establish criteria governing and regulating a consolidated transactional reporting system and a composite quotation system.

Subsection (h) gives the SEC responsibility for promulgating rules to assure the fair and equitable treatment of all participants in the system and to coordinate functions among the various markets comprising the system.

Subsection (i) prohibits any securities exchange or securities association from maintaining or enforcing any rule or any action that would be inconsistent with the rules promulgated pursuant to subsections (g) and (h).

Subsection (j) provides that the SEC will have the same authority with respect to the Board, its constitution, and its rules and amendments thereto as the SEC has with respect to registered securities exchanges and securities associations on the day after enactment of the Securities Acts Amendments of 1974.

Finally, subsection (k) gives the Board authority to assess participants in the system reasonable fees to finance to cost of the Board's operations and to contract with suppliers and operators of equipment needed to perform the appropriate functions of the system.

LOANS FOR VETERANS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in our 200-year history, American soldiers have returned home not to cheers, and trumpets, but rather only to the closed eyes and ears of a nation that grew tired of the Vietnam war. Our colleague, Mr. MURPHY of New York, has opened his eyes and has seen one of the major needs of the Vietnam era veterans—money; money to start or improve his business.

Mr. MURPHY's bill, of which I am a cosponsor, will not only raise the loan ceiling from $2,500 to $30,000 but further it will make all veterans eligible for these loans. To date, young veterans, or those who have served in our Armed Forces since January 31, 1955, have been excluded from eligibility for small business loans. This bill would correct this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam war may not have been our most popular war. However, we should not turn our backs, nor our budget, to the millions of America's former service men and women. They were there when called on, and it is our national and humanitarian duty to come now to their aid.

I introduce the following editorial from El Diario, La Prensa, the fine bilingual newspaper in my city on Mr. MURPHY's bill for the further information of my colleagues:

LOANS FOR VETERANS

It does seem often that veterans are a separate oppressed minority. Many feel that the only time they are in the newpapers is when someone with military experience hijacks a plane, robs a bank or goes out on a killing spree. In the nation's haste to forget its wars, the veteran has been left alone, alone to grapple with his particular problem: trying to get back the chance to enter the mainstream he lost when he answered the call of his country.

Especially poignant is the case of the Vietnam Vet. After other American wars, veterans came home as victors, full of tales of glory. But not the Viet veteran: Wrong war. Wrong generation. Wrong ending. There were no heroes this time. In 1970, a study found that the Vietnam veteran is in much worse shape than his World Wars I and II counterparts.

Coming to the aid of the forgotten veteran, Congressman John Murphy (D.-N.Y.) has now introduced a bill that would really aid the ex-soldiers in their struggle to carve out a future for themselves. The bill would provide for a new program for veterans to obtain business loans.

"Our veterans—the Congressman stated—are a valuable asset to any community. Their desire to own their own business must be encouraged. The legislation I have introduced will add the needed momentum to get veterans back into their community."

Congressman Murphy went on to say that "Veterans who want to obtain loans to start their own business, or improve an existing business, have been fighting a lot of red tape. With the introduction of my new bill, I hope to raise the limits on the amount the veteran can borrow."

Right now the Business Loan Program of the Veterans Administration is foundering. Loans are heard to obtain, and when granted, the maximum amount that a veteran can receive is approximately $2,500: Now, this is chickenfeed in these times of brutal, runaway inflation.

Congressman Murphy's new bill would raise the loan limit to $30,000. Of this amount, not more than $20,000 shall be used for purchases of construction, repairs, or improvements of lands and buildings. Not more than $10,000 is to be used for repair or improvement to equipment or stock.

"The most important part of my bill—Mr. Murphy added—is the fact that for the first time all veterans will be eligible to obtain these loans. Up until this time there was a discrimination against the young veteran." (Veterans who have served after January 31, 1955 have not, up until now, been eligible to obtain a small business loan.)

The Congressman stated that this inequity must be resolved: "These men answered the same call to serve their country as did the men of World Wars I and II, and it is unfair that they are being denied the same benefits that our older veterans now possess," Mr. Murphy said.

With the increase in benefit allowances and the eligibility of veterans who have served since the Korean conflict, this new legislation should provide greater assistance to all veterans.

We hope with Mr. Murphy that Congress will not let this bill languish and die in committee and that the measure will not only increase the amount that the Vet can borrow but that it will encourage more veterans to actively seek these loans as a way of starting a business and getting back into the community.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, August 2, 1974*

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the Earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.—Psalms 90: 1, 2.

Our fathers looked to Thee and trusting in Thy mercy, Thou didst uphold them all their days. Give to us in our day such an awareness of Thy presence that we may know that Thou art with us to uphold us and to guide us. Strengthen us in the hour of temptation, keep our feet from falling and our spirits from fainting. Lead in the paths of Thy peace and along the road of Thy righteousness that we may not fail man nor Thee in these critical times.

Make us true children of Thine, promoting peace and justice with good will among our people: for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3620. An act to establish the Great Dismal Swamp National Wildlife Refuge; and

H.R. 4861. An act to amend the act of October 4, 1961, providing for the preservation and protection of certain lands known as Piscataway Park in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 15544. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent, agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15544) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. BAYH, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CHILES, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

BELLMON, Mr. HATFIELD, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 2193. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Asian Development Bank;

S. 3362. An act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the operation, maintenance, and continued construction of the Federal transmission system in the Pacific Northwest by use of the revenues of the Federal Columbia River Power System and the proceeds of revenue bonds, and for other purposes; and

S. 3792. An act to amend and extend the Export Administration Act of 1969.

SECURITY PRECAUTIONS IN HOUSE DURING IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to speak out because it is a matter of concern and has been for some time. This has to do with the fact that in the matter of a few days this House Chamber will be the scene of common national attention where the focus of a great majority of the American people will be concentrated.

It has been precisely at those times that recent history has shown that some people take advantage of an opportunity like this, in order to try to focus attention on some things that happen to be agitated for.

I hope that the security that will prevail during the deliberations on the Articles of Impeachment that will be before the House as a result of the action of the Committee on the Judiciary will be a matter of utmost priority on the part of the House leadership. I believe that the usual security precautions will be inadequate. I think that there is a very serious possibility that once again the House could, to its great dismay, find itself the scene of an incident that was enacted here about 13 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the least that can be done is to provide for some precautions now existing at the airport terminals—scanners leading to the House galleries. Ordinary security will not be enough.

CONFERENCE OF HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE ON IMPEACHMENT DEBATE

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the coming Presidential impeachment debate calls for the House to adopt certain special procedures which are not otherwise necessary when considering regular congressional business.

The members of the Rules Committee, Speaker CARL ALBERT, House Majority Leader TIP O'NEILL, House Majority Whip JOHN MCFALL, House Minority Leader JOHN RHODES, House Minority Whip LES ARENDS, Judiciary Committee Chairman PETER RODINO, and Representative EDWARD HUTCHINSON, the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, met in an unofficial capacity Thursday afternoon, August 1. In the 2½ hour meeting thoughts were exchanged and recommendations made regarding the rules and procedures which would be most practical in allowing the entire House membership participation in this historical legislative event.

Although the bipartisan gathering reached no official decision, there was agreement that after the Judiciary Committee files its report on the impeachment proceedings next week, August 8, the Committee on Rules will then convene—on August 13 for the purpose of defining the rules and procedures for House debate. It was also agreed by the members of the Democratic and Republican leadership present that the impeachment debate will begin on the floor of the House on Monday, August 19.

Among the impeachment procedures to be given consideration by the Committee on Rules will be: The overall time of debate; division of debate time during the floor discussion; the control of the time; the question of whether the three articles of impeachment recommended by the Judiciary Committee should be amended; and whether or not the electronic media should be allowed to broadcast the proceedings of the House floor.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION FOR PRESIDENTIAL INTERCESSION ON BEHALF OF CAPTURED LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN SEAMAN

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

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a concurrent resolution today calling for Presidential intercession on behalf of captured Lithuanian-American seaman Simas Kudirka, who has been illegally imprisoned in the Soviet Union since 1971.

I hope my colleagues will join the more than 30 sponsors of this resolution in calling on the President of the United States to take the proper action on behalf of this unfortunate American citizen.

We ask that the President direct the Secretary of State to bring to the immediate attention of the Soviet Government the deep and growing concern in the United States over Simas Kudirka's plight.

Further, we ask that the Secretary of State be directed to urge the Soviet Government to release Kudirka from prison and permit his free emigration to the country of his choice, one of the basic rights of every American citizen.

Finally, we ask that the President forward a copy of this resolution to our representative to the United Nations for transmission to the Commission on Human Rights or the Division of Human Rights of the United Nations.

We urge that, during this present spirit of détente, the governments of these two great world powers not overlook the human rights of one ill-fated man whose entire future is at the mercy of the whims of a government.

The incredible ineptitude of American officials lost Simas Kudirka's freedom for him in 1971 when he sought asylum in the country to which he has a birthright. It is now our duty and deepest responsibility to do all in our power to regain for this man and his family the freedom to return to his homeland.

TENNESSEE PRIMARY VICTORY FOR THE HONORABLE DAN KUYKENDALL

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman DAN KUYKENDALL, for his overwhelming primary victory yesterday in the city of Memphis, which is the 17th largest city in this country.

DAN, against three opponents, garnered 83 percent of the vote. With the two largest newspapers in his district having come out for impeachment of the President and one of his opponents being for impeachment of the President, and another spending over $60,000, I believe it a real tribute to the great job DAN KUYKENDALL has been doing for his district.

It is also significant that this was the largest Republican primary in the history of that particular county, both in numbers and in the percentage of votes cast.

So, I again, Mr. Speaker, take this opportunity to congratulate DAN KUYKENDALL on his overwhelming victory. It certainly pays off to take a positive approach as DAN has done all through his service here in the House.

RESOLUTION OF CENSURE OF THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, soon we will face awesome and troubling decisions relating to impeachment of the President.

Hearings of the Judiciary Committee and developments in the courts have, I believe, clearly established negligence, maladministration, and moral insensitivity on the part of the President. And yet I question whether the evidence establishes convincing proof of wrongdoing on the part of the President personally of such magnitude as to warrant removal from office.

With the thought that others may be similarly troubled and may wish the opportunity to censure sharply the President without taking the ultimate step of voting impeachment, I have introduced today a resolution of censure. In the preparation and introduction of the resolution, I have been encouraged by a number of Members on both sides of the aisle.

I will ask the Rules Committee to make this resolution in order for consideration so that Members will have the choice between censure and impeachment when the time comes to vote.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. 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. 435]

Andrews, N.C.	Forsythe	Minshall, Ohio
Armstrong	Fountain	Mitchell, Md.
Ashley	Fraser	Mollohan
Badillo	Fulton	Murphy, N.Y.
Beard	Gibbons	Murtha
Biaggi	Ginn	Nedzi
Bingham	Goldwater	Owens
Blackburn	Grasso	Pike
Blatnik	Gray	Podell
Brasco	Green, Oreg.	Pritchard
Brinkley	Griffiths	Quie
Broomfield	Grover	Quillen
Brown, Calif.	Gubser	Railsback
Brown, Ohio	Gunter	Rangel
Burke, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho	Rarick
Burleson, Tex.	Hansen, Wash.	Rees
Carey, N.Y.	Hays	Reid
Carter	Hébert	Reuss
Chisholm	Holifield	Roncallo, Wyo.
Clancy	Holtzman	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Ichord	Ruppe
Clay	Jones, Ala.	Ryan
Conyers	Jones, N.C.	Schneebeli
Crane	Jones, Okla.	Shipley
Culver	Jones, Tenn.	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Stanton,
de la Garza	Kuykendall	James V.
Dennis	Lagomarsino	Steiger, Ariz.
Dent	Landrum	Stratton
Derwinski	Lehman	Stuckey
Diggs	Lent	Symington
Donohue	Litton	Teague
Dorn	Long, Md.	Thompson, N.J.
Downing	Lott	Ullman
Drinan	McCormack	Waldie
Dulski	McKinney	Whitten
Eckhardt	McSpadden	Wiggins
Eilberg	Macdonald	Williams
Evans, Colo.	Madigan	Wyatt
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Nebr.	Wydler
Fisher	Mathias, Calif.	Wyman
Flood	Matsunaga	Young, Alaska
Flowers	Mayne	Young, Ga.
Flynt	Metcalfe	
Ford	Milford	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 302 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15736, THE RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1254 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1254 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 15736, an authorization bill for Federal reclamation programs.

House Resolution 1254 provides that all points of order against title I of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives—prohibiting appropriations in a legislative measure—are waived.

There are 14 different titles in the bill, and it includes projects in 10 different States. The total authorization in the bill is $203,925,000.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill is necessary to complete many reclamation projects which are vital to their respective areas of the country. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported this bill by a unanimous vote. I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1254 in order that we may debate, discuss, and pass H.R. 15736.

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

Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, this rule, House Resolution 1254, provides for the consideration of H.R. 15736, Federal Reclamation Projects, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate. In addition, the rule provides that the bill be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections, and that points of order be waived against title I for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI. Clause 4 prohibits appropriations on a legislative bill. Title I contains language transferring funds from an existing fund to a new purpose, and therefore a waiver is necessary.

H.R. 15736 is an omnibus bill, providing funds for numerous reclamation projects. The bill consists of 14 titles, each broadly representative of one or more individually introduced bills.

The total cost of these projects is $203,925,000.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule in order that the House may proceed to consider this bill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14780, AMENDING THE BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACT OF 1973

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1250 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1250 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on 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.

House Resolution 1250 provides that, 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 S. 3190 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 14780 as passed by the House of Representatives.

H.R. 14780 authorizes an appropriation of $49,840,000 for fiscal year 1975 to support the operations of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and the Board for International Broadcasting. Of the total authorization, $30,685,000 is provided for Radio Free Europe, $18,865,000 is allocated to Radio Liberty, and $290,000 is for the Board for International Broadcasting.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1250 in order that we may discuss, debate, and pass H.R. 14780.

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

Mr. Speaker, as noted, House Resolution 1250 is an open rule with 1 hour of

general debate on H.R. 14780, the Board for International Broadcasting Act amendments. In addition, the rule makes it in order to insert the House-passed language in the Senate bill, after completion of action on the House bill.

The purpose of H.R. 14780 is to authorize $49,840,000 for fiscal year 1975 to support the operations of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and the Board for International Broadcasting.

Of the amount in this bill, $30,685,000 is for Radio Free Europe, $18,865,000 is for Radio Liberty, and $290,000 is for the Board for International Broadcasting.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974

Mr. JOHNSON of California. 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. 15736) to authorize, enlarge, and repair various Federal reclamation projects and programs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON).

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. 15736, with Mr. ROBERTS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to endorse H.R. 15736, the Reclamation Development Act of 1974, and to commend it to my colleagues for their support.

The bill includes all of the authorizing legislation for the Bureau of Reclamation that is planned for consideration in this Congress.

We have chosen to present a consolidated bill in the interest of conserving the time of the House which is becoming increasingly limited as we move toward the end of the session.

In this connection, I would like to assure the Members of the Committee that the processes of our committee have been rigidly followed and that the reporting of an omnibus bill does not imply any shortcutting of procedures or any lack of attention to the issues.

Each program contained in the bill was the subject of duly announced public hearings by the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources and three of the more important programs were visited by the subcommittee for on-site inspection and the hearing of local witnesses.

In fact, the same care and attention has been given to the individual titles of H.R. 15736 as though they were to be reported and presented individually.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a minor bill; nor should it be considered a major measure as water resource development legislation goes.

The total appropriations being authorized is $191,972,000.

Additional costs for which appropriations have otherwise been authorized will be incurred in the estimated amount of $11,953,000.

Thus, the total price tag on the legislation is $203,925,000.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources, where this legislation was developed, I ask the Members to indulge me in a few general remarks for placing the issues in their proper perspective.

Thereafter, there will be ample opportunity for interested Members to discuss, in detail, the elements in which they may have a special concern.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal reclamation program, to which this measure relates, has been an important element of western economic life for 72 years.

Through its projects and influence, facilities have been provided to convert millions of acres of otherwise nonproductive lands into dependable assets for the production of badly needed food and fiber.

These islands of irrigated lands have, in a very real sense, created pockets of prosperity which are strong, tax-producing elements of national strength.

Within them, and in their zones of influence, have been created many of our great metropolitan centers.

The reclamation projects of the West have also contributed to the water and power supply upon which much of our western society depends for its domestic water and energy needs.

In the opinion of this Member, the relatively modest spending that takes place each year on behalf of this program is just about the best money that we pay out.

Not only is much of it returned with interest to the Treasury, but the tax base it creates return revenues every year equal to the original investment.

A few years ago observers of this program began to notice a trend.

I can no more tell you when it started than a man can tell you the precise moment that he develops a cancer.

All I know is, one day we became aware that it was there.

The trend to which I refer has become, with the passage of time, an open, overt, and unconcealed crusade to close down this program and to liquidate the institutions and organizations we have developed for implementing it.

It is clear to me that the nerve center, or command post, for this operation is in the Office of Management and Budget; an institution inhabited by people, not one of which has ever stood for election to his job or had his appointment confirmed by the U.S. Senate.

In more recent years, this influence has spread to the operating agencies by the infiltration of these offices by headquarters-trained operators who, apparently, owe no allegiance to the precepts of the programs—the public utterances of the duly appointed Cabinet officers—or the enactments of the Congress which brought the programs and institutions into being.

How effective has been this effort?

We can only judge by the record.

Despite the clear mandate of the Congress in authorizing feasibility studies and providing their funding at the rate of several millions of dollars per year, the Department of the Interior has averaged well below one recommendation per year for the last 6 years; in fact, I believe that the record will verify that there have only been two voluntarily submitted feasibility reports in the past 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I have spent countless hours of my own personal time and that of my staff trying to stimulate some interest on the part of the Department of Interior in fulfilling its statutory responsibility to investigate these programs and to file reports on their findings—whether they be favorable or adverse.

We do not get many reports but we do get some interesting excuses.

The only consistent thing about these excuses is that they consistently change.

For example, it seems that we do not need any irrigation projects because they result in commodity production and there is already too much of that.

This is the current rage downtown, as evidenced by administration testimony before our subcommittee on July 1, 1974, which was to the general effect that irrigation programs were the lowest priority of all water-resource undertakings—and that a proposed study should not be authorized, much less carried out.

Another excuse which occupied center stage for years was the fiction that the analytical procedures were obsolete and needed to be changed.

Thereafter, recommendations would presumably be resumed.

This exercise has been going on since early 1969 and has resulted in a statement of "principles" so patently ill-advised that the Congress was compelled to suspend its application—through a statute signed into law by the President on March 7 of this year.

There have been other excuses and I could not begin to discuss all of them under our time limitations.

The requirement for filing environmental impact statements is one of them.

Actually this is a sound and meaningful procedure that no one can fairly oppose but—when it is carried on and implemented in such a way as to provide a field day for the nitpickers and procrastinators—one is compelled to the conclusion that its avowed intent is being grossly subverted.

The last excuse is the "backlog."

This is the line of argument that there is already some authorized projects and therefore there should not be any more until the authorized projects are constructed.

I accept the fact that this bothers some of my colleagues and bothers them genuinely and sincerely—although it bothers this Member hardly at all.

Mr. Chairman, I have recited this information as background for our consideration of this measure here today.

It is all relevant to what we are asking the House to do.

Many Members have appropriately noted that our committee report contains an extraordinary number of letters from the Department of the Interior.

Indeed, there are 17 of them.

