisions the period from the last Sunday in October 1974, through the last Sunday in February 1975; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. McKINNEY, and Mr. MOSHER):

H.R. 16103. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5 of the United States Code to clarify certain exemptions from its disclosure requirements, to provide guidelines and limitations for the classification of information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. McSPADEN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ESCH, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. BERGLAND, and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H.R. 16104. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16105. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to extend the period after discharge in which psychosis is deemed to be incurred in military service from 2 years to 3 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONLAN:

H.R. 16106. A bill to repeal the earnings

limitation of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINN:

H.R. 16107. A bill to require the establishment of an agricultural service center in each county of a State as part of the implementation of any plan for the establishment of such centers on a nationwide basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. STEELE, Mr. TALLCOTT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 16108. A bill to protect the constitutional right of privacy of individuals concerning whom identifiable information is recorded by enacting principles of information practices in furtherance of articles I, III, IV, V, IX, X, and XIV of amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. BRAY) (by request):

H.R. 16109. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement for quadrennial physical examinations for members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 16110. A bill to terminate the Airlines Mutual Aid Agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 16111. A bill to reestablish the fiscal integrity of the Government of the United States and its monetary policy, through the establishment of controls with respect to the levels of its revenues and budget outlays, the issuance of money, and the preparation of the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 16112. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to improve the business loan program for veterans and to make veterans who served after January 31, 1955, eligible for such program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. VANDER VEEN):

H.R. 16113. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to

increase the authorization of appropriation for the Land and Water Conservation Fund; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. BAFALIS):

H. Con. Res. 569. Concurrent resolution calling for a domestic summit to develop a unified plan of action to restore stability and prosperity to the American economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LITTON:

H. Res. 1256. Resolution requesting the President to comply with the Supreme Court order and turn over evidentiary information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUKEN:

H. Res. 1257. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact and ramifications of the Supreme Court decisions on abortion; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. BIESER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. ZABLOCKI):

H. Res. 1258. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning ratification of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, and a comprehensive review of this Nation's national security and international policies regarding chemical warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 1259. Resolution providing for television and radio coverage of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on any resolution to impeach the President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. FREY, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 1260. Resolution calling for a domestic summit to develop a unified plan of action to restore stability and prosperity to the American economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania introduced a bill (H.R. 16114) for the relief of Victor Henrique Carlos Gibson, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HON. WAYNE MORSE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the death of one of America's most distinguished liberal statesmen, in the midst of his attempt to reenter the public service, represents a great loss for America.

A courageous and outspoken individual with an incredible political perspicacity, former Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon repeatedly demonstrated his expertise on matters relating to agriculture, civil rights, conservation, education and labor. Throughout his 24-year tenure in the Senate, Morse revealed his strong dedication to the public interest; he sought

to place the welfare of the public above his loyalty to "the party."

The interest and concern that Senator Morse directed toward problems in the domestic sphere was extended to the realm of foreign affairs as well. The Senator's bold decision, in 1964, to oppose the Gulf of Tonkin resolution revealed another fine characteristic inherent in his personality—his refusal to abandon the principles he believed in despite the fact that his convictions were considered unpopular or improper by majority standards.

Men of Wayne Morse's caliber, integrity and intelligence are not easily found in government.

Though there can never be another Wayne Morse, let us hope that his spirit will serve as an inspiration to all individuals engaged in the public service. Our Nation needs more leaders with the

stature and conviction of Senator Morse for only they can maintain an independent, fresh and nonpartisan outlook in these times of increasing political distrust, partisanship and disillusionment.

As a further tribute to Senator Morse, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a moving editorial from the New York Times, dated July 23, 1974, memorializing him.

The editorial follows:

THE SENATE'S LOSS

Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon was too much the maverick to be a reliable party man, too much the gadfly to be a hero of the Senate Establishment, too much the independent to be predictable even in his proved liberalism. He was a superb public servant—not in spite of those attributes but because of them.

Originally a Republican of the Western progressive breed known in an earlier day as the "sons of the wild jackass," Wayne Morse