They have been included routinely in accordance with the practice of including departmental reports as elements of our committee report.

They also have the added function of illustrating the point that I have previously made concerning the consistently inconsistent position of this administration and its policies on these important issues.

Returning to the commodity issue—I will not unduly burden the members with the obvious.

With cereal, vegetable and fruit prices at all time highs—with cattle feed and forage so scarce that the cattle industry faces wholesale bankruptcy—with our great midwestern breadbasket experiencing the worst drought in 40 years—the administration's irrigation priorities can be seen as the arrant nonsense that they are.

Nevertheless, H.R. 15736 does not authorize a single dollar for irrigation development although it does contemplate the expenditure of slightly over $3 million, already authorized, for drainage construction on existing projects and for the study of one project that would be principally for irrigation.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if this bill has a shortcoming it is the omission of several fine potential irrigation projects which we know to be stockpiled in the Washington office of the Bureau of Reclamation but which the administration refuses to send to us on one pretext or another.

Now, concerning the backlog.

I wish it did not exist.

I wish the executive branch would get on with the business of implementing the Nation's laws.

If the President will request the funds I submit that he will get them.

Be that as it may, this bill has been limited to the approximate level of $200 million in an effort to not unduly enlarge the backlog.

To put this in some perspective it should be noted that the funding level for reclamation construction is about $300 million, plus or minus, each year.

In the 92d Congress we authorized about $350 million. This bill adds about $200 million more.

This total of $550 million should be placed alongside appropriations of more than twice that amount—to illustrate that the backlog is being reduced, certainly in terms of constant dollars.

Very quickly, in my remaining time, let me summarize the bill and what is in it.

It does the following:

Authorizes two reservoir projects in Texas for municipal water supply and other purposes.

Increases appropriations authority for two ongoing reclamation projects in Oklahoma and Colorado.

Facilitates municipal incorporation of reclamation townsite of Page, Ariz.

Authorizes land acquisition and facility development for environmental preservation at two operating reclamation reservoirs in California.

Authorizes repairs to eliminate unsafe conditions at two operating reclamation projects in Wyoming and South Dakota.

Authorizes additional drainage for irrigated land on two projects in Utah.

Authorizes fish passage facilities at existing dam in Oregon.

Authorizes minimum recreation pool in existing reservoir in New Mexico.

Authorizes disposal of surplus canal right-of-way in Oregon.

Authorizes feasibility investigation of three potential programs in California, Arizona, and North Dakota.

One more word, Mr. Chairman, about the departmental reports.

Some of them are favorable, some of them are favorable with amendments.

Some of the amendments were adopted and some were not.

Some of the reports were adverse and some of them recommended deferral for reasons the committee considered not valid.

In every case, where the administration made a recommendation for deferral or change, we heard them out.

In those cases where the committee has departed from the administration's position it has done so judiciously and openly.

We have swept nothing under the rug—rather we have attempted to reassert the prerogative of the Congress, and this House, to determine the public policy and the will of the people.

I believe the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has acted responsibly and in keeping with the spirit of its clear constitutional prerogative and duty—to consider the Executive's views and then vote what it, the Congress, deems best for all the people.

I trust that the House will agree and signify that agreement by promptly and overwhelmingly passing H.R. 15736.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to set forth for the benefit of the committee the projects that are to be found in this bill, and their costs:

SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND COSTS—H.R. 15736

Title No. and description of title	Appropriations authority	Other costs	Total
I—Incorporation of Page, Ariz.	$4,000,000	[1] $8,318,000	$12,318,000
II—Cibolo project, Texas	24,160,000		24,160,000
III—Mountain Park project, Oklahoma	$6,057,000		$6,057,000
IV—Casitas Reservoir Open Space, California	10,000,000		10,000,000

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 15736, and would like to state that the mountain park project includes a pipeline to the city of Frederick, Okla., at a cost of $4.7 million which will be reimbursed by the city.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, continuing with the summary of authorizations and costs, they are as follows:

Title No. and description of title	Appropriations authority	Other costs	Total
V—Klamath project right-of-way, Oregon			
VI—Solano project recreational facilities, California	$3,000,000		$3,000,000
VII—Miscellaneous drainage construction, Utah		[2] $2,535,000	2,535,000
VIII—Belle Fourche Dam rehabilitation, South Dakota	3,620,000		3,620,000
IX—Glendo Road relocation, Wyoming	284,000		284,000
X—Nueces River project, Texas	$50,000,000		$50,000,000
XI—Elephant Butte recreation pool, New Mexico			
XII—Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado	90,000,000		90,000,000
XIII—Savage Rapids fishway, Oregon	851,000		851,000
XIV—Feasibility study authorities		[2] $1,100,000	1,100,000
Total	191,972,000	11,953,000	203,925,000

[1] Represents value of property authorized to be transferred to city of Page, Ariz.

[2] Appropriations authorized by other legislation.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) is one of the soundest and most responsible legislators in this whole body, and the gentleman chairs the subcommittee with great distinction and care.

I want to thank the gentleman for bringing to the floor a very sound and responsible bill, and a bill that is badly needed.

I particularly want to congratulate

the gentleman on title II, which settles this very difficult and long-standing problem in Page, Ariz.

Mr. Chairman, I say that this is a good bill, and I hope that the Members will pass it with an overwhelming vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER).

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 15736 and to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman and ranking members of the subcommittee and congratulate the subcommittee on its work. Under their leadership our committee has taken a new approach to water and power legislation this year. By taking action on each of the individual bills and then incorporating them into one piece of omnibus legislation, they have narrowed considerably the work of this body and have produced a well-balanced program of project authorizations.

No single piece of legislation is perfect in all of its aspects, and this bill is no exception. Most of the projects authorized in H.R. 15736 are quite complicated in their details, and many of these details could be argued till doomsday. But the subcommittee and full committee have done their work well and I believe that the details as finally submitted are right and proper for each project.

Local conditions vary from State to State and from county to county, and these variations have been taken into account. The result, I believe, is a bill that is fair and just to local participants in each instance.

If I were to take exception to any aspect of this legislation, I would comment on the fact that none of these projects authorize the creation of additional irrigable acreage. This may appear to be a serious oversight in the light of the current food shortages, but I would point out that the food shortage situation did not exist at the time we began work on these projects. The shortages have developed over the past few months, after this bill was well along the way to completion. I would expect that next year's Reclamation Act will include projects that will expand our food production capabilities.

A number of projects incorporated in this bill are of an emergency nature and are sorely needed to solve existing serious problems. We have serious flood dangers that are being corrected, serious municipal water supply shortages that will be eliminated; overcrowded recreation facilities that will be expanded to meet needs, and a problem of impeded fish passage on the Rogue River that is being corrected.

These are all worthwhile projects, and I urge my colleagues to pass this bill so that work can begin as soon as possible this year.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want first of all to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee for bringing this legislation in the fashion that he did. We had a rapid succession of hearings, visited many of the sites, and after having done that, we put them all together. While normally I would not think that the best way to go about legislation is on an omnibus basis, I think that in this particular case it enabled us to have a balanced program of reclamation.

We have, Mr. Chairman, various States represented, three projects in California, two in Texas, two in Arizona, two in Oregon, one each in New Mexico, Oklahoma, Wyoming, Utah, South Dakota, and North Dakota. Besides having the diversity, Mr. Chairman, throughout all of the various States, we also have diversity in the types of projects that we have. For example, in the South Dakota project, we found that the dam was very dangerous because of faulty construction and design by the Federal Government, and so it fell on the Federal Government to correct its original mistake.

In Texas, there are two new dams that are being authorized. In Oregon we have a fish passage which will increase the fish population in the river, adding to the economics of the country.

Then we have one in my home State, Mr. Chairman, which moves water down the Rio Grande for the purpose of economic development in a particular section of the State.

So I think, Mr. Chairman, that by and large this approach was particularly good in this legislation. I commend all of the committee members who worked so hard to bring this legislation in.

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

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

Mr. KETCHUM. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Mexico, and certainly associate myself with the remarks of my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), who is chairman of the subcommittee. I would join with my colleagues in commending Mr. JOHNSON for the manner in which this bill was brought to the floor, and for, as always, his distinguished leadership in this field.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN).

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman. I rise in support of H.R. 15736, the Reclamation Development Act of 1974. As has already been stated, this bill includes most of the legislation affecting the Federal reclamation program that has been considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during this session of the Congress. I fully support the entire bill but I want to particularly speak to title II, the Cibolo project and title X, the Nueces River project, in Texas, both of which are subjects of legislation which I have sponsored.

However, before doing this, I want to commend my very able and distinguished colleague, Mr. JOHNSON of California, chairman of the Water and Power Resources Subcommittee. In my opinion, the gentleman from California is the most knowledgeable member in this field in the House. The success of the reclamation program in this country during the last decade is largely due to the work of Mr. JOHNSON and we certainly owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Chairman, the Cibolo project which will be located in Wilson County in my district, approximately 30 miles southwest of the city of San Antonio, is a multipurpose project. The main purpose is to furnish a surface water supply for municipal and industrial uses in order to meet the increasing demands and needs of San Antonio and the cities of Karnes City and Kenedy. The reservoir will also afford a high degree of flood control in the downstream river valley and provide abundant fish and wildlife and recreational benefits.

Mr. Chairman, damsites are hard to find and when one is located, it must be put to optimum use. The Cibolo project will be developed in such manner. The city of San Antonio is the largest city in the United States which depends solely on ground water for its needs. That source is the Edwards aquifer. When the subcommittee held its field hearings, it received testimony that within a short time, this source would become inadequate to fulfill the needs of the city. A large area withdraws water from this aquifer and before too long, withdrawals will be running far ahead of recharge capability. If the city of San Antonio's needs are not provided with the development of a surface water source, it will face a very critical shortage and its prosperity and growth will be in jeopardy. This project is a vital need and necessity for that area.

The project will be constructed under a cost-sharing formula which calls upon the local water users to share substantially in the total cost. Of the project cost estimate of approximately $50 million, $24 million is to be appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I hasten to assure my colleagues there has been no testimony offered to our committee either in the field or in the hearings held here adverse to this project.

Now, Mr. Chairman, title X, the Nueces River project, Texas, provides for a multipurpose dam and reservoir at the Choke Canyon site on the Frio River, a tributory of the Nueces River in Live Oak and McMullen Counties, Tex. The main purpose of this project is to furnish a municipal and industrial water supply to the Coastal Bend Region of Texas which encompasses the city of Corpus Christi and numerous adjacent smaller communities. The reservoir will provide local flood control benefits, fish and wildlife development, and outdoor recreation opportunities. The city of Corpus Christi faces shortages of municipal and industrial water with which to support regional economic growth by 1980. This project, like the Cibolo project, will be financed on a cost-sharing basis with the local water users. The estimated cost of this project is approximately $64 million based on January 1974 price levels. Of this sum, local interests will advance the sum of at least $15 million.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee held extensive field hearings on this project and we found a complete unanimity of

opinion favoring the construction of this project. Work on these two projects on the local and State level has been going on for years and I am happy to see that the efforts and aspirations of those involved in the long, tedious process of developing the plans for them has at last borne fruit by the consideration of these measures by the House today.

I urge my colleagues to support these two projects and the bill as a whole as recommended by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 15736, the Federal Reclamation Projects and Programs Act which contains, as title VI, the general concept—and most of the language—of my bill, H.R. 11758.

At the outset, let me comment briefly on the leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON). While he is clearly recognized with respect in the Congress for his ability and expertise, I want to credit him for the extra effort he gives.

He has held field hearings in most of the areas involved in this legislation and is outstanding in his dedication for the wise and responsible consideration of questions relating to our water resources.

The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee and I am most appreciative of his responsiveness on this issue and others.

And the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY) has been most helpful to me as a member of the committee he chairs.

The introduction of my bill to establish a framework for the management of recreational facilities at Lake Berryessa, in Napa County, Calif., came after a long series of events and a great deal of investigation and study into the problems that have arisen in conjunction with this project which was built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Before detailing the provisions in the bill, Mr. Chairman, I would like to outline the history of the project that has brought us to the place we are today.

The project was constructed in 1956 as a single-purpose irrigation project under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. At that time, it was estimated that virtually no recreational demand for leisure time utilization of the lake would exist and no provisions were made for recreation.

It did not take long, however, for the people of the area to recognize that Lake Berryessa was, and is, the only major freshwater reservoir that is readily available to the San Francisco metropolitan area.

Simultaneously, of course, leisure time activities began to increase for every American in both the time available and the scope of these pastimes.

The result was a substantial recreational use of Lake Berryessa almost immediately after its completion. That growth has continued unabated until this day and, in fact, has increased at a progressively more rapid rate.

Part of the reason for the failure of the Federal agency to recommend the inclusion of recreational facilities at the time of construction of the reservoir was the fact that the lake has a potential drawdown of 200 feet in the event of a series of dry years. However, such a drought period would be unusual and the drawdown has not, nor is it likely, to approach the maximum.

Thus, the lake has provided good quality recreation which has further expanded the demand for its use.

As the demand grew initially, the Bureau of Reclamation found itself without the authority either to construct recreational facilities or to operate and maintain any such facilities.

Very early, then, the Bureau negotiated an agreement with the county of Napa to have the county undertake management of the recreational aspects of the project.

During that time, the county expended over $1 million in fulfilling its responsibilities. In doing so, the county has brought about the development of the only recreational facilities, roads, health and safety supervision, and other functions at the lake.

The only way the county, with its extremely limited financial resources, could meet the need was to contract with concessionaires whose lease provided income to the county.

Because short-term recreation facilities do not return in fees their capital and maintenance costs, the concessionaires have naturally concentrated on long-term use facilities although they have not done so exclusively by any means.

The county has been unable to justify providing day-use facilities from its general revenues because of the large costs involved and because nearly all of those who use the lake are from outside of the county. In fact, 95 percent of those who use the lake reside out of the county but within 100 miles of the lake.

Those short-term facilities which have been developed by the concessionaires are operated by them at a loss. And, studies have shown that users of day-use facilities are unwilling to pay actual costs to reach the break-even point.

Therefore, as recreation demand has continued to accelerate, a conflict has arisen between the need for short-term facilities and the long-term developments around the lake. Because the Bureau of Reclamation does not have the authority to construct, operate or maintain any of these facilities, the problem has increased in complexity and the need for its resolution has increased in urgency.

As the years passed, it became increasingly obvious that changes in management policy would have to be made and that nearly every one involved was desirous of making a number of substantial changes in policy.

Finally, in 1970, the situation came to a head when growing pollution problems at the lake caused a moratorium on the expansion of recreation facilities. Previous negotiations were continued but no agreement was reached.

This impasse could not be allowed to continue. In order to help the negotiating process, I formed a Lake Berryessa Recreation Management Task Force whose purpose was to bring the interested parties together in order to resolve the points of difference and specify the points of agreement.

The task force held a number of meetings and made a number of recommendations that successfully began the process that developed the bill before us today.

The bill itself is modeled after a bill that was enacted as Public Law 87-542 to "provide for the establishment and administration of basic public recreation facilities at the Elephant Butte and Caballo Reservoir areas in New Mexico."

That 1962 act was designed to solve a problem similar to the one we have at Lake Berryessa.

The exact analysis of each section of title VI is included in the committee report but, in general terms, the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to develop, operate, and maintain short-term recreational facilities at the lake. This will mark the first statutory recognition of the Federal role.

Second, the title permits the Secretary to carry out his authority by contracting with "the State of California, or a political subdivision thereof, or a non-Federal agency or agencies or organizations," for management and for operation and maintenance responsibilities should this prove to be a desirable option.

Included in the authority is a provision for a recreation management plan and a provision permitting the collection of fees for the use of the day-use facilities.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of $3 million for the development costs of the facilities.

Let me point out that the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act of 1965 which would ordinarily be involved in a case such as this one is inapplicable here because the reservoir was in operation at the time the act was approved. As an "existing" reservoir it faces a stringent limitation on assistance under the act.

The Department of the Interior in its departmental report on my bill said the Water Projects Recreation Act is "totally inadequate to meet the need."

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe title VI is a fair and responsible approach to solving a federally created problem that needs to be addressed most urgently and I hope it will have the strong and favorable support of the House.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I would say that so far as the field itself is concerned, those of us in the subcommittee had opportunity to examine very carefully, as we did, each of these projects. We had extensive hearings. We had a thorough consideration in markup.

I can say that I think the bill itself (H.R. 15736) is deserving of the support of this body.

I would say a brief word about the two Oregon projects which are in the bill. One of them is in the territory of my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN), who is in an important

meeting of the Ways and Means Committee at this time. I would say that in Mr. ULLMAN's project, title V of the bill, the Klamath right-of-way, we have a situation where a right-of-way, acquired many years ago as part of a then contemplated and authorized project, is no longer needed. The title to the right-of-way, however, is in the United States, and we are in a situation where the interest of the United States is a blot on the title of many individual landowners. The United States has no further use for this land.

Mr. ULLMAN has here proposed a constructive and universally helpful solution to the present problem. The purpose of this particular title is to authorize the Secretary to sell this land to the adjoining landowners. It would be beneficial to the private ownership. It would actually yield money to the United States. The land, as I said, is of no use to the Government any longer.

The second Oregon project is title XIII, the Savage Rapids Fishway, which is in the Fourth District, my district. We are in a situation where we are well along with the construction of a major dam on the Rogue River, the Lost Creek Dam. We have many millions of dollars invested in this important project. We have a fish hatchery with something like $11 million invested in it, and yet further down the Rogue a bottleneck, the Savage Rapids Dam. It is necessary that there be improvement of the fishways around this Savage Rapids Dam in order to get the full benefit to the country of the investment of more than $100 million in the Lost Creek and Elk Creek Dams further up the river. Defective fish passageways are killing fish as they go up and down the river. This can be and needs to be corrected.

Let me only comment further that we would be extremely penny-wise and pound-foolish not to go forward with this project. There has been a study of this situation made under a bill enacted several years ago by the Congress. The recommendation that resulted from the study that was made some time ago is a clear affirmation of the need for this project. I urge that this project as part of this bill secure the consent and approval of Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time with the injunction and the recommendation to my colleagues to support the entire bill.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I particularly would like to speak to the need for a feasibility study of the Apple Creek unit in my own State of North Dakota.

The quality of municipal and rural domestic water in these counties where the feasibility study will take place is very marginal. For example, Long Lake, the biggest body of inland water in that area, has a severe salinity problem of 10,000 parts per million, and in Apple Creek itself, the salinity ranges from 200 to 1,000. Because of the semiarid problem in North Dakota, Apple Creek often dries out, which increases the salinity problem. The yearly evaporation adds to this problem.

The fact that more irrigation development will come about as a result of this study is advantageous, not undesirable. What my colleagues have been reading in the newspapers in the last 2 weeks and seeing on television of the severe drought that affects the upper Midwestern States is true. You can imagine the adverse effect this is going to have on the consumer this fall and into the winter.

This project adds to the contribution of food and fiber for the benefit of the consumers. The President's economic speech, which he made just recently out in California, pointed out that we needed to stimulate agricultural production. This bill and this part of this bill does just that, and is in the Nation's best interests.

There is additionally a recreation potential in Apple Creek which is tremendous, according to our State water commission. Many experts, both Government and private, forecast that water is one of the critical shortages this country will face in the future. As we found out in the energy crisis, the lack of anticipation of shortages creeps up on us and is adverse to the well being of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of not only the entire bill, but particularly of this investigative authorization for the Apple Creek unit.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR).

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 15736. I want to commend the Interior Committee and especially Chairman JOHNSON's Subcommittee on Water and Power for their diligent efforts on this important measure. I know that the demands upon the time of the committee members has been extreme in this era of energy and environment. The very fact that they have found the time to report H.R. 15736 attests to its importance.

I would like to comment briefly on title VIII, the portion of the bill with which I am most familiar. Title VIII would authorize the rehabilitation of the Belle Fourche Dam in western South Dakota.

Belle Fourche Dam was one of the first two projects constructed by the U.S. Reclamation Service. Construction of the dam began in 1905 and was finished in 1910. For many years it was the longest earth-filled dam in the world. Presently there are approximately 420 water users in the project who are irrigating 57,128 acres.

The problems of these irrigators may seem insignificant by comparison to needs of the Nation, but an uninterrupted supply of water for irrigation is vitally important to them and, indirectly, to those who reside for a considerable distance surrounding the project.

I would not pretend to be either an engineer or an economist. I do know, however, that a continuation of the current situations is unacceptable both from the standpoint of assuring adequate waters for irrigation and that of insuring truly adequate protection from a disastrous flood.

The Department in their report to the committee on the project, printed on page 61 of the committee report, said:

> Recently developed meterological techniques, current hydrological data, plus additional years of experience in precipitation and runoff studies, have revealed that the design inflow flood at Belle Fourche Dam is greater than was estimated when the structure was designed and constructed. Based upon this information, it has been concluded that failure of Belle Fourche Dam could result from the occurrence of floods approaching the magnitude of the design inflow flood, or from unusually severe wave action against the concrete slab protection on the upstream face of the dam.
>
> Failure of the dam would cause a major disaster in the area downstream, including possible loss of life. Located within the downstream flood zone are: the town of Nisland, South Dakota; two Indian villages (Bridger and Cherry Creek); and a number of farmsteads and ranch headquarters. These communities would either be partially or completely inundated.

The effect of too little water for irrigation upon the farmers and ranchers of the area would be devastating. Likewise, the devastation and loss of life which occurred in the June 9, 1972, Rapid City flood, less than an hour's drive from the Belle Fourche Dam, is vividly etched in our memories and can only increase our concern over the condition of the spillway and face of the dam.

The local irrigation district has looked to the Bureau of Reclamation for the necessary corrective measures since at least March 1, 1966, when a contract providing for interim safety measures was entered into. I believe that any further delay in accomplishing the repairs courts disaster—natural and/or economic.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the passage and rapid implementation of H.R. 15736.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, title I of this bill provides for the incorporation of Page, Ariz., a community in the northern part of my State and in my congressional district that was established by the Bureau of Reclamation in the late fifties to provide accommodations for government and contract employees and their families engaged in the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. Since that time, the town has been administrated by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Unlike many other reclamation encampments which disappear with the completion of construction, Page, Ariz., has become a full-fledged community of permanent residents. These residents wish to see their town become self-governing under the laws of Arizona and separate from the Colorado River storage project.

By enactment of this bill, the people of this community will realize the goal of self-government. Page will become a permanent habitat, regulated by its residents.

The character of the town of Page is changing and developing at a rapid rate to meet the needs of the area, ranging from tourism to the business of providing a vast array of services for miles around. The bill is structured to enable the municipality to assume the fiscal and

community responsibilities which are rightfully those of local government.

The people of Page, Ariz., have given a great deal of time and attention to this legislation. This title of H.R. 15736 enjoys the full support of the citizens of Page. Last fall when the Water and Power Resources Subcommittee visited Page and held hearings on this proposal, every witness testified in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to endorse the position of the people of Page, Ariz., to assume this mantle of governmental responsibility. I urge my colleagues to support the passage and enactment of H.R. 15736.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, title I of this bill provides for the incorporation of Page, Ariz., a community in the northern part of that State that was established by the Bureau of Reclamation in the late fifties to provide accommodations for Government and contract employees and their families engaged in the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. Since that time, the town has been administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Unlike many other reclamation encampments which disappear with the completion of construction, Page has become a full-fledged community of permanent residents. These residents wish to see their town become self-governing under the laws of Arizona and separate from the Colorado River storage project.

By enactment of this bill, the people of this community could enjoy self-government. Page would become a permanent habitat, regulated by its residents.

The character of the town of Page is changing and developing at a rapid rate to meet the needs of the area, ranging from tourism to the business of providing a vast array of services for miles around. The bill is structured to enable the municipality to assume the fiscal and community responsibilities which are rightfully those of local government.

Our colleague, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, in whose district this community is located, has given a great deal of time and attention to this legislation. Knowing that he would be unable to be here today, the gentleman from Arizona asked me to bring to the attention of the Members that this title enjoys the full support of the citizens of Page. Last fall when the Water and Power Resources Subcommittee visited Page and held hearings on this proposal, every witness testified in support of this bill.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the statements of my colleagues regarding H.R. 15736, and in particular, section IV of the act. This section authorizes the acquisition of an 1,800-acre section of land between Lake Casitas Reservoir and Los Padres National Forest in California. The acquisition is necessary in order to protect the purity of the water in Lake Casitas, which is part of the water supply of the city of Ventura.

Lake Casitas Reservoir is a federally funded reclamation project which was brought into being largely through the efforts of the late Congressman Charles Teague. Chuck Teague originally sponsored the acquisition proposed in title IV of the bill and it would be a fitting memorial, Mr. Chairman, to have it enacted in this session. I strongly endorse it for favorable consideration of the House.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, the omnibus bill, H.R. 15736, contains authorization for a project of vital importance to the continued growth and development of the Texas Coastal Bend Area. This is the Choke Canyon project.

An integral element of the Texas water plan, it is urgently needed to provide a major new water supply to meet the rapidly increasing municipal and industrial water developments of an 11-county area centering around the city of Corpus Christi.

Extensive studies by the Texas Water Development Board indicate that the area's municipal and industrial requirements, by 1977 at the latest, will equal the dependable yield of its only presently available water supply. Early authorization of the Choke Canyon project is essential if this area is to continue to expand economically.

In my efforts to advance this project I have had the generous understanding and full cooperation of my colleague, the Honorable HAROLD T. JOHNSON, chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources, who conducted field hearings in my congressional district. My able and respected Texas colleagues, the Honorable JOHN YOUNG and the Honorable ABRAHAM KAZEN, cosponsors of my original authorization bill, have been towers of strength, the former in his capacity as a member of the Rules Committee and the latter as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The subcommittee and committee staff, particularly Jim Casey, the consultant on water and power resources, have been enormously helpful. To all of them I extend my deeply felt gratitude.

I ask now—and with confidence—for similar understanding by the membership of the whole House. The Choke Canyon project has the full support of local and State governmental bodies. It is economically feasible and its contribution is in the public interest. I commend it to the House without reservation.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15736 authorizes the sum of $24,160,000 for construction costs of the Cibolo Reclamation project, which affects two leading communities in my congressional district. For some 14 years the south Texas communities of Kenedy and Karnes City have labored to make this project a reality.

The Cibolo project would conserve water and supply badly needed additional municipal and industrial water to these two communities and to the city of San Antonio. It enjoys strong local support and is backed by other Members of Congress whose districts would be affected.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to Chairman HAROLD JOHNSON and members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources for their favorable consideration of this vitally necessary project. I trust the House will send it forward today.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to unanimous consent on H.R. 15736, Federal Reclamation Act, I wish to call to the attention of the House two provisions of the bill which are critical to the enhancement of northern California. The first provision is title VI concerning the development of recreation facilities for Lake Berryessa, a Bureau of Reclamation reservoir in Napa County, Calif. The second provision, title XIV, deals with the development of a total water plan for Solano County.

Lake Berryessa was authorized in 1948 and constructed in 1956, by the Bureau of Reclamation, for the purposes of flood control, irrigation and municipal and industrial water supply. The project did not take into account the development of recreational use, though the lake is located between the two largest population centers in northern California: the San Francisco Bay area and the Sacramento Valley.

The lake has become the second most popular recreation area in California with over 2 million recreation visitor days per year. The visitation is considerably more than many federally funded parks in California, including Point Reyes National Seashore and Redwood National Park.

The management of this enormous recreational area has, up to now, lain with Napa County. Though Napa County use of the lake is only about 10 percent of all the visitor use, the county has contributed over a million dollars from its limited financial resources to provide what exists as public recreational areas. The county's limited financial and staff resources have necessitated, however, the contracting of private companies to develop the area and the county to forgo its responsibilities in 1975.

Unfortunately, the contracted firms' developments have not been for general public use, but rather for more profitable private interests. Such development has further added to a lack of general public recreational space and coordinated recreational planning and development.

The area receives no State funds since it is a Federal project, and properly should come under our jurisdiction to enhance this site. The provision calls for the transfer of authority for recreational operation to the Department of the Interior and funding to provide much needed public facilities such as; picnic areas, sanitation facilities, garbage collection, bath houses and other daily use facilities which are limited or totally lacking in the area.

I am in full support of my California colleague, Mr. CLAUSEN, in his efforts in resolving the management and recreational funding problems which have plagued this popular recreation area. I am confident that with adequate management and funding, Lake Berryessa can properly be developed, both recreationally and environmentally, to insure

long lasting use and appreciation of the area by millions of people.

Provision XIV authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a total water management study for Solano County. The study will analyze the changing needs, goals, and objectives of the area.

Solano County stretches from the Carquinez Strait, in the San Francisco Bay area, to the Sacramento Delta. The area is rich, therefore, in waterways which have had increased development and use, serving the shipping needs of the agriculturally abundant central valley of California. The area has had a progressively increasing population growth and greater industrial and municipal needs. These factors have further increased the need for an analysis and definition of water needs to meet the changing patterns of land use, water requirements, and updating these concerns and population growth to forecast water demand in Solano County.

The study is particularly critical in order to develop a proper water management program, one which will accommodate the needs of the county and insure the preservation of the wetlands in the area. One primary wetland wildlife habitat area is the Suisun Marsh. The marsh serves as an important element of the migratory waterfowl flyway in California.

The study will serve as a comprehensive short- and long-range forecast of the changing needs in the area and responsively providing for proper water management to a much greater extent than past studies have accomplished.

In the interest of the public's welfare and in meeting our federally obligated responsibilities, I urge the House to heartily support, in particular, title IV and title XIV of the reclamation bill before us today.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the bill by titles.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as "The Reclamation Development Act of 1974".

TITLE I

INCORPORATION OF PAGE, ARIZONA

SEC. 101. It is the purpose of this title to separate that unincorporated area in Coconino County in the State of Arizona, commonly known as the town of Page, Arizona, from the Colorado River storage project in order that the United States may withdraw from the ownership and operation of the town and the people of that area may enjoy self-government, and to facilitate the establishment by the people of a municipal corporation under the laws of the State of Arizona by the transfer of certain Federal property described in section 103 of this title.

SEC. 102. The following definitions shall apply to terms used in this title.

(a) The area referred to herein as Page, Arizona, includes the following described land:

PAGE TOWNSITE, ARIZONA

GILA AND SALT RIVER MERIDIAN, ARIZONA

	Acres
Township 40 north, range 8 east:	
Section 1. All	638.94
Section 2. East half southwest quarter, southeast quarter	240.00
Section 11. East half	320.00
Section 12. All	639.38
Township 41 north, range 8 east:	
Section 25. South half southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter	60.00
Section 36. East half, south half northeast quarter northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, northwest quarter, southeast quarter, northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, east half northwest quarter, southwest quarter, south half southwest quarter	540.00
Township 40 north, range 9 east:	
Section 4. All	639.48
Section 5. All	639.84
Section 6. All	622.74
Section 7. All	623.68
Section 8. All	640.00
Section 9. All	640.00
Section 19. East half southwest quarter, southeast quarter	240.00
Section 20. South half	320.00
Township 41 north, range 9 east:	
Section 21. West half southwest quarter, west half, southeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter	120.00
Section 28, West half northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, south half, southeast quarter northwest quarter west half, southeast quarter	590.00
Section 29. All	640.00
Section 30. All	641.20
Section 31. All	640.00
Section 32. All	640.00
Section 33. All	640.00
Total	10,717.56

The boundary of Page, Arizona, is shown on drawing numbered 557–431–83, entitled "Page, Arizona, Townsite Boundary" which is on file in the Office of the Commissioner of Reclamation, Washington, District of Columbia.

(b) The term "municipality" shall mean Page, Arizona, after its incorporation as a municipality under the laws of the State of Arizona.

(c) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) The term "municipal facilities" shall mean certain land, and the improvements thereon, in Page, Arizona, such as hospital, police, and fire protection systems, sewage and refuse disposal plants, water treatment and distribution facilities, streets and roads, parks, playgrounds, airport, cemetery, municipal government buildings, and other properties suitable or usable for local municipal purposes, including any fixtures, equipment, or other property appropriate to the operation, maintenance, replacement, or repairs of the foregoing, which are owned by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, on the date of incorporation of Page, Arizona.

SEC. 103. Upon incorporation of Page, Arizona, as a municipality under the statutes of the State of Arizona, the Secretary shall:

(a) Transfer to the municipality without cost, subject to any existing leases granted by the United States, all improved or unimproved lands within Page, Arizona, owned by the United States, which the Secretary determines are not required in the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal activities within or near Page, Arizona, and can properly be included within the municipality under the laws of the State of Arizona, except the land to be transferred pursuant to subsection (c) hereof, and to assign to the municipality without cost any leases granted by the United States on such land.

(b) Transfer to the appropriate school district without cost all right, title, and interest of the United States to the land in block 14–A and lot 1, block 16, as shown on the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation drawing numbered 557–431–87, April 29, 1971, which drawing is on file in the Office of the Commissioner of Reclamation, Washington, District of Columbia, together with improvements thereon owned by the United States at the time of the transfer.

(c) Transfer to the municipality without cost all rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to any land, and the improvements thereon, which may be contained in any reversionary clause of any dedication deed for land in Page, Arizona, issued by the United States.

(d) Transfer all activities and functions of a municipal character being performed by the United States to the municipality subject to the provisions of sections 104 and 107 of this title.

(e) Transfer to the municipality without cost the municipal facilities, as defined in subsection 102(d) of this title, except as provided under subsection 104(a) of this title.

(f) Assign to the municipality without cost those contracts to which the United States is a party, and which pertain to activities or functions to be transferred under subsection (c) of this section and are properly assignable. This shall include contracts for furnishing water outside the boundaries of Page, Arizona, utilizing the municipal system: *Provided,* That the contract which the United States has executed with a private utility for furnishing and distributing electrical energy to the municipality shall be assigned to the municipality upon its request: *And provided further,* That in the assignment of the contract for the operation of the Page Hospital the operating fund balance under said contract, together with all hospital accounts receivable, shall be transferred to the municipality for the same purpose as a part of the assignment of said contract.

SEC. 104. There is hereby reserved for the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project, the consumptive use of not to exceed three thousand acre-feet of water per year from Lake Powell, of which not to exceed two thousand seven hundred and forty acre-feet of consumptive use of water are hereby assigned to the municipality, consistent with the Navajo Tribal Council resolution numbered CJN–50–69, dated June 3, 1969: *Provided,* That upon incorporation the municipality shall enter into a contract satisfactory to the Secretary covering payment for and delivery of such water pursuant to the Colorado River Storage Project Act of June 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105), which contract shall among other things provide that:

(a) The reservation and assignment of the consumptive use of water from Lake Powell under this section shall be subject to the apportionments of consumptive use of water to the State of Arizona in article III of the Colorado River Compact and article III(a)(1) of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact.

(b) Title to the water pumping and conveyance systems within the Glen Canyon Dam and powerplant necessary to supply

water to the municipality for culinary, industrial, and municipal purposes shall be retained by the United States until the Congress provides otherwise.

(c) Such retained facilities shall be operated and maintained by the Secretary at the expense of the United States until termination of the fifth fiscal year following the year of incorporation. Not to exceed two thousand seven hundred and forty acre-feet of water per annum or three million gallons of water in any twenty-four-hour period, will be pumped by the United States from Lake Powell to the water treatment plant, or to such intermediate points of delivery as shall be mutually agreed upon by the municipality and the United States for use by the municipality.

(d) Beginning with the sixth year following incorporation and continuing through the tenth year, the municipality shall in each year pay to the United States proportionately increasing increments of the annual costs, including depreciation of the pumping equipment, involved in subsection (c) above with the objective that following the close of said tenth year the municipality shall thereafter bear such costs in total, according to the following schedule:

Portion of cost in subsection (c) of section 104 to be paid to United States each year by municipality (per centum)	
Year following incorporation:	
Sixth	20
Seventh	40
Eighth	60
Ninth	80
Tenth	80
Thereafter	100

(e) Upon incorporation and at all times thereafter, the municipality shall bear all costs for operation, maintenance, and replacement of the municipal water system beyond Glen Canyon Dam and powerplant, including but not limtied to filtration, treatment, and distribution of water supplied pursuant to the water service contract with the United States.

SEC. 105. As soon as reasonably practicable after incorporation of the community, the Secretary is hereby authorized to complete all or any part of the following work which has not been completed at the date of incorporation.

(a) Take census of population of the municipality within one year following incorporation.

(b) Repair existing twelve-inch water supply line, if inspection determines this is necessary.

(c) Paint interior of water storage reservoirs.

(d) Seal coat paved streets in municipality.

(e) Install water sprinkler system in Page cemetery.

(f) Improve streets, install curbs, gutters, and sidewalks as follows:

(1) North Navajo Drive:

(i) Pave streets to seventy-foot width from Ninth Avenue to relocated intersection of Aero Avenue and sixty-one-foot width from Aero Avenue to Tenth Avenue.

(ii) Place curb, gutter, and sidewalk on east side of North Navajo Drive from Aero Avenue to Tenth Avenue.

(2) Aero Avenue from North Navajo Drive to Future Street:

(i) Widen existing thirty-foot paved width to seventy-foot paved width.

(ii) Place curb, gutter, and sidewalk on both sides of street.

(3) Tenth Avenue from Future Street to Sandstone Street:

(i) Construct new pavement on north half of street and overlay south half of street.

(ii) Place curb and gutter only on north side of street.

(4) Future Street—Approximately two thousand one hundred and fifty feet beginning at Tenth Avenue and bordering east side of block 101 as shown on Page townsite and block plats:

(i) Pave street to fifty-two-foot width.

(ii) Place curb, gutter, and sidewalk on west side of street and curb and gutter only on east side of street.

(5) Hopi Avenue from Oak Avenue to west boundary of block 101:

(i) Pave street to forty-two-foot width.

(ii) Place curb, gutter and sidewalk on north side.

(iii) Place curb and gutter only on south side.

(g) Construct paved access road from United States Highway Numbered 89 to site of new sanitary landfill to be located in the northwest quarter, section 20, township 41 north, range 8 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, Arizona: *Provided*, That in the performance of the work authorized in this section, the Secretary may either cause the work to be done or transfer funds to the municipality for this purpose after ascertaining that each segment of work will be accomplished by a date certain and to standards satisfactory to the Secretary.

SEC. 106. (a) Upon incorporation the Secretary is authorized to make a lump-sum payment of $500,000 to the municipality as assistance to the municipality in meeting the expenses of police and fire protection facilities and services, sewage system, refuse disposal, electrical distribution system, water treatment and distribution, streets and roads, library, park, playgrounds and other recreational facilities, municipal government buildings, and other properties and services required for municipal purposes.

(b) To make a lump-sum payment of $50,000 to the municipality for improvements to the Page Hospital.

SEC. 107. Upon incorporation, the United States will provide to the municipality, upon its request, the services of Federal personnel, while they are employed by the United States in the operation and maintenance of the Glen Canyon unit of the Colorado River storage project, to assist in the transition from a federally administered community to a self-governing municipal corporation: *Provided*, That such assistance shall be for a maximum of six months following the date of incorporation: *And provided further*, That the total number of such employees shall be limited to ten at any time.

SEC. 108. (a) Except as herein specifically provided, no assets of the Colorado River storage projects or moneys of the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund shall be utilized after incorporation of the municipality for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and thereupon transferred to the municipality the amount necessary for the municipality to acquire the electric distribution facilities in Page, Arizona, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract with the utility supplying the electricity, in the event the municipality exercises the option in said contract to acquire said electric distribution facilities: *Provided*, That the municipality agress to repay with interest the amount of the funds so transferred in twenty equal annual installments: *Provided*, That the funds so repaid and the accrued interest thereon will be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the aforesaid Upper Colorado River Basin Fund. The interest rate used for computing interest on the unpaid balance of funds transferred to the municipality for purposes of this subsection shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the incorporation of Page, Arizona, occurs, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

SEC. 109. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to transfer to the United States to be held in trust for the Navajo Tribe title to a tract of land situated within the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter, section 8 the southwest quarter, section 9, section 16, the east half of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter, section 28, all in township 41 north, range 9 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, Coconino County, Arizona, and containing eight hundred and eight acres, more or less, of which the particular description and drawing (Numbered 557-431-38 "Navajo Tribe—Antelope Creek Recreation Development Area Survey Traverse" dated May 22, 1969) are on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. The transfer of title to such land is made in consideration of Navajo Council Resolution Numbered CNJ-50-69 dated June 3, 1969, and with the understanding that the land so transferred shall thereafter constitute a part of the Navajo Reservation and shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to that reservation.

SEC. 110. The Congress hereby directs the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the effectuation of Navajo Tribal Council Resolutions CD 108-68 and CJN-50-69, subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Basin Project Act (82 Stat. 885).

SEC. 111. The Secretary is hereby authorized, subject only to the provisions of this title to perform such acts, to delegate such authority, and to prescribe such rules and regulations, and establish such terms and conditions as he may deem necessary and appropriate for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 112. The Upper Colorado River Basin Fund established pursuant to section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105), shall be utilized as appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That the total expenditures from the fund shall not exceed $4,000,000. Payments made under the provisions of section 105 and section 106 of this title, and transfer, made under the provisions of subsection 108(b) will be made from revenues accruing to said basin fund from the sale of power from the Upper Colorado River storage project.

SEC. 113. All authority of the Secretary under sections 101 through 112 of this title shall terminate five years following date of enactment unless incorporation of Page, Arizona, shall previously have been achieved.

SEC. 114. This title may be cited as the "Page, Arizona, Community Act of 1974".

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title I?

There being no amendments to title I, the Clerk will read title II.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

CIBOLO PROJECT, TEXAS

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Cibolo project, Texas, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and the provisions of this title and the plan set out in the report of the Secretary on this project with such modification of, omissions from, or additions to the works, as the Secretary may find proper and necessary for the

purposes of storing, regulating, and furnishing water for municipal and industrial use, conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources, providing outdoor recreation opportunities, and controlling floods. The principal features of the project shall consist of a dam and reservoir on Cibolo Creek and public outdoor recreation facilities.

SEC. 202. The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the reimbursable costs of the project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction of the project is commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into a contract with a qualified entity or entities, for delivery of water and for repayment of all the reimbursable construction costs.

(b) Construction of the project shall not be commenced until a suitable contract has been executed by the Secretary with a qualified entity or entities.

(c) Such contract may be entered into without regard to the last sentence of section 9, subsection (c), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

(d) Upon execution of the contract referred to in subsection 203(a) above, and upon completion of construction of the project, the Secretary shall transfer to a qualified contracting entity or entities the care, operation, and maintenance of the project works; and, after such transfer is made will reimburse the contractor annually for that portion of the year's joint operation and maintenance costs which, if the United States had continued to operate the project, would have been allocated to flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreation purposes. Prior to assuming care, operation, and maintenance of the project works the contracting entity or entities shall be obligated to operate them in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army with respect to flood control, and by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to fish and wildlife and recreation.

(e) Upon execution of the contract referred to in subsection 203(a) above, and upon completion of construction of the project, the contracting entity or entities, their designee or designees, shall have a permanent right to use the reservoir and related facilities of the Cibolo project in accordance with said contract.

SEC. 204. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Cibolo project shall be in accordance with provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

SEC. 205. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to defray construction costs of the Cibolo reclamation project allocable to flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreation the sum of $24,160,000 (July 1973 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved herein: *Provided,* That prior to appropriation of any Federal funds the San Antonio River Authority shall, pursuant to a contract satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, agree to advance funds for postauthorization planning and construction of the Cibolo reclamation project. The amount of funds to be advanced annually shall be in the proportion to the total annual fund requirements for the project as the construction cost allocated to municipal and industrial water is to the total cost of the project: *Provided further,* That the sum of funds advanced shall not exceed the total project cost allocated to municipal and industrial water. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for the operation and maintenance of the project. The discount rate to be used by the Secretary for allocating costs of the works authorized herein shall be the rate for the fiscal year of passage of this Act as derived by the Secretary of the Treasury utilizing the formula set forth in Senate Document Numbered 97, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, as revised by the Water Resources Council announcement in the Federal Register of December 24, 1968.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will read title III.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

SEC. 301. In order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities to deliver a water supply to the city of Frederick, Oklahoma, from the Mountain Park reclamation project, section 1 of Public Law 90-503 (82 Stat. 853) is amended by deleting "Altus and Snyder, Oklahoma," and substituting therefor "Altus, Snyder, and Frederick, Oklahoma,".

SEC. 302. The amount which section 6 of said Act authorizes to be appropriated is hereby further increased by the sum of $6,057,000 (January 1974 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering costs indexes applicable to the type of construction involved herein.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title III?

Their being no amendments to title III, the Clerk will read title IV.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

CASITAS RESERVOIR OPEN SPACE, CALIFORNIA

SEC. 401. In order to provide for protection of the quality of water in Lake Casitas, and to provide for the preservation and enhancement of public outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife, and the environment of the area, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to acquire in the name of the United States certain privately owned lands within townships 3 and 4 north, ranges 23 and 24 west, San Bernardino base and meridian, lying outside the boundaries of the Los Padres National Forest, as generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Private Lands in Casitas Reservoir Watershed", numbered 767-208-237, and dated September 1972, which is on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 402. (a) Within the area described in section 401 of this title, the Secretary may acquire such lands by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange: *Provided,* That any lands owned by the State of California or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation.

(b) With respect to any property acquired for the purposes of this title, which is beneficially owned by a natural person and which the Secretary determines can be continued in private use for a limited period of time without undue interference with the administration and public use of the area, the owner may on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary retain a right of use and occupancy of such property for agricultural or noncommercial residential purposes for a term, as the owners may elect, ending either—

(1) at the death of the owner or spouse, whichever occurs later, or

(2) not more than twenty-five years from the date of acquisition.

Any right so retained may, during its existence, be transferred or assigned. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(c) The Secretary may terminate the right of use and occupancy, retained pursuant to this section, upon his determination that such a right is being exercised in a manner not consistent with the purposes of this title and upon tender to the holder of the right an amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(d) For the purposes of this title "noncommercial residential property" shall mean any single family residence in existence or under construction as of July 1, 1974.

SEC. 403. The Secretary shall administer the lands to be acquired in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Act of July 9, 1965 (79 Stat. 213), and may issue such licenses, permits, or leases, or take such other action as may be required for proper management in accordance therewith. The lands will be kept in their natural state as permanent open space and may be managed by the Casitas Municipal Water District, or any other authorized non-Federal public body as part of the Lake Casitas Recreation Area.

SEC. 404. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 (April 1974 price levels) plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by changes in the price indexes for agricultural and noncommercial residential property in Ventura County, California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment to title IV.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 21, line 15, add the following sentence: "All funds authorized to be appropriated by this title shall be nonreimbursable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

There being no further amendments to title IV, the Clerk will report title V.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V

KLAMATH PROJECT RIGHT-OF-WAY, OREGON

SEC. 501. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the respective owners of record of those certain lots situated in those subdivisions of Klamath Falls, Oregon, respectively known as Mills Addition, Enterprise Tracts, Mills Garden, Old Orchard Manor, Sixth Street Addition, and Subdivision Block 803, and as such officially shown on the recorded plats of the city records, all right, title, and interest of the United States in the specific tracts of land now owned by the United States which collectively constitute the abandoned Klamath reclamation project "B" lateral canal right-of-way, as designated for general location purposes on Bureau of Reclamation drawing numbered 12–208–338, dated March 27, 1970, and filed for reference purposes in both the Klamath County recorder's office and the corresponding records of the city of Klamath Falls, to the extent that any such tract would constitute a contiguous addition to each of the lots in the above-named subdivisions if the boundaries of each of said lots were to be extended to include the affected portion of above-cited public lands of the United States. Such conveyance shall, in each instance, be made only upon application therefor by the owner of record of one of the affected lots within one year of the date of this Act: *Provided*, That said owner of record shall, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior, support such application at time of filing same with proof of ownership and an adequate description of the exterior boundaries of the parcel of Government interest land applied for. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, as determined appropriate by him, to require payment of not more than $100 per parcel of Government interest land applied for in addition to the cost of such conveyance.

SEC. 502. Acceptance of any conveyance made hereunder by any applicant shall constitute a complete and unconditional waiver and release by said applicant or applicants individually or collectively of any and all claims against the United States arising from or occasioned by use of the land by said applicant or his successors in interest.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title V be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will report title VI.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI

SOLANO PROJECT RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, CALIFORNIA

SEC. 601. In order to provide for the protection, use, and enjoyment of the esthetic and recreational values inherent in the Federal lands and waters at Lake Berryessa, Solano project, California, the Secretary of the interior is hereby authorized to develop, operate, and maintain such short-term recreation facilities as he deems necessary for the safety, health, protection, and outdoor recreational use of the visiting public; to undertake a thorough and detailed review of all existing developments and uses on Federal lands to determine their compatibility with preservation of environmental values and their effectiveness in providing needed public services; to implement corrective procedures when necessary; and to otherwise administer the Federal land and water areas associated with said Lake Berryessa in such a manner that, in his opinion, will best provide for the public recreational use and enjoyment thereof, all to such an extent that said use is not incompatible with other authorized functions of the Solano project.

SEC. 602. The Secretary of the Interior shall make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and may enter into an agreement or agreements with the State of California, or political subdivision thereof, or a non-Federal agency or agencies or organizations as appropriate, for the development of a recreation management plan, and for the management of recreation including the operation and maintenance of the facilities within the area. The agency performing the recreation management functions is authorized to establish and collect fees for the use of recreation facilities.

SEC. 603. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior the sum of $3,000,000 (April 1974 price levels) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in development costs as indicated by cost indexes applicable to the types of development involved herein. There is also authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for administration of existing facilities and for operation and maintenance of the facilities authorized by this Act.

SEC. 604. All funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act shall be nonreimbursable.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment to title VI.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 24, line 20, strike the word "Act." and insert in lieu thereof: "title.".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second committee amendment to title VI.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 24, line 22, strike the word "Act" and insert in lieu thereof: "title".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments to title VI? If not, the Clerk will report title VII.

The Clerk read title VI, as follows:

TITLE VII

MISCELLANEOUS DRAINAGE CONSTRUCTION, UTAH

SEC. 701. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct drainage facilities for the Vernal Unit of the Central Utah project and the Emergy County project to the extent that he determines necessary for the sustained crop production on the irrigable lands of these projects. The Secretary is further authorized to negotiate and execute amendments to contract numbered 14–06–400–778, dated July 14, 1958, between the United States and the Uintah Water Conservancy District and contract numbered 15–06–400–2427, dated May 15, 1962, between the United States and the Emery Water conservancy District to provide for the cost of such drainage works to be paid from the Colorado River storage project basin fund with repayment to be based on ability of irrigation water users to repay as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VII be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VII? If not, the Clerk will report title VIII.

The Clerk read title VIII as follows:

TITLE VIII

BELLE FOURCHE DAM REHABILITATION, SOUTH DAKOTA

SEC. 801. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain an adequate spillway and to improve the upstream slope protection of Belle Fourche Dam, Belle Fourche project, Belle Fourche, South Dakota, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) and the provisions of this title.

SEC. 802. Construction authorized by this title shall be for the safety of Belle Fourche Dam and shall not provide additional conservation storage capacity or develop benefits over and above those provided by the original dam and reservoir. Nothing in this title shall be construed to reduce the amount of project costs allocated to reimbursable purposes heretofore authorized.

SEC. 803. Reimbursement of costs associated with improving upstream slope protection on Belle Fourche Dam shall be limited to an amount equal to the estimated annual savings to the Belle Fourche Irrigation District in operation and maintenance expense over the remaining life of the district's repayment contract with the United States. The Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into an amendatory repayment contract with the Belle Fourche Irrigation District to effect such reimbursement without interest. All other costs of construction authorized by this title shall be nonreimbursable.

SEC. 804. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction authorized by this title the sum of $3,620,000 (April 1974 price levels) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of changes in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VIII be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VIII? If not, the Clerk will report title IX.

The Clerk read title IX, as follows:

TITLE IX

GLENDO UNIT ROAD CONSTRUCTION, WYOMING

SEC. 901. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to relocate, reconstruct, and rehabilitate the road that was initially relocated in connection with the construction of Glendo Dam and Reservoir to provide a safe, durable, two-lane highway for public use.

SEC. 902. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the relocation, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of said highway the sum of $284,000 (January 1974 price levels) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuation in construction cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IX be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title IX?

Hearing none, the Clerk will report title X.

The Clerk read title X as follows:

TITLE X

NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TEXAS

SEC. 1001. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Nueces River project, Texas, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and the provisions of this title and the plan set out in the report of the Secretary on this project with such modification of, omissions from, or additions to the works, as the Secretary may find proper and necessary for the purposes of storing, regulating, and furnishing water for municipal and industrial use, conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources, and providing outdoor recreation opportunities. The principal features of the project shall consist of the Choke Canyon Dam and Reservoir on the Frio River and public outdoor recreation and sport fishing facilities.

SEC. 1002. (a) Costs of the project, allocated to municipal and industrial water supply, shall be repayable to the United States in not more than forty years under either the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws or under the provisions of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (title III of Public Law 85–500, 72 Stat. 319, and Acts mandatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That, in either case, repayment of costs allocated to municipal and industrial water supply shall include interest on the unamortized balance.

(b) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the reimbursable costs of the project allocated to municipal and industrial water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction of the project is commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

SEC. 1003. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into a contract with a qualified entity or entities, for delivery of water and for repayment of the balance of the reimbursable construction costs.

(b) Construction of the project shall not be commenced until a suitable contract has been executed by the Secretary with a qualified entity or entities.

(c) Such contract may be entered into without regard to the last sentence of section 9, subsection (c), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

(d) Upon execution of the contract referred to in section 1003(a) above, and upon completion of construction of the project, the Secretary shall transfer to a qualified contracting entity or entities the care, operation, and maintenance of the project works, and, after transfer is made, will credit annually against the contractors repayment obligation that portion of the year's joint operation and maintenance costs which, if the United States had continued to operate the project, would have been allocated to fish and wildlife and recreation purposes. Prior to assuming care, operation, and maintenance of the project works the contracting entity or entities shall agree to operate them in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to fish and wildlife and recreation.

(e) Upon complete payment of the obligation assumed, including appropriate interest charges, the contracting entity or entities their designee or designees, shall have a permanent right to use the reservoir and related facilities of the Nueces River project in accordance with said contract.

SEC. 1004. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Nueces River project shall be in accordance with provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

SEC. 1005. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Nueces River project, Texas, the sum of $50,000,000 (January 1974 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved herein: *Provided*, That, prior to appropriation of any Federal funds, a qualified local entity shall, pursuant to a contract satisfactory to the Secretary, agree to advance on a schedule mutually acceptable to the local entity and the Secretary, the sum of not less than $15,000,000 representing a non-Federal contribution toward implementation of this title.

Upon completion of the work authorized herein, the aforesaid $15,000,000 shall be applied as a credit to the repayment obligation of the local entity for municipal and industrial water service.

The Secretary is authorized and directed, upon receipt of the aforesaid advance to proceed with postauthorization planning, preparation of designs and specifications, land acquisition, and award of construction contracts pending availability of appropriated funds.

At any time following the first advance of funds by the local entity, said entity may request that the Secretary terminate activities then in progress, return unexpended balances of the funds so advanced, assign to the local entity the rights to any contract in force, convey any real estate acquired by the advanced funds and provide any data, drawings, or other items of value procured with advanced funds to the local entity; and such request shall be binding upon the Secretary.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title X be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title X? If not, the Clerk will report title XI.

The Clerk read title XI, as follows:

TITLE XI

ELEPHANT BUTTE RECREATION POOL, NEW MEXICO

SEC. 1101. (a) Pending the negotiation of contracts and completion of construction for furnishing water supplies for tributary irrigation units as authorized by section 8 of the Act of Congress dated June 13, 1962 (Public Law 87–483; 76 Stat. 96), and subject to the availability of stored water in Heron Reservoir in excess of one hundred thousand acre-feet, which water is not required for existing authorized uses, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to permit releases from the Heron Reservoir or the San Juan-Chama project to provide storage and establish a minimum recreation pool in Elephant Butte Reservoir. Such releases, to the extent of the available supply, shall be limited to providing fifty thousand acre-feet for the initial recreation pool and up to six thousand acre-feet of water delivered to Elephant Butte Reservoir annually, for a period not exceeding ten years from establishment of the recreation pool, to replace loss by evaporation and other causes. Authorized releases, as provided above, are subject to and subordinated to any obligations under contracts for San Juan-Chama project water now or hereafter in force and for filling and maintaining a pool in Cochiti Reservoir under the Act of Congress dated March 26, 1964 (Public Law 88–293; 78 Stat. 171). The provisions of section 11(a) of the Act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), requiring a contract satisfactory to the Secretary for the use of any water of the San Juan River are hereby expressly waived with respect to the use of water required to establish and maintain a permanent pool in Elephant Butte Reservoir.

(b) The releases of water from Heron Reservoir authorized herein shall not be permitted unless and until the Rio Grande Compact Commission agrees by resolution that—

(1) the term "usable water" as defined in article I of the Rio Grande Compact shall not include San Juan-Chama project water stored in Elephant Butte Reservoir;

(2) in the determination of "actual spill" as that term is defined in article I of the Rio Grande Compact, neither the spill of "credit water", as that is defined in article I of the Rio Grande Compact, shall not occur until all San Juan-Chama project water in Elephant Butte Reservoir shall have been spilled; and

(3) the amount of evaporation loss chargeable to San Juan-Chama project water stored in Elephant Butte Reservoir shall be that increment of the evaporation loss from the storage of San Juan-Chama project water; the evaporation loss from the reservoir shall be taken as the difference between the gross evaporation from the water surface of Elephant Butte Reservoir and the rainfall on the same surface.

(c) Fifty per centum of any incremental costs incurred by the Secretary in the implementation of this title shall be borne by a non-Federal entity pursuant to arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary.

SEC. 1102. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to increase the amount of money heretofore authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Colorado River storage project, any of its units, or of the Rio Grande project.

SEC. 1103. Nothing herein shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, modify or be in conflict with the provisions of the Rio Grande Compact.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title XI be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objectin to the request of the gentlman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment to title XI.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 33, line 7, strike the words "shall not" and insert in lieu thereof: "nor 'actual spill' shall".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second committee amendment to title XI.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 33, line 14, after the word "from" insert: "the reservoir resulting from".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to title XI?

Hearing none, the Clerk will report title XII.

The Clerk read title XII, as follows:

TITLE XII

FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO

SEC. 1201. Section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado", approved August 16, 1962 (76 Stat. 389), is amended by striking out $170,000,000 "(June 1961 prices)" and inserting in lieu thereof "$432,000,000 (January 1974 price levels)".

SEC. 1202. That for the purpose of increasing the hydroelectric generating capacity the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain a second one hundred-megawatt unit at the Mount Elbert pumped storage powerplant site of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado. The funds required to construct such unit are included in the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 1201 of this title.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title XII be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments to title XII of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 34, line 12, strike out "$170,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "'$170,000,000".

Page 34, line 15, strike the words "That for" and insert in lieu thereof: "For".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title XII? If not, the Clerk will read title XIII of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE XIII

SAVAGE RAPIDS FISH WAY, OREGON

SEC. 1301. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to construct the necessary facilities at Savage Rapids Dam, Grants Pass Division, Rogue River Basin, Oregon, to provide for improved anadromous fish passage at the dam. Such improvements will be substantially in accordance with the plan set forth in the joint special report of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife entitled "Anadromous Fish Passage Facilities, Savage Rapids Dam, March 1974". Operation and maintenance of the facilities herein authorized will be in conformity with procedures developed by the Oregon State Game Commission and will be performed by the Grants Pass Irrigation District at no cost to the United States.

SEC. 1302. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the facilities authorized by this Act the sum of $851,000 (April 1974 price levels), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved herein.

SEC. 1303. The cost of all construction authorized by this title shall be nonreimbursable.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title XIII be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title XIII?

If not, the Clerk will read title XIV.

The Clerk read title XIV, as follows:

TITLE XIV

FEASIBILITY STUDY AUTHORITIES

SEC. 1401. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to engage in feasibility studies of the following potential water resource development programs:

(1) A total water management study to consider and coordinate the results of other water-related studies concerning Solano County, California.

(2) A municipal and industrial water supply delivery system for delivery of water to the city of Yuma, Arizona.

(3) The Apple Creek unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program in North Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title XIV be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note that there is about $200 million of authorizations provided in this bill, including authorizations for projects in California, Oregon, North Dakota, South Dakota, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Oklahoma, to mention just a few of the States in which there are projects which are covered by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recently reported a strip mining bill which was passed by the House. This strip mining bill, when it passed the House, included a provision to encourage mountaintop removal, and other forms of devastation of the land in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) or any Member on the other side whether there are any funds in this bill for reclamation projects in the State of West Virginia, now that we are ripping up the land through more strip mining.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question, no, I would say not.

West Virginia is not one of the reclamation States under the Reclamation Act that was passed in 1902 and which became operational throughout the West. There were 17 Western States—and the States of Alaska and Hawaii were added since that time—that have been covered by reclamation law administered under the Bureau of Reclamation as far as the projects and the development of reclamation land is concerned.

This has been an ongoing project for 72 years now, and this legislation is responsible for doing a great job in reclaiming the arid lands of the West and controlling devastating floods, and more recently it has been expanded under legislation by the Congress to include recreation, fish and wildlife, water quality, and other purposes that concern the environment. The most recent of the projects which has been authorized carries as one of the purposes the environment and the ecology of the areas that are affected by the project as a spelled-out purpose in the legislation. West Virginia has never been included in the Reclamation Act as a reclamation State.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia has raised an inquiry concerning the reclamation law which is confined to the Western States. However, certainly the gentleman from West Virginia is particularly aware of the fact that under the able leadership of the Committee on Public works in the other body, through Senator RANDOLPH, and through the leadership of the delegation from West Virginia in this body, the State of West Virginia has obtained more than its share of projects in the public works field. I just want to make that point clear.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comment made by both gentlemen from California. But the law is grossly unfair if it excludes Eastern States. And I strongly disagree with the statement that West Virginia has obtained more than its share of public works funds. Now that we have revenue sharing, West Virginia has funding for many categorical grants.

I would merely like to add that during May of 1974 there has been a 60-percent increase in strip mining production in the State of West Virginia, as contracted with May of 1973. I would certainly hope that when the conferees on the strip mining bill meet with the Senate to consider what kind of surface mining reclamation provision should come out this Congress, they can come up with something that is a little bit stronger and which hopefully will include the Mansfield amendment which was adopted in the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments to title XIV, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROBERTS, 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. 15736) to authorize, enlarge, and repair various Federal reclamation projects and programs, and for other purposes, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. HEINZ. 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 320, nays 8, not voting 106, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—320

Abdnor	Cederberg	Fuqua
Abzug	Chamberlain	Gaydos
Adams	Chappell	Gettys
Addabbo	Clark	Giaimo
Anderson, Calif.	Clausen, Don H.	Gilman
Anderson, Ill.	Clawson, Del	Gonzalez
Andrews, N.C.	Cleveland	Goodling
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cochran	Green, Pa.
Annunzio	Cohen	Gude
Archer	Collier	Guyer
Arends	Conlan	Haley
Ashbrook	Conte	Hamilton
Aspin	Conyers	Hammer-schmidt
Bafalis	Corman	Hanley
Baker	Cotter	Hanrahan
Barrett	Coughlin	Harrington
Bell	Daniel, Dan	Harsha
Bennett	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hastings
Bergland	Daniels, Dominick V.	Hawkins
Bevill	Danielson	Hébert
Biester	Davis, S.C.	Heckler, Mass.
Blackburn	Davis, Wis.	Heinz
Blatnik	Delaney	Helstoski
Boggs	Dellenback	Hicks
Boland	Dellums	Hillis
Bolling	Denholm	Hinshaw
Bowen	Dennis	Hogan
Brademas	Devine	Holt
Bray	Dickinson	Horton
Breaux	Dingell	Hosmer
Breckinridge	Dorn	Howard
Brooks	Downing	Huber
Broomfield	Drinan	Hudnut
Brotzman	Duncan	Hungate
Brown, Calif.	du Pont	Hunt
Brown, Mich.	Edwards, Ala.	Hutchinson
Broyhill, N.C.	Edwards, Calif.	Ichord
Broyhill, Va.	Erlenborn	Jarman
Buchanan	Esch	Johnson, Calif.
Burgener	Eshleman	Johnson, Colo.
Burke, Calif.	Fascell	Johnson, Pa.
Burke, Fla.	Findley	Jordan
Burke, Mass.	Fish	Karth
Burlison, Mo.	Foley	Kastenmeier
Burton, John	Fountain	Kazen
Burton, Phillip	Fraser	Kemp
Butler	Frelinghuysen	Ketchum
Byron	Frenzel	King
Camp	Frey	Koch
Carney, Ohio	Froehlich	Kyros
Casey, Tex.	Fulton	Latta
Cederberg	Gibbons	Leggett
Chamberlain	Ginn	Long, La.
Chappell	Goldwater	Long, Md.
Clark	Grasso	Lott
Clausen, Don H.	Gray	Lujan
Clawson, Del	Green, Oreg.	Luken
Cleveland	Griffiths	McClory
Cochran	Grover	McCloskey
Cohen	Gubser	McCollister
Collier	Gunter	McCormack
Conlan	Hanna	McDade
Conte	Hansen, Idaho	McEwen
Conyers	Hansen, Wash.	McFall
Corman	Hays	McKay
Cotter	Henderson	McKinney
Coughlin	Holifield	Macdonald
Daniel, Dan	Holtzman	Madden
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Jones, Ala.	Madigan
Daniels, Dominick V.	Jones, N.C.	Mahon
Danielson	Jones, Okla.	Mallary
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Tenn.	Mann
Davis, Wis.	Kluczynski	Maraziti
Delaney	Kuykendall	Martin, Nebr.
Dellenback	Lagomarsino	Martin, N.C.
Dellums	Landrum	Mathias, Calif.
Denholm	Lehman	Mathis, Ga.
Dennis	Lent	Matsunaga
Devine	Litton	Mayne
Dickinson	McSpadden	Mazzoli
Dingell	Metcalfe	Meeds
Dorn	Milford	Melcher
Downing	Minshall, Ohio	Mezvinsky
Drinan	Mitchell, Md.	Michel
Duncan	Murphy, N.Y.	Miller
du Pont	Nedzi	Mills
Edwards, Ala.	Parris	Minish
Edwards, Calif.	Passman	Mink
Erlenborn	Patman	Mitchell, N.Y.
Esch	Patten	Mizell
Eshleman	Pepper	Moakley
Fascell	Perkins	Mollohan
Findley	Pettis	Montgomery
Fish	Peyser	Moorhead, Calif.
Foley	Pickle	Moorhead, Pa.
Fountain	Pike	Morgan
Fraser	Poage	Mosher
Frelinghuysen	Preyer	Moss
Frenzel	Price, Ill.	Murphy, Ill.
Frey	Price, Tex.	Murtha
Froehlich	Randall	Myers
Fulton	Rees	Natcher
Gibbons	Regula	Nelsen
Ginn	Reuss	Nichols
Goldwater	Rhodes	Nix
Grasso	Riegle	Obey
Gray	Rinaldo	O'Brien
Green, Oreg.	Roberts	O'Hara
Griffiths	Robinson, Va.	O'Neill
Grover	Robison, N.Y.	Owens
Gubser	Rodino	Podell
Gunter	Roe	Powell, Ohio
Hanna	Rogers	Pritchard
Hansen, Idaho	Roncallo, N.Y.	Quie
Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, Pa.	Quillen
Hays	Rose	Railsback
Henderson	Rosenthal	Rangel
Holifield	Rostenkowski	Rarick
Holtzman	Roush	Reid
Jones, Ala.	Rousselot	Roncalio, Wyo.
Jones, N.C.	Roy	Rooney, N.Y.
Jones, Okla.	Roybal	Ruppe
Jones, Tenn.	Runnels	Schneebeli
Kluczynski	Ruth	Shipley
Kuykendall	Ryan	Sikes
Lagomarsino	St Germain	Snyder
Landrum	Sandman	Stanton, James V.
Lehman	Sarasin	Steiger, Ariz.
Lent	Sarbanes	Stuckey
Litton	Satterfield	Symington
McSpadden	Scherle	Teague
Metcalfe	Schroeder	Thomson, Wis.
Milford	Sebelius	Traxler
Minshall, Ohio	Seiberling	Ullman
Mitchell, Md.	Shoup	Waldie
Murphy, N.Y.	Shriver	Whitten
Nedzi	Shuster	Williams
Parris	Sisk	Wyatt
Passman	Skubitz	Wydler
Patman	Slack	Wyman
Patten	Smith, Iowa	Young, Alaska
Pepper	Smith, N.Y.	Young, Ga.
Perkins	Spence	Zwach
Pettis	Staggers	
Peyser	Stanton, J. William	
Pickle	Stark	
Pike	Steed	
Poage	Steele	
Preyer	Steelman	
Price, Ill.	Stephens	
Price, Tex.	Stokes	
Randall	Stratton	
Rees	Stubblefield	
Regula	Studds	
Reuss	Sullivan	
Rhodes	Symms	
Riegle	Talcott	
Rinaldo	Taylor, Mo.	
Roberts	Taylor, N.C.	
Robinson, Va.	Thompson, N.J.	
Robison, N.Y.	Thone	
Rodino	Thornton	
Roe	Tiernan	
Rogers	Towell, Nev.	
Roncallo, N.Y.	Treen	
Rooney, Pa.	Udall	
Rose	Van Deerlin	
Rosenthal	Vander Jagt	
Rostenkowski	Vander Veen	
Roush	Vanik	
Rousselot	Veysey	
Roy	Vigorito	
Roybal	Waggonner	
Runnels	Walsh	
Ruth	Wampler	
Ryan	Ware	
St Germain	Whalen	
Sandman	White	
Sarasin	Whitehurst	
Sarbanes	Widnall	
Satterfield	Wiggins	
Scherle	Wilson, Bob	
Schroeder	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.	
Sebelius	Wilson, Charles, Tex.	
Seiberling	Winn	
Shoup	Wolff	
Shriver	Wright	
Shuster	Wylie	
Sisk	Yates	
Skubitz	Yatron	
Slack	Young, Fla.	
Smith, Iowa	Young, Ill.	
Smith, N.Y.	Young, S.C.	
Spence	Young, Tex.	
Staggers	Zablocki	
Stanton, J. William	Zion	

NAYS—8

Bauman	Crane	Landgrebe
Collins, Tex.	Gross	Steiger, Wis.
Conable	Hechler, W. Va.	

NOT VOTING—106

Alexander	Fulton	Owens
Armstrong	Gibbons	Podell
Ashley	Ginn	Powell, Ohio
Badillo	Goldwater	Pritchard
Beard	Grasso	Quie
Biaggi	Gray	Quillen
Bingham	Green, Oreg.	Railsback
Brasco	Griffiths	Rangel
Brinkley	Grover	Rarick
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Reid
Burleson, Tex.	Gunter	Roncalio, Wyo.
Carey, N.Y.	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Ruppe
Chisholm	Hansen, Wash.	Schneebeli
Clancy	Hays	Shipley
Clay	Henderson	Sikes
Collins, Ill.	Holifield	Snyder
Cronin	Holtzman	Stanton, James V.
Culver	Jones, Ala.	Steiger, Ariz.
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N.C.	Stuckey
de la Garza	Jones, Okla.	Symington
Dent	Jones, Tenn.	Teague
Derwinski	Kluczynski	Thomson, Wis.
Diggs	Kuykendall	Traxler
Donohue	Lagomarsino	Ullman
Dulski	Landrum	Waldie
Eckhardt	Lehman	Whitten
Eilberg	Lent	Williams
Evans, Colo.	Litton	Wyatt
Evins, Tenn.	McSpadden	Wydler
Fisher	Metcalfe	Wyman
Flood	Milford	Young, Alaska
Flowers	Minshall, Ohio	Young, Ga.
Flynt	Mitchell, Md.	Zwach
Ford	Murphy, N.Y.	
Forsythe	Nedzi	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mrs. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Roncalio of Wyoming with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Sikes with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Pritchard.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Brasco.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Beard.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. Lagomarsino.
Mr. Ginn with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Cronin.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Dulski.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Forsythe.
Miss Holtzman with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Brinkley.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Lehman.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Milford.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Traxler with Mr. Rangel.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Young of Alaska with Mr. Powell of Ohio.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15544, THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT, POSTAL SERVICE, EXECUTIVE OFFICE, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1975

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speak-

er's table the bill (H.R. 15544) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, 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 Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEED, ADDABBO. ROYBAL, STOKES, BEVILL, SHIPLEY, SLACK, MAHON, ROBISON of New York, MILLER, VEYSEY, YOUNG of Florida, and CEDERBERG.

AMENDING THE BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACT OF 1973

Mr. MORGAN. 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. 14780) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1975 for carrying out the provisions of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

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. 14780) with Mr. MCKAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 14780, authorizes an appropriation of $49,990,000 for fiscal year 1975 to support the operations of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and the Board for International Broadcasting.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, Congress created the Board for International Broadcasting upon the recommendations of a Presidential Study Commission headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, president emeritus of Johns Hopkins University.

Under the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973, the Board is charged with review and oversight responsibilities. It is also authorized to receive congressionally appropriated funds for allocation to the two stations.

Although the 1973 act was signed into law on October 19, 1973, members of the Board were not appointed and confirmed by the Senate until just prior to the May 14 and 15 hearings before our committee.

As a result of this delay, the Board is just now getting into operation. But Dr. David Abshire, the chairman of the Board, has already moved forward to carry out the intent of Congress to streamline these operations, to reduce personnel, and to cut down on other costs.

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1975 budget request includes a provision for the consolidation of certain facilities of the two stations. It also provides for the modification of the remaining operating centers and elimination of those supporting functions which are no longer required. These expenditures now will reduce overall rentals and lower base cost of administrative and technical support services in the future.

In fiscal 1974, 295 employees of the two stations have been retired or otherwise separated. Radio Free Europe terminated 221 employees—or 14.4 percent—and Radio Liberty terminated 74 employees—8 percent. I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that these terminations cost more money rather than less money during the year in which they are put into effect. That is because salary and separation benefits have to be paid out immediately—on a lump-sum basis. These are benefits spelled out in contracts which are enforceable in foreign courts.

Despite these increased costs and despite the further decline in the dollar's value abroad, the fiscal year 1975 authorization is smaller than what Congress authorized for these stations in fiscal year 1974.

Radio Liberty has also cut back its operations rather severely. The regular North Caucasian service, for example, has been eliminated and Radio Liberty now carries only a special Sunday program. This affects broadcasts in five distinct languages of the Soviet Union. In addition, Radio Liberty has been required to discontinue service to eastern Siberia from transmitters in Taiwan. Both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have made reductions in substantive original programing. They have also cut down in other areas, such as foreign news bureaus and stringers.

In the light of all these economy measures, Mr. Chairman, the committee has become convinced that the two radios are operating on a tight budget. We are also convinced that the Board for International Broadcasting will give these broadcasts operating continuing oversight and review and that further economy measures will be put into effect during this coming year.

The bill under consideration today contains only one amendment adopted by our committee. This amendment authorizes an additional $75,000 for Latvian broadcasts, and $75,000 for Estonian broadcasts. The administration's budget provided only $75,000 to Radio Liberty for beginning broadcasts in Lithuanian; no funds were projected for broadcasting in Latvian and Estonian.

The question of Baltic language broadcasting is one which the committee has been looking into for the past several years. Both Radio Liberty and the Department of State have recognized the desirability of commencing broadcasts in all three Baltic languages. This view has also been supported by other public witnesses who have appeared before our committee.

It was the committee's consensus that all of the people of the Baltic States should be reached by Radio Liberty and that these broadcasts should begin in fiscal year 1975. Our amendment will make this possible.

Let me point out, however, that even with this additional amount included, the fiscal year 1975 authorization contained in this bill is less than the amount Congress authorized last year.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say that our committee firmly believes that these radios continue to perform a highly useful function and one which is in the overall foreign policy interest of the United States.

Their operations are not out of line with the policy of détente. In fact, by permitting the voices of moderation in these countries to be heard they help promote détente. This is the view of an impressive number of people who are experts in the field of Soviet affairs, both within the Government and from the outside.

The radios also have received the editorial support of the overwhelming majority of newspapers and publications in the United States and Western Europe—publications like the Washington Post and the Chicago Tribune, which are often sharply divided over other issues.

These radios provide the citizens of Eastern Europe with news about events taking place within their own countries—news which is denied to them by their own strictly-controlled media. Moreover, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are the only source of this type of information and it is for this reason, I believe, that our committee voted overwhelmingly in favor of their continuance—by a vote of 23 to 6.

As the Eisenhower Commission noted in its report of last year:

> A people uninformed or misinformed is a danger to itself and a potential danger to its neighbors. Thus, a precondition for world peace is international freedom of information.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the radios are not merely designed to help the listeners in the Soviet Union and elsewhere inform themselves about what is happening in the world, but to promote our own national self-interest as well. This is a point, which I feel, needs to be emphasized.

Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, by pointing out that the House, on June 18, has approved the fiscal 1975 appropriations for the Board for International Broadcasting and the two radios, subject to an authorization. Passage of this bill will enable those funds to go forward.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that Members will join with me in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in support of this legislation. The Chairman of the full committee has already given considerable detail about its significance.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to express

my strong support for H.R. 14780. This will provide a 1-year authorization of $49,990,000 to support the operations of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and the Board for International Broadcasting. It was approved by a vote of 23 to 6 by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The bill as reported by the committee includes funds for Radio Liberty to begin broadcasts to the Baltic States. The administration request contained $75,000 to initiate broadcasts in Lithuanian. The committee added $75,000 to begin broadcasts in Latvian and $75,000 to initiate broadcasts in the Estonian language. I strongly support these modest sums which will enable Radio Liberty to broadcast to the captive Baltic nations.

In my opinion the recently established Board for International Broadcasting, under the chairmanship of Dr. David Abshive, offers great promise for bringing about more efficiency and effectiveness in the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The radios are already tightening their operation with permanent personnel reduction totaling 295 in fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty continue to play a vital role as "domestic radios" for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Testimony before our committee has dramatically portrayed the effectiveness of these broadcasts and the need to continue them.

While we continue to hope that one day there will be a free flow of information between all countries of the world, until that time arrives, Western broadcasts will remain a lifeline to many people in the Communist world. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are a vital part of that lifeline. They should be continued, and I urge approval of this bill.

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

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, It is important that Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians all have a chance to hear non-Communist broadcasts in their own language. Otherwise many listeners will be excluded by the language barrier. It would be difficult for those so excluded to build a realistic view of the world based only on the Communist side of the picture.

According to recent studies, many middle and senior level Communist Party officials listen to Radio Free Europe, the sister organization of Radio Liberty. This is striking testimony that even the men at the top behind the Iron Curtain feel a need to hear uncensored broadcasts.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania all declared their independence from Russia in 1918 and were promptly invaded by the Red army. The Baltic States resisted the attack until in 1920 the Soviet Government recognized their independence. After two decades of self-government, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania were forcefully reannexed by Russia as Soviet Republics in 1940.

Over these past 30 years, the Soviets have continued their illegal annexation and occupation denying the citizens of the Baltic States basic human rights and freedom of expression. Religious persecution has been particularly severe. Latvians, Estonians, and Lithuanians bravely resisted these encroachments on their freedom, but can certainly use the added inspiration Radio Liberty provides. Not only are the broadcasts important to Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, it is important to the United States that as many as possible of those trapped behind the Iron Curtain hear what the free world has to tell them.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, it is with a little bit of awkwardness in not having been an attendee at the sessions which were held in committee this year on this bill, that I take some time, hopefully not as much as 5 minutes, to indicate my objection to what remains, in my opinion, the unreconstructed, excessive emotionalism connected with an era I had long since hoped had passed in American foreign policy.

I cannot help but comment on what seems to be the irony of this bill. I have been a part of a committee which was willing to surrender itself to serving the evisceration of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, both in the choice of its Director and, more importantly, in the size of the budget for the Agency. When one considers the importance of the activity for which ACDA is designed to provide, we would hope for at least a voice to begin to deal with the far more pressing problems for the survival of mankind that are presented by the continuing strategic arms race. It is in the context of the importance of ACDA's potential role that we see the stark contrast in a $50 million authorization for what is called the Board for International Broadcasting and the pathetic $10 million for ACDA. Despite the best efforts of its supporters, and despite the name change, what we have in this bill is a program essentially in the same kind of shape that it was 25 years ago—a lingering vestige of the cold war, an anachronism by most standards, and certainly markedly ineffectual when it comes to really providing the citizens of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe access to other points of view.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the contrast is also striking, in looking at the Peace Corps budget. The Peace Corps has emerged over the course of the last 2 or 3 years into a broader program involving domestic activity. But we have had testimony that the number of would-be American applicants for that program has been increasing; a number of positions remain unfilled because the authorization and the appropriation for the Peace Corps are not sufficient to meet the expressed aim of the program. And again $50 million which is thrown in the direction of this board, for radios funded at least through 1971 by CIA funds, makes no sense at all.

It is suggested that despite the efforts toward reconciliation between the Soviet Union and the United States, the majority of the committee feels that there must be an effort made to insure that we maintain a certain posture of wariness with respect to the differences in ideology between the two nations. I cannot agree.

Let me suggest, in addition, that we consider the administration's charge that we practice fiscal restraint. It was the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury that we cut some $10 billion from this year's budget in an effort to balance it. It makes no sense to me not to let the Department of Defense carry the financial burden of this kind of activity, since it is able to get its needs met far more substantially than most other agencies. I don't see why these programs should be carried on at the expense of other programs which are hard pressed to meet the goals which they set out to meet.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose this legislation is regarded in the course of things as an afterthought. And we must consider the fact that we find ourselves on a Friday afternoon with 135 Members absent, which is perhaps a demonstration of their good sense. We are considering this program in a half-hearted way, which is some indication of the kind of significance that the Congress attaches to $50 million funded for a program which has long since ceased to be of interest, not only to the American public but to the international community. I think it is important to show on the record, at least to the degree that it is useful at all, that there is some doubt in the Congress about this sort of thing, which I think long ago should have disappeared with the first flight into Peking, or with the first tentative initiatives toward redefining the American role in regard to the Soviet Union, and American global responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, without casting any aspersions on my colleagues, I hope we can make the radios the subject of consideration with a great deal more scrutiny during the course of the next year when we are again faced with the problem of coping with the American foreign policy disarray. Even in small ways we might address more discussion to proposals like this.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, Radio Free Europe had its origins as a privately funded activity, with the money coming from individuals and private organizations who felt so intently that a sound propaganda message should be sent within the borders of potentially hostile countries that they were willing to dig into their own pockets and budget such sums for that purpose. And for a good many years the American people suffered under the illusion that this organization, namely, Radio Free Europe, was a privately funded activity in its entirety.

Then the revelation came to light that surreptitiously the CIA had provided a substantial part of the funds, and we have at last changed from undercover public financing of Radio Free Europe to on-the-table public financing of Radio Free Europe.

But I do raise the question as to whether there is enough interest in Radio Free Europe across the Nation as well as within the countries which are supposed to be benefited by this program really to justify its continuation.

I do not have the answer. I just raise the question.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if the gentleman from Illinois has read the hearings the gentleman would find that there is very considerable interest in Eastern Europe in these broadcasts, and that they also have a good audience in the Soviet Union.

I think it is no surprise that there is no great interest in this country because the broadcasts do not involve this country. These are directed at Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

I might also say to the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman is inaccurate in suggesting that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty at the outset were privately funded. That may have been what was thought, but they were funded by, as the gentleman said, funds from the CIA.

But that is water over the dam. They have withstood inquiry by a commission established for the purpose of establishing whether their activities should continue.

I might say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am glad that we are now funding them over the counter, publicly. But I think without any question, on the basis of what we heard in the way of witnesses, that there is a need and there is an audience, and I would suggest that the question can be easily answered.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I might respond to the comments of the gentleman from New Jersey by saying I was present and examined substantial parts of the hearings, and I know there was some testimony in support of it. Questions were also raised, however.

I think my point is sound, relative to the fact that at the outset the public believed that it was a privately funded and privately directed organization, and not a propaganda effort of the U.S. Government.

I think that Gresham's law has operated in this field in that when the fact became known that public money was indeed the backbone of Radio Free Europe then private donations have dropped off. Bad money drives good out of circulation, likewise, public money tends to dry up private donations.

I can recall in my early years in Pike County, Ill., when I was a newspaper editor, that at that time the local banker each year took on the job of raising money for Radio Free Europe. He thought it was a very valuable and constructive device, and he wanted it continued. Little did he know that the CIA was actually the backbone of its financial structure.

I question whether it really serves a useful purpose within these countries.

I raise these questions because I think they are still valid and should be examined thoroughly before further funding is authorized.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would first begin by stating that I would like to associate myself with the exceptionally important remarks made by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

I then would like to turn the attention of the Committee, and particularly that of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to page 11 of the committee report entitled "Opposing Views of Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL" and at one point there the gentleman states:

> I think it fair to state that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty exist largely as a matter of habit. The question for Congress today is whether habituation is a sufficient reason to spend $50 million each year to keep these marginal operations going.

He further states:

> It is clear from this year's testimony that neither private U.S. contribution nor our European allies are going to give any significant funds to sustain these stations.

He then points out that this money could better be used—in his view—by financing an improved and expanded Voice of America, and that this new Voice of America could incorporate the work of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, thereby eliminating the duplication implicit in two U.S. Government broadcasts to Eastern European countries, and to use the savings to reach other people in the world who are also deprived of news about events in their own countries.

He ends his views by saying:

> I hope the Congress will seriously examine our international broadcasting program and allow our policies in this field to express the best of our society instead of a bad version of government radio journalism.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the full committee whether or not he agrees with Mr. ROSENTHAL'S notion that an expanded radio Voice of America would eliminate the need for these two programs, thereby saving us money and reducing duplication and advancing the level of competence in journalism.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, the Voice of America is an altogether different program. The Voice of America is the radio arm of the U.S. Information Agency, and it is the official voice of the U.S. Government. Its primary purpose is to report on U.S. life and events and interpret and explain U.S. policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, on the other hand, provide a service that is made necessary by virtue of heavy censorship within the Iron Curtain countries. The Soviet leaders must be sort of fearful of these broadcasts getting to their citizens because they spend, it has been reported, $200 million a year to jam these stations. They do not jam Voice of America because it does not tell them anything they do not want the people to know. But these broadcasts are altogether different.

Voice of America broadcasts, of course, are mostly in English. These broadcasts are in 17 different languages of the Soviet Union, so they are altogether different. The Voice of America will not work for this kind of program.

Mr. DELLUMS. May I ask the chairman one additional question. How does he then respond to the criticism raised by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) who points out that perhaps this is a carryover from the cold war days, and that this would probably affect détente? We are talking about strategic arms limitation agreements and trade agreements, but perhaps this propaganda negates our moving into these areas?

Mr. MORGAN. It has been said here, in hearings, and over in the other body, that this is an antique of the cold war. But if it is an antique, the Soviets are paying a mighty high price for it, when they are spending $200 million a year to jam it.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because nowhere along the way of consideration in the Committee on Foreign Affairs did I get any convincing evidence that we are getting very much for these continued appropriations to the International Broadcasting Board, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty.

My remarks will be brief. There are far better ways to spend $50 million than on this kind of proposition. I do not know whether or when you who support this expenditure are going to meet problems of inflation, and the problems of debt and deficit in this country. This $50 million will have to be borrowed and 8 or 9 percent interest will have to be paid on the money. If Congress cannot begin to save a few items in terms of $50 million, then we are not going to make any progress toward halting inflation.

This $50 million and the many millions of dollars expended since this program was started, is money down the drain.

The Members of Congress who vote for it ought to have to explain why they continue when there is practically no help from the foreign countries who were supposed to join in this program.

The foreign giveaway bill will soon come before the House, and you will be asked to again vote $4 billion or $5 billion for that monstrosity. This, I repeat, is a good place to save $50 million and dedicate it to a useful purpose such as a payment on the Federal debt instead of increasing it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14780 and wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvinia, the dis-

tinguished chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs. His remarks accurately reflect the position adopted by the overwhelming majority of committee members who voted on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty serve the foreign policy interests of the United States. I believe they make a positive rather than a negative contribution toward the lessening of East-West tensions; and I think all of the evidence at our disposal, including several major studies of the radios' operations and the testimony of a broad spectrum of expert witnesses who have appeared before our committee in recent years, clearly supports this conclusion. Last May, during the temporary absence of our chairman, I had the privilege of presiding over the hearings on this authorizing legislation and on the basis of that experience, I am all the more convinced that the case for continuation of these broadcast operations is as strong today as at any time in the past.

Mr. Chairman, much can be said—and indeed, much has been said—about the positive value of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty during this critical stage of changing and evolving relationships between East and West. At this time, however, I should like to focus primary attention on certain popular misconceptions about the radios' operations which tend to resurface each year, as this authorization is debated—both in our committee and on the floor. Some Members have raised serious questions in this connection which I believe deserve serious replies. I believe there are logical, convincing answers to all of them, but let me concentrate here on just a few of the more prominent charges which have been leveled at the radios in recent years.

First of all, we have heard the charge that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are run principally by non-American emigres, operating from foreign countries to send their views—I repeat their views—to other foreign countries. This charge simply is not true.

The management of both stations and the policy direction are firmly in the hands of American citizens. The boards of directors of both radios, which set policy, are composed exclusively of American citizens—and prominent, distinguished Americans, like Gen. Lucius Clay, former Ambassador Robert Murphy and others. Moreover, the policy decisions of these directors and trustees are now subject to additional oversight and continuing review by members of the board for international broadcasting, who are selected on a nonpartisan basis from among Americans distinguished in the fields of foreign policy and/or mass communications.

All major policy positions within the radios' respective organizations are occupied by Americans. These Americans have had extensive experience in U.S. affairs, government, and international communication. They are also experts in Soviet and East European Affairs.

RFE, for instance, currently employs 233 U.S. citizens in leading management and policy roles out of a total work force of 1,312. Of the non-American employees—only 458 or less than one-third—were born in eastern Europe.

RL employs 167 U.S. citizens out of an employee total of 774; 304 employees, or less than 50 percent, were born in the U.S.S.R. Questions were raised in committee as to why RFE employs 153 Spanish nationals and RL, 291 Portuguese. What, it was asked, do these people know about Soviet Russia and the countries of eastern Europe? The answer is that the main RL transmitter site is located in Spain, whereas RFE's main transmitter is located in Portugal. Spanish and Portuguese nationals are employed as engineers and technicians on these transmitter sites and as general "local employees."

It is, of course, perfectly true that the radios employ non-Americans in a variety of technical capacities, particularly in translation and script-writing work where their linguistic skills are at a premium. Radio Free Europe broadcasts a daily total of 79 program hours in 6 languages. Radio Liberty broadcasts 91 hours per day in 17 distinct languages spoken within the Soviet Union. There simply are not enough Americans qualified to do that job. Moreover, non-Americans are employed at wage scales which are considerably less than would be the case if Americans were to fulfill these same functions.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the hiring of non-Americans to perform such duties is nothing new or exclusive to the radios. The Defense Department alone employs some 150,000 foreign nationals worldwide. The Department of State has some 5,218 local employees on its rolls around the world and USIA, around 5,173—just to mention a few. Every agency of the government with overseas missions or operations hires so-called local employees, who are by definition foreign nationals. By contrast, the two radios combined employ a grand total of 1,686 non-Americans—which is, by any standard of comparison, a "drop in the bucket." So much for the so-called foreigner label which has been misleadingly applied to these two broadcasting operations.

Another question which arises from year to year is: "How do we know that anyone really listens to these broadcasts?" Is there any real evidence, some Members have asked—as distinct from self-serving estimates—that the radios are actually reaching a significant, representative listening audience?

The answer is that a considerable body of evidence exists on this subject—based on independent, modern audience research and public opinion sampling methods. RFE, for example, has been conducting research on East European listening habits for the past 15 years. The original polling model used in this research was set up under contract with Professor Cantrell of Princeton University, assisted in part by Lloyd Free of the National Institute of Social Research. In recent years, RFE's opinion-sampling methods have been independently examined and specifically endorsed by:

First. The Oliver Quayle Co., October 1970.

Second. The Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, March 1972.

Third. The Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting, the so-called Eisenhower Commission.

In its report issued in the fall of 1970, the Oliver Quayle Co., concluded:

RFE management can take pride and place confidence in this audience research phase of its operation . . . opinion research procedures at Radio Free Europe are sound.

The Congressional Research Service Report of March 22, 1972, found that "the weight of the evidence is that RFE has a substantial and growing popular audience in the five East European countries."

At present, RFE receives audience research data from six independent, professional West European polling organizations headquartered in such countries as Austria, Denmark, Sweden, France, and the United Kingdom.

Radio Liberty has also been conducting this type of research on a continuing, ongoing basis. Again, its opinion-sampling methods have been independently evaluated and endorsed—most recently by MIT professor Ithiel De Sola Pool, a distinguished behavioral scientist and America's foremost expert on diffusion of information within the U.S.S.R.

Moreover, during the period 1970–72, a major behavioral study was conducted on Soviet listening habits. The study was based on information collated by an independent—London-based—social research bureau. Researchers who worked on this project did not know for whom the material was being sought. Interviews were conducted with 1,680 Soviet citizens—primarily tourists—all of whom, and I want to emphasize this point, subsequently returned to the Soviet Union. None were defectors, emigres or those who might be classifiable as "dissidents" or persecutees.

All of these studies are merely illustrative of the work being carried out in this field. The examples I have cited are by no means all-inclusive. On the basis of this extensive research it is estimated that RFE has a total listening audience of about 30 million people—who listen to the radio one or more times per month. This represents 50 percent of the population over 14 years in age in the five "target countries" of Eastern Europe. Similarly, Radio Liberty is believed to reach between 35 and 40 million different listeners during the course of an average month.

Apparently, Mr. Chairman, the Soviet authorities are convinced of the accuracy of these statistics, even if some Members of this body are not. Official estimates provided by our own Government indicate that the Soviets spend between $200 and $300 million per year in attempts to "jam" Radio Liberty broadcasts. This is an exceedingly costly operation to undertake if "nobody listens to the radios"—as is sometimes alleged.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me comment very briefly on the question which is raised every year about the alleged lack of West European support for these broadcast operations. If these radio stations are so important, it is asked, why have Western European governments refused to contribute to their support? The answer is that they have not refused; on the contrary, they have provided very significant indirect support—without which the radios could not continue. This support includes:

First. Granting the radios use of various frequencies;

Second. Leasing numerous facilities—at bargain rates;

Third. Providing various tax advantages;

Fourth. Allowing them to operate on their soil.

The West German Government, in particular, has steadfastly resisted Soviet pressures to terminate the radios operation from West German soil—and at a time, I should add, when the foreign policy of that Government has been directed toward improving relations with the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe, this is a most significant contribution which cannot even be measured in monetary terms, since it affects, to some degree, the very cornerstone of Bonn's Eastern European policy.

Mr. Chairman, it should also be noted that the West German Government is already paying the major share of the cost of RIAS—Radio in the American Sector of Berlin. In the light of all of these considerations, I believe it is both inaccurate and unfair to imply that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is not doing its part to carry its share of the overall broadcast "burden."

There is one additional point, Mr. Chairman: The Eisenhower commission recommended against direct public support of broadcast operations by European Governments. Such participation, the commission noted, could result in "confusion in operational policies" and a loss of effectiveness. Thus, in all fairness to our European friends, I think it should be pointed out that one reason West European Governments have not directly supported the radios operations is a very simple one: they have not been asked.

Essentially, Mr. Chairman, these questions I have raised are tangential to the main issue. The real question we must ask ourselves is whether the annual cost of the broadcast operations—which is equivalent to the cost of four F–14 planes—is worthwhile. We must ask ourselves whether the continued functioning of these stations which impart information, not propaganda, to peoples otherwise deprived of it is of value to the United States and furthers the national interest. I think the answer is a resounding yes, and I urge passage of H.R. 14780, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, Jesus of Nazareth once said:

> Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free.

A great President, President Thomas Jefferson, once said words which became the motto of the University of Virginia, which he founded:

> For here we are not afraid to follow the truth wherever it may lead us, nor to tolerate any errors as long as reason is left to combat it.

One of our great newspaper chains has as its motto:

> Give light, and the people will find their own way.

Why are we spending $50 million of the taxpayers's money to continue the work of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe? Mr. Chairman, we are doing so that the people who live behind the Iron Curtain might have the light of truth, that the people who live in the Soviet Union and in other communist countries might simply know what is happening in those countries, what their own intellectuals are saying, what their own thinkers are thinking, and what the truth is as to what is happening now.

Mr. Chairman, I would hardly think that $50 million is too much to expend for such a purpose. Is this some vestige of a cold war that is obsolete and outworn? I say it is not. It is obsolete only if truth is obsolete. It is obsolete only if it is irrelevant whether or not the people who live in the Soviet Union or other Iron Curtain countries shall know what their own best minds are saying, or shall know what is happening in their own societies.

I would say what we are doing is helping to render a service to the people of the Soviet Union, and other Iron Curtain countries. We are rendering a service to them that can indeed lay the basis for long-run friendship and a more stable relationship.

Is this a job the Voice of America could or should do? It is not. That is the official voice of our Government. We could not provide this service through the Voice of America, as the chairman has said, but this is a service that is vital and essential if one cares about human rights; about the right of people to know what is being said and done in their own society.

The distinguished author, Mr. Solzhenitsyn, has had his work broadcast including a book in full through Radio Liberty, and there alone has that been broadcast to the people of the Soviet Union.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I want to commend the gentleman for his remarks. I share his view. I think providing the people of the Soviet Union an opportunity to know what they cannot know is essential, because there is no free press, there are no periodicals or bookstands in which people can buy freely. There is an effort to obstruct the effective increased contacts with the West and it does seem to me this kind of communication is worthy of our support, so long as the Soviet Union maintains such a closed society.

I want to commend the gentleman for the way he has stated the case so well.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution, because he had laid his finger on the very heart of the matter and it is this: In our country we take for granted a free press. We in the body politic often suffer from the excesses and sometimes the very efficiency of the free press. We are often injured, at least in our own minds, by what they do and say, those who participate in the free press of this society; but I want to say this and say it very strongly: However irresponsible reporters may become in a given instance, even if one could attack whole areas of the media, there is no evil of the free press that is worthy to be compared with the consummate evil of a press controlled by the Government. That is precisely what we have in these other countries. There is no escape from it and there is no other way for the people in these countries to know the truth and I think we are rendering a great service here.

Now, who is running this outfit? Is it the CIA? It is not.

Dr. David M. Abshire is a scholar, an able statesman and diplomat. Whatever he is, he does not represent the CIA. He is rather the chairman of the Center for Strategic International Studies at Georgetown University. He is doing a fine job of leadership, as the chairman has pointed out. We can know that this board is in good hands and is doing a good job.

Mr. Chairman, the word "propaganda" has been used concerning the work of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. Nothing could be more inappropriate than such a characterization at this point in history. The primary function of these media is to simply report the news in closed societies that the free press would surely report in an open society. I do not believe there can be evil in telling the truth to the people, in giving light so the people can find their own way. I urge approval of this authorization.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14780, which would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1975 for carrying out the provisions of the Board for International Broadcasting Act and supporting the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are voices of freedom in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; they are not Government spokesmen but rather representatives of the independent free press. Since we in this country too often take the latter for granted, we often fail to realize the importance of the existence of such a service to captive nations. Moreover, the service which these two radios perform is indispensible to the continuation of open communication between the people of the Soviet Union and the western democracies, and therefore essential to increasing detente between East and West and liberalization within the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc countries.

It has long been my firm belief that for these two radios to perform their vital functions fully, it is essential that they include broadcasts in the Baltic languages—Latvian, Estonian and Lithuanian. In its report on last year's authoriz-

ing legislation, the House Foreign Affairs Committee joined in this view by pointing out "that Baltic language broadcasts should be accorded a high priority and be included in fiscal year 1975 budget presentation to Congress. Planning for this contingency should begin promptly."

Unfortunately, the administration request for this fiscal year provided only for the initiation of broadcasts in the Lithuanian language. While this was a major step in the right direction, I feel that it is extremely important that broadcasting be commenced in all the Baltic languages. To that end on March 7 I introduced legislation (H.R. 13354) to provide the necessary funding for broadcasting in Latvian and Estonian. And I am most gratified that the committee has overwhelmingly adopted an amendment based on this bill, authored by me and offered by my distinguished friend and colleague Mr. BIESTER to provide an additional $150,000 to the Board for International Broadcasting for the specific purpose of beginning broadcasts by Radio Liberty into the Soviet Union in all of the Baltic languages.

Mr. Chairman, it is a tragic fact that the plight of these nations too frequently goes unnoticed by the free world because of their small size. All three, however, have strong traditions of liberty and democracy, and their inability to achieve the right of self-determination represents one of the most tragic aspects of modern international relations. Any individual who is aware of the history of oppression in these countries and who appreciates the freedoms we possess cannot help feeling a sense of outrage at the consistent denial of similar freedom to the peoples of this region.

Fifty-five years ago, Estonia declared her independence. During the 22 years of freedom that followed, Estonia was a prosperous and growing nation carving out her own destiny. She lost her independence with the advent of World War II when the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with Germany.

Latvia, too, declared her independence in 1918, after more than two centuries of domination by the Russian Empire. The newly formed state quickly became a model of democracy, its Government functioning on true proportional representation and free and open elections. In 1932, Latvia and the Soviet Union signed a treaty of nonaggression which absolutely forbade Russian intervention in Latvian affairs. Very shortly afterward, in blatant violation of their written promise, the Soviet Union began to undertake the active subversion of free Latvia, culminating in total domination by 1940.

That same year saw the forcible annexation of Lithuanian to the Soviet Union. For a brief period between 1920 and 1940, Lithuania enjoyed political sovereignty. With the outbreak of World War II, however, she became one of the first countries to experience the fierce aggression of both Hitler and Stalin. From 1944 to 1962, anti-Soviet partisans struggled for independence, but their efforts were brutally crushed. Fifty thousand Lithuanians were lost during these 8 years of guerrilla warfare, and one-sixth of the population was deported during the Stalin regime. Still the defiance of these courageous people has not been quelled. As recently as May 1972, continued violation of human rights and religious persecution resulted in three self-immolations by Lithuanian youths.

While it is eminently clear that acquiescence is not a Baltic characteristic, the intensive pressure of a consistent program of Russification over the past 30 years now threatens to destroy national culture and identity.

By providing the funds for Radio Liberty to broadcast beacons of freedom in the Baltic tongues, our country can at least help preserve their inextinguishable spirit of liberty and independence, while exerting pressure on the Soviet Government to liberalize its policies in these lands.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation. H.R. 14780 provides the authorization for fiscal year 1975 for the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The effectiveness of these two radios in bringing factual news to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union has been documented in hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is important to note that despite détente the Communist governments of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union have continued to restrict the dissemination of factual news in their countries. If anything, they have clamped the lid on even tighter.

So there continues to be a need for the services of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, which act as "domestic" radios bringing to the people of Hungary, for example, news about developments in their own country.

I am especially pleased that beginning with fiscal year 1975, Radio Liberty will begin broadcasts to the Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—which continue to be occupied by the Soviet Union. The administration included funds to initiate broadcasts to Lithuania, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs added funds for broadcasts to Latvia and Estonia.

Until such time as the free flow of information is permitted, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe must be continued. I urge approval of this bill.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation, and I wish to associate myself with the position of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and with the majority position of our Committee on Foreign Affairs. I believe that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty continue to serve an important national purpose, which is definitely supportive of U.S. foreign policy objectives.

Let me also state, Mr. Chairman, that I fully support the official policy of our Government to seek détente with the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe. If I believed for 1 minute that these two radios were, in fact, "outmoded instruments of the cold war" or sterile "propaganda" operations, as is sometimes alleged by the stations' critics, I would oppose any further investment of public funds in their continuance. It is because, in my judgment, the radios are not only consistent with the principles of détente but also contribute toward that goal that I lend them my support.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) has pointed out, there are a number of misconceptions about these broadcast operations and some allegations which require continuing clarification and rebuttal. I am confident that logical, persuasive responses can be made to all of them. In the brief time at my disposal, however, I would like to focus my attention on the role of these radios in an era of détente because I feel this is an issue of overriding importance. It is also an issue which tends to produce an almost "Pavlovian" reaction among some of those who have supported the radios in the past, but who now feel that their "time has passed" and that they have become an anachronism.

If the concept of détente is to be meaningful—if it is to become something more than a slogan—it must be based on a "freer flow of people, ideas and information" between East and West. That is the language and the position which has been adopted by the U.S. delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which is presently in progress in Geneva. A unilateral decision to terminate the radios' broadcast operations would, in fact, serve to undermine that position at a crucial juncture in these sensitive and far-reaching negotiations.

Free communication and exchange of ideas ought to be a two-way street. Unfortunately, it is not. We all know that. If an event transpires which the Soviets or anyone else wants to make available to the people of the United States, that idea is disseminated without any difficulty to our entire population—in just about the time it takes for a person to snap his fingers.

Let us, however, consider how this process works in reverse: Let us assume for a moment that we did not have Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and that we merely depended on the normal sources of information for dissemination of news about what is going on within the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe. Obviously, the door to our message is absolutely closed unless the closed society decides to open the door and let the information in.

If these two radio stations did nothing else than to recite the facts that ordinary people ought to have about events taking place around them—to help them make up their minds as to what they are, what they are doing, and what their government is doing, this would be serving a useful purpose. We all know what can happen if a closed, totalitarian society—specially one armed with nuclear weapons—keeps such information from reaching the people of that society: Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan of the 1930's and 1940's are examples of the possible results. That is why the Eisenhower Commission pointed out that "a people uninformed or misinformed is a danger to itself and a potential danger to its neighbors." Such ignorance is, in fact, a serious potential danger to the people of the United States, and this is a factor

which ought to be underlined. That is why I believe the radios perform an essential function which is in our self-interest.

Mr. Chairman, the radios permit the voices of moderation within the Soviet Union and Eastern European societies to be heard—an essential factor in bringing about détente. All of the recent studies carried out on the radios' listening audiences—based on polls conducted by the Soviets themselves as well as by reputable polling organizations in the West—indicate that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are listened to by a substantial cross-section of Communist Party members ,not just by a handful of dissident intellectuals, as is sometimes inferred. These individuals receive news about their own countries which is denied them by their own strictly controlled media.

Moreover, and I want to emphasize this fact, these radios are the only source of this type of information. This coverage we are talking about is not—I repeat not—provided by the Voice of America, nor the BBC, nor the Deutsche Welle, nor by AFN, nor any other radio. Nor could it be. For years now, we have heard the serious and well-intentioned suggestions by several Members that the Voice of America be reorganized and even expanded to take over at least some of the functions of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. On its face, this proposal seems appealing, as it implies a consolidation of facilities and the avoidance of duplication—at a presumed savings to the taxpayer. The idea is, however, unrealistic and unworkable. The reason is that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have been assigned specific frequencies by the West German Government—80 in the case of Radio Free Europe alone—which are, for all practical purposes, nontransferable to another broadcasting operation, such as Voice of America. Thus, for technical reasons alone—this supposed option is not a real one. It is one thing to vote for termination of the radios in their entirety; it is quite another to suggest a consolidation which is impossible to implement.

I say this as one who has long advocated that our Government undertake or sponsor a comprehensive and coordinated study of all U.S. overseas broadcasting facilities and operations. There is an obvious need, in my opinion, to review and evaluate these individual operations, not only in terms of their respective missions, but also in relationship to one another. I believe such a study could point up areas in which real savings might be achieved and produce some informed, meaningful recommendations for increased operational efficiency at reduced cost.

In this connection, I particularly welcomed the section of our committee's report which urged the Board for International Broadcasting to address itself to another recommendation of the Eisenhower Commission:

That a comprehensive study of all United States international broadcasting facilities be undertaken at the earliest possible date.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, members of the Board have just recently been appointed and are just beginning to carry out their prescribed responsibilities. I was pleased to note that plans for the consolidation of certain facilities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty already are under active review, and I trust that Dr. Abshire and his colleagues will move further in this direction in the months ahead.

There is, however, a degree of misunderstanding within this body about the distinctive role of the two radios we are considering today. Unlike the Voice of America, the BBC or any other official Government radio—Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty provide a service that is made necessary by virtue of heavy censorship within the target countries. They are the "surrogate" radios of those countries, focusing on factual news reporting of internal developments—functions the official national radios are neither prepared nor equipped to undertake. For instance, Radio Liberty is the only radio—I repeat, the only one—to have broadcast the complete text of the celebrated Gulag Archipelago by Nobel prize winning author Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in Russian to the Russian people.

Well, it has been asked by some critics, Is this a proper or appropriate function for Radio Liberty to carry out? Or is this "interference"—by means of U.S. appropriated funds—in the "internal affairs" of another country? Again, my answer is: Yes, it is appropriate—provided the broadcasts in question provide factual, balanced news coverage and commentary and not "hostile propaganda." The U.S. Government has never accepted the proposition that the airwaves anywhere in the world are subject to exclusive control of any government or regime which happens to control the territory to which these broadcasts—any broadcasts—are beamed.

Congress has, in fact, often ventured much further into this field than have the radios. Members have sponsored bills and resolutions condemning the denial of human rights, oppression of different religions, discrimination against certain ethnic or political groups in foreign lands.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in case there is any doubt on this point as far as the weight of international opinion is concerned, let me quote article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly:

Everyone has the right of freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference, to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

This statement, I realize, reflects the ideal rather than the reality, as it exists in much of the world today. It is, nevertheless, an indication that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are on the right side of this fundamental issue of human rights and are by no means acting contrary to generally accepted standards of international conduct.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 14780, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(a) of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2877(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "$50,209,000 for fiscal year 1974" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "$49,840,000 for fiscal year 1975; and

(2) by striking out "fiscal year 1974" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1975".

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 7, strike out "$49,840,000 for fiscal year 1975" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$49,990,000 for fiscal year 1975, of which not less than $75,000 shall be available solely to initiate broadcasts in the Estonian language and not less than $75,000 shall be available solely to initiate broadcasts in the Latvian language."

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this discussion. I wanted, before the time of the gentleman from Alabama ran out, to make a couple of observations on his remarks. One is to the differentiation, the distinction, that is to be drawn between the funding of these programs and their origins and the funding of the Voice of America, which is referred to as the official voice of this country's Government. It is apparently being suggested that it is somewhat desirable to maintain a difference or separation between the broadcasts of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe and that of the Voice of America. I think the distinction between these broadcasts is at best a very subtle one, since as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) has said, the source for all these broadcasts is the Treasury of the United States and the taxpayers of this country.

Second, not necessarily in keeping with the kind of historical sense referred to in the opening remarks of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN), I would like to offer some comments made in the last couple of years by two historians: Henry Steele Commager and Arthur Schlesinger. They have suggested that the legacy of this country to society, both at home and on a global scale, is that of a somewhat enlarged definition of national security, and an obsession with secrecy.

I only can rejoin to the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama that I would think we would have been somewhat more inhibited in our zealousness, in suggesting that we alone know the truth

and that we want to make certain that the East Europeans and those behind the Iron Curtain are the beneficiaries of it, were we to consider our own internal problems over the last few years. My sense of history is that our American Presidents, both Republican and Democratic, have had their own difficulties in determining what that truth happens to be. I would hope that we have gained some great, or at least comparative humility over the course of the past turbulent years, when it comes to the kind of evangelical zeal which has characterized our efforts in the past in the area of foreign affairs, and especially when it comes to our effort to suggest that we have a society which is impervious to error and free from fault.

I am not suggesting at all that there are not still broad differences in ideologies, I do not think this bill is something that ought to go without at least some obvious footnoting, especially in the context of the problems we have dealt with none too successfully, internally, in an effort to get the truth to the American public.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would never attempt to compete with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) in quoting from the Good Book, but if I remember correctly, it says something about, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors."

The only trouble that I have had with that is that I have not found anyone willing to forgive me my debts and I doubt very much that we are going to find anybody in Europe who is going to forgive us our debts either, as a nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCKAY, 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. 14780) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1975 for carrying out the provisions of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973, pursuant to House Resolution 1250, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 58, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

YEAS—278

Abdnor	Eshleman	Melcher
Adams	Fascell	Mezvinsky
Alexander	Findley	Miller
Anderson, Calif.	Fish	Mills
Anderson, Ill.	Foley	Minish
Andrews, N.C.	Fountain	Mink
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fraser	Mitchell, N.Y.
Annunzio	Frelinghuysen	Mizell
Archer	Frenzel	Moakley
Arends	Frey	Mollohan
Ashbrook	Froehlich	Montgomery
Ashley	Fuqua	Moorhead, Pa.
Aspin	Gaydos	Morgan
Baker	Gettys	Mosher
Barrett	Giaimo	Moss
Bauman	Gilman	Murphy, Ill.
Bell	Gonzalez	Murtha
Bennett	Goodling	Myers
Bergland	Green, Pa.	Natcher
Bevill	Gubser	Nelsen
Biester	Gude	Nichols
Blatnik	Guyer	O'Brien
Boggs	Hamilton	O'Hara
Boland	Hammer-schmidt	O'Neill
Bolling	Hanley	Parris
Bowen	Hanna	Passman
Brademas	Hanrahan	Patman
Bray	Harsha	Patten
Breckinridge	Hastings	Pepper
Brooks	Heckler, Mass.	Perkins
Broomfield	Heinz	Pettis
Brotzman	Helstoski	Peyser
Brown, Calif.	Henderson	Pickle
Brown, Mich.	Hicks	Pike
Broyhill, N.C.	Hillis	Poage
Broyhill, Va.	Hinshaw	Powell, Ohio
Buchanan	Hogan	Preyer
Burgener	Holt	Price, Ill.
Burke, Mass.	Horton	Price, Tex.
Butler	Hosmer	Randall
Carney, Ohio	Howard	Rees
Casey, Tex.	Hudnut	Regula
Cederberg	Hungate	Reuss
Chamberlain	Hunt	Rhodes
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Riegle
Clausen, Don H.	Johnson, Pa.	Rinaldo
Cleveland	Jordan	Roberts
Cochran	Karth	Robison, N.Y.
Cohen	Kazen	Rodino
Collier	Kemp	Roe
Collins, Ill.	King	Roncallo, N.Y.
Conable	Koch	Rooney, Pa.
Conlan	Kyros	Rose
Conte	Landgrebe	Rostenkowski
Corman	Latta	Roush
Cotter	Leggett	Roy
Coughlin	Litton	Ruth
Crane	Long, La.	St Germain
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Lott	Sandman
Daniels, Dominick V.	Lujan	Sarasin
Danielson	McClory	Sarbanes
Davis, S.C.	McCloskey	Sebelius
Davis, Wis.	McCollister	Shoup
Delaney	McCormack	Shriver
Dellenback	McDade	Sisk
Dennis	McEwen	Skubitz
Devine	McFall	Slack
Dickinson	McKay	Smith, Iowa
Dingell	McKinney	Smith, N.Y.
Dorn	Macdonald	Spence
Downing	Madden	Staggers
Duncan	Madigan	Stanton, J. William
du Pont	Mahon	Steed
Edwards, Ala.	Mallary	Steele
Edwards, Calif.	Martin, Nebr.	Steelman
Erlenborn	Martin, N.C.	Steiger, Wis.
Esch	Mathias, Calif.	Stephens
	Mathis, Ga.	Stokes
	Matsunaga	Stratton
	Mazzoli	Stubblefield
	Meeds	Sullivan
	Talcott	Waggonner
	Taylor, N.C.	Walsh
	Thompson, N.J.	Wampler
	Thone	Ware
	Thornton	Whalen
	Tiernan	White
	Traxler	Whitehurst
	Treen	Whitten
	Udall	Widnall
	Van Deerlin	Wiggins
	Vander Jagt	Wilson, Bob
	Vander Veen	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
	Vanik	Winn
	Vigorito	Wolff
		Wright
		Wylie
		Yates
		Yatron
		Young, Fla.
		Young, Ill.
		Young, S.C.
		Young, Tex.
		Zablocki
		Zion
		Zwach

NAYS—58

Abzug	Haley	Rosenthal
Addabbo	Harrington	Rousselot
Badillo	Hawkins	Roybal
Bafalis	Hechler, W. Va.	Runnels
Blackburn	Huber	Ryan
Burke, Fla.	Hutchinson	Satterfield
Burlison, Mo.	Ichord	Schroeder
Burton, John	Jarman	Selberling
Burton, Phillip	Johnson, Colo.	Shuster
Byron	Kastenmeier	Snyder
Camp	Ketchum	Stark
Chappell	Long, Md.	Studds
Clawson, Del	Luken	Symms
Collins, Tex.	Maraziti	Taylor, Mo.
Conyers	Mayne	Towell, Nev.
Daniel, Dan	Michel	Veysey
Dellums	Nix	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Denholm	Obey	Young, Ga.
Drinan	Robinson, Va.	
Gross	Rogers	

NOT VOTING—98

Armstrong	Fulton	Murphy, N.Y.
Beard	Gibbons	Nedzi
Biaggi	Ginn	Owens
Bingham	Goldwater	Podell
Brasco	Grasso	Pritchard
Breaux	Gray	Quie
Brinkley	Green, Oreg.	Quillen
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	Railsback
Burke, Calif.	Grover	Rangel
Burleson, Tex.	Gunter	Rarick
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Idaho	Reid
Carter	Hansen, Wash.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Chisholm	Hays	Rooney, N.Y.
Clancy	Hébert	Ruppe
Clay	Holifield	Scherle
Cronin	Holtzman	Schneebeli
Culver	Jones, Ala.	Shipley
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N.C.	Sikes
de la Garza	Jones, Okla.	Stanton, James V.
Dent	Jones, Tenn.	Steiger, Ariz.
Derwinski	Kluczynski	Stuckey
Diggs	Kuykendall	Symington
Donohue	Lagomarsino	Teague
Dulski	Landrum	Thomson, Wis.
Eckhardt	Lehman	Ullman
Eilberg	Lent	Waldie
Evans, Colo.	McSpadden	Williams
Evins, Tenn.	Mann	Wyatt
Fisher	Metcalfe	Wydler
Flood	Milford	Wyman
Flowers	Minshall, Ohio	Young, Alaska
Flynt	Mitchell, Md.	
Ford	Moorhead, Calif.	
Forsythe		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Podell against.

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

Mr. Dent for with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Carey of New York against.

Mr. Breaux for, with Mr. Rangel against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Mitchell of Maryland against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Roncalio of Wyoming with Mr. Brasco.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Biaggi with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Reid.

Mr. de la Garza with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Donohue with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Hays.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Holifield.
Ms. Holtzman with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Lehman.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Forsythe.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Milford.
Mr. Owens with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Cronin.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Beard.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Ginn with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Brinkley with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Moorhead of California.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Dulski.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Lagomarsino.
Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Young of Alaska with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Wydler with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Pritchard with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1250, I call up the Senate bill (S. 3190) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1975 for carrying out the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MORGAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MORGAN moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3190 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 14780, as passed, as follows:

That section 8(a) of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2877(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "$50,209,000 for fiscal year 1974" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "$49,990,000 for fiscal year 1975, of which not less than $75,000 shall be available solely to initiate broadcasts in the Estonian language and not less than $75,000 shall be available solely to initiate broadcasts in the Latvian language"; and

(2) by striking out "fiscal year 1974" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1975".

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 14780) was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he will kindly advise us of the program for next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, so we may have some indication of his plans?

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

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would really like to announce that today I have circulated a letter that should be in the offices of each of the Members which sets up a schedule so that Members who are interested may listen to the tapes that are going to be available in the Congressional Building where the impeachment inquiry staff is located. There will be assistance provided to all of the Members, and this is spelled out in this letter—the schedule as to the time when the tapes will be available, together with the transcripts, and assistance will be provided by members of the impeachment inquiry staff.

In addition to that, there is also in the letter pertinent information which relates to the particular pieces of information or documents that are available. All of the documents that have been printed and the President's counsel's brief will be included. Members will have available to them all that the Committee on the Judiciary has presented and printed and published up to this particular time, which I am sure all Members will be interested in.

I thought that I would make this announcement so that this letter will come to the Members' attention and will not be somehow or other just laid aside. I think the Members are going to be interested in seeing it and knowing that there is a schedule for them, and we will allow them sufficient time within which to be briefed regarding these various materials that are available and the facilities that are available to them.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to address some remarks to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, in view of the fact that the leadership on both sides of the aisle met yesterday with members of the Committee on Rules trying to put together a schedule, which, of course, we understand is tentative.

It was my understanding from that meeting that the Judiciary Committee would be planning to report next Wednesday, and would be going to the Rules Committee on Tuesday, August 13, with the anticipation that the matter of impeachment would be on the floor on Monday, the 19th.

Would the gentleman want to comment on that?

Mr. RODINO. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct. That is the schedule that we hope to follow. I have discussed this with the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking minority member, and we have agreed that the scheduling is the kind of scheduling dates that we can meet. On Tuesday, the 13th, we would go before the Rules Committee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I will announce the program for next week.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of August 5, 1974, is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day and under suspensions we will have 19 bills, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 72, invitation to hold Winter Olympics in Lake Placid, N.Y.;

H.R. 15936, continuation pay for physicians of the uniformed services in initial residency;

H.R. 14402, Air Force lieutenant colonels and colonels;

H.R. 13377, medical care for certain members of U.S. allies in World Wars I and II;

H.R. 15912, Veterans Housing Act;

H.R. 13267, Extension of certain agricultural programs to Guam;

H.R. 16045, solid waste disposal;

H.R. 16077, National Health Service Corps scholarships;

H.R. 14213, 3-year extension for the Drug Enforcement Administration;

Senate Joint Resolution 229, Export-Import Bank 30-day extension;

House Joint Resolution 1104, Export Administration 2-month extension;

Senate Joint Resolution 228, Defense Production Act 2-month extension;

H.R. 8352, Cascade Head Scenic Research Area, Oreg.;

H.R. 7486, Boston National Historical Park, Mass.;

H.R. 14167, amending the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Act;

House Concurrent Resolution—corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 69;

H.R. 15172, passport application fee;

House Resolution 1258, chemical warfare policy review, and

House Concurrent Resolution 507, aid to Turkey relating to resumption of opium production.

Votes will be postponed until the end of the legislative day.

On Tuesday we will have the Private Calendar and under suspensions there will be no bills.

Then we will have H.R. 16243, the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1976; and

H.R. 9989, real estate settlement procedures, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

On Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday we will have:

H.R. 16090, Federal Election Campaign Act amendments, subject to a rule being granted;

A resolution for broadcasting impeachment proceedings;

H.R. 16136, military construction authorization, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 15977, Export-Import Bank, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 15264, Export Administration Act, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

There will be a Friday session on next week.

Mr. ARENDS. There will be?

Mr. O'NEILL. May I repeat, there will be a Friday session on next week.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

May I also say, that beginning the week of August 19 when we will have the impeachment resolution, it is our intention to meet daily from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. and to meet through Saturday, August 24.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AUGUST 5, 1974

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL)?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa reserves the right to object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to this program. Is the gentleman programing under a suspension of the rules the military construction authorization bill?

Mr. O'NEILL. No. The gentleman has reference to an earlier draft of the proposed schedule. I announced that H.R. 16136 would be on Wednesday and the balance of the week, subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. GROSS. That will be programed under a rule?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes, it was taken off the original list of suspensions.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman is saying, in view of the program we have here, the Defense appropriation bill and another bill on Tuesday—does the gentleman think we can finish the Defense appropriation bill and another bill on Tuesday?

Mr. O'NEILL. Well, that is the way we have scheduled it, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). We will have to see what develops during the course of the day; but the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act was taken off the calendar at the request of the committee this week and was placed in that particular spot on the calendar because it was the only place we could put it in. Possibly after the Defense Appropriations Act is over, we can work late on Tuesday.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman does not contemplate a Saturday session?

Mr. O'NEILL. Not for next week.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO FILE A REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 507

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Resolution 507.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO FILE A REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1258

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 1258.

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

There was no objection.

MEANINGFUL REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, many Americans in recent years have examined the method used by the major political parties to nominate Vice Presidential candidates and concluded the system is badly in need of reform. It has been argued that we should start giving as much attention to the choice of Vice President as to the choice of President.

I concur in that analysis. For too long we have lived with a system under which we spend many months, even years, debating the qualifications of Presidential candidates, but then almost as an afterthought, choose the person who stands only a heartbeat away from the Presidency.

Consequently, I strongly support the efforts of the Republican and Democratic parties to develop meaningful reforms. I know this is not an easy task. There are theorists who would have us believe reform is simply a matter of passing the final nomination decision to some committee or even the Congress. Others believe as I do that must involve more, not fewer people, in the nomination process. Of course, there is no foolproof reform. But there are steps we can take to help guarantee the integrity of the party selection process while greatly increasing the amount of scrutiny given Vice Presidential candidates.

Certainly this is a matter that is of great consequence to all citizens, whether or not they are active in party politics. Almost one-third of our 37 Presidents have also served as Vice President and 8 of those 12 Vice Presidents succeeded to the Nation's highest elected office because of the death of the Chief Executive. Indeed, three of our last five Presidents also served as Vice President. Meanwhile, the responsibilities and duties of our Vice Presidents have been greatly expanded in modern times. Congress too has recognized the importance of the office by adopting the 25th amendment which provides emergency measures to fill Vice-Presidential vacancies.

This increased awareness of the importance of the office has helped us recognize the problems inherent in the traditional convention nomination system. Both major parties are actively seeking reforms in this process and as part of the effort I appeared on April 27 before a subcommittee of the Rule 29 Committee of the Republican National Committee to outline my proposal which is the basis for my remarks here today.

In that regard, let me also express my disappointment that the subcommittee—after recognizing the shortcomings in the present convention nomination system—did not then recommend a positive plan to remedy the situation. Hopefully, given enough incentive from concerned citizens throughout the Nation, the full committee will address this problem at its meeting in December and draft a comprehensive and revised procedure to assure adequate opportunity for appraisal of a Vice-Presidential candidate's potential.

THE KEY TO REFORM

While I agree there is a real need for reform, I believe we must guard against overreaction and doing injury to our two party political system and broaden citizen involvement in the decisionmaking process at our national conventions. That is why I believe the key to reform is a longer selection period at the convention and increased preconvention scrutiny and political testing of potential Vice Presidential nominees. I will outline a plan to provide this scrutiny very shortly, but first let me share with you some of the principles I hope will be encompassed in any change.

Let us maximize public exposure of the qualifications and records of each potential Vice-Presidential nominee well in advance of the balloting at the convention. The news media can play an important role in this area and members of the public can come forward with information and their views on the potential nominees.

We should set aside sufficient time for consideration of a nominee's qualifications and get away from the frantic, disorganized "traditional" process in which exhausted delegates and an equally tired Presidential nominee face an unrealistic deadline for selecting a Vice-Presidential candidate.

Let us encourage selection of the person who might be the best future President, not simply the person who is deemed most attractive for geographical or ticket-balancing considerations.

Let us encourage broader participation by delegates at the convention in the selection process and recognize that the decision is the responsibility of properly

selected delegates and not that of a committee or a branch of the Government such as the Congress.

With these principles as goals, I would like now to examine some of the proposals for reform starting with the suggestion that Congress approve or reject the choice for Vice President of a newly elected President. This is basically the same procedure used in the confirmation last year of Vice President GERALD R. FORD. However, I believe congressional approval should remain an emergency measure used only to fill a vacancy in the office of Vice President. The party and the Presidential nominee, I believe, should work together in the selection of a Vice Presidential nominee and the final decision on who shall serve as President and Vice President should be made by the voters. I see no special merit in turning to a parliamentary system of choosing our leaders. The executive branch—as a coequal branch of Government—draws its authority from the voters of the Nation, not another branch of Government. This was the system envisioned by the framers of the Constitution and to change it would take a constitutional amendment. This would be a long process and in the end I do not believe the people would support loss of their right to participate in the selection of the Vice President.

In addition, while I prefer to assume the highest motives on the part of Congress, it is not hard to imagine how the opposition party—or even members of the President's party after a close or ideologically divisive election—might resort to partisanship in rejecting or delaying confirmation of a Vice Presidential nominee. I also do not believe this system would broaden participation by the electorate or encourage selection of the person who might be the best future President. Indeed, a President who does not enjoy the support of Congress might compromise his choice on the best man for the job by making a recommendation that is "politically" popular with the Congress.

Another recommendation I consider flawed is the idea that Vice Presidential candidates use the primary election route to seek convention delegates in the same manner as the Presidential candidates. Or, in a variation on the same concept, the runnerup at the convention in the Presidential balloting would be the Vice Presidential nominee. I think neither would work since this could very well leave an ideological gap at the top of the ticket which would not be healthy for the party or the Nation.

Also, a national primary or an established system by which candidates seek the Vice Presidential nomination in the primaries would eliminate very able men from consideration for the Presidential nomination. Conversely, a very inadequate Vice Presidential candidate might lock up enough delegates for the nomination should all the able candidates concentrate on the Presidency. I see no need to encourage this kind of system when we want to have the highest caliber men in both posts.

It has also been proposed that candidates for President and Vice President run as teams starting with the first Presidential primaries. It is suggested that this would reduce the clutter of candidates for President since some run only to attract support for their nomination as the Vice-Presidential candidate. This system, too, would deny men of high caliber from winning the Vice-Presidential nomination since very able men who run for the Presidential nomination would not be available to fill out a Presidential ticket announced 6 months before the convention.

Among the less serious proposals is one by which we would abolish the Vice-Presidency and allow the House Speaker to serve as President until there is a special, nationwide election to fill the vacancy. However, I think few of us would like to see the country headed by an acting President. Also, the Speaker might well be of another political party from that of the President he succeeded. This could cause considerable turmoil in the weeks and perhaps months preceding the special election.

Of course, there is one alternative that is basically available under the current system. I speak of open conventions whereby the delegates would choose the Vice-Presidential nominee without a recommendation from the Presidential nominee. However, I think we can all agree that in most instances the Presidential nominee will insist on being able to recommend a Vice-Presidential candidate. Indeed, he should have a significant but, not a determining voice in the selection of a running mate.

Still another possibility would parallel the system being adopted by the Democratic Party. Under this concept, the convention could be extended by 24 hours to give additional time for selection of a Vice-Presidential candidate. However, the Presidential candidate would have the option of recommending deferral of the choice to a "miniconvention" comprised of members of the national committee. This recommendation would be approved or rejected by the full convention. The "miniconvention" would act within 21 days of the convention. Another provision which fortunately has been abandoned by the Democrats stipulated that information about the qualifications of potential Vice-Presidential nominees would be compiled by a committee named by the party chairman in May preceding the convention and the information would be made available to the Presidential nominee.

It is indeed encouraging that both of the Nation's major political parties have recognized the need to adopt reforms. There has been considerable public reaction to the suggestions of the Democratic Party commission. The New York Times on January 15 described the proposals as "modest reforms" worthy of adoption by both parties to replace the "demonstrably unsatisfactory" traditional methods of choosing a Vice-Presidential nominee. In my own congressional district, the press in Ypsilanti, Mich., suggested that under either an extended convention program or the "miniconvention" the "hurly burly, sleepless selection of a Vice-Presidential nomination which has been the custom would be eliminated. This is no small improvement; the new idea is worth a try and worth Republican adoption, too."

A SOLEMN RESPONSIBILITY

I agree that more time is needed for thoughtful deliberation by the delegates and the Presidential nominee in order to get away from the deadline politics that has plagued previous conventions. As the New York Times said in its editorial, the decision should be less of an afterthought and more of a solemn responsibility. However, I believe the decision of who shall be the Vice-Presidential nominee is best left with the delegates chosen to attend the national convention, not the national committee.

Our aim should be to open up the selection process to more complete participation by duly chosen delegates representing a broad cross-section of party sentiment. Limiting the Vice-Presidential selection process to national committee members would be a step away from meaningful reform. I do not intend to cast any derogatory aspersions on members of the national committees. I know many members personally and have the highest regard for their integrity and dedication. But we must avoid even the appearance of a return to smoke-filled-room politics at which secret deals could be made. It is entirely conceivable that during the 21 days before the "miniconvention" is held there could be a great deal of wheeling and dealing. Power brokers could make their influence felt. The Presidential nominee—anxious to avoid a divisive fight within the party—could be forced into a secret deal in exchange for support for his choice. Instead of opening up the system and inspiring confidence in our citizens who thirst for meaningful participation in the two-party system, this proposal could lead to greater injustices and cynicism.

I must confess to personal skepticism too, about whether the miniconvention would ever be utilized even if adopted by a major party. I think we can legitimately ask ourselves whether a Presidential nominee would risk deferring the selection of a Vice-Presidential candidate to the national committee. Hopefully and idealistically, deferral would be aimed at focusing public scrutiny upon the recommendation of the Presidential candidate. Practically, it might also be argued that no Presidential nominee would choose to defer the choice to the miniconvention unless he was certain of rubberstamp approval of his recommendation. I think we can assume the Presidential candidate's decision to recommend a miniconvention would be based upon his assessment of the prospects for a divisive fight within the national committee. The candidate would also consider the effect of the delay on his campaign effort. If the convention was held in the third week in August, the ticket would not be completed until the first or second week in September.

In addition, there is always the possibility that adverse information—real or manufactured—might be made public about his recommended choice for Vice President. Considering all the possible pitfalls, I really believe a Presidential candidate would instead opt for the con-

vention to make the final selection. However, under this proposal the delegates might know little or nothing about the recommended candidate and would have precious few hours to check on his credentials.

Rather than resort to window dressing reform—the only description I can honestly give to the miniconvention concept—I have proposed that the Republican Party zero in on concrete reform that will provide preconvention scrutiny of potential Vice-Presidential nominees and reserve sufficient time for a deliberate and reasoned selection process by the Presidential candidate and national convention delegates.

THE BEST CANDIDATE

To give the party the best possible Vice-Presidential nominee and encourage full participation in the selection process, I propose that—

First. The Republican Party mandate that each candidate for the GOP Presidential nomination would announce publicly—at least 14 days before the start of the convention—the name or names of one to six potential Vice-Presidential nominees.

Second. The Presidential candidate would announce within 24 hours of his nomination his recommendation for Vice President or his suggestion to the convention that the delegates make their own choice without his endorsement of a single candidate.

Third. If the Presidential candidate endorses one Vice-Presidential candidate, he should be allowed to choose from outside his originally announced list if the person or persons on the list decide against being candidates for the Vice-Presidential nomination or the Presidential candidate decides that on the basis of new information they are not his first choice for Vice President.

Fourth. Welcoming remarks, adoption of rules and resolution of credentials disputes shall be completed on the first day of the convention in two sessions, one starting in the early afternoon and the second in the evening.

Fifth. The second day of the convention shall be for the address by the temporary chairman followed by nominating speeches and selection of the Presidential nominee.

Sixth. Activities on the third day shall include an address by the permanent chairman of the convention, adoption of the party platform and other committee reports, delivery of the keynote address and election of the Republican National Committee.

Seventh. Nominating speeches and selection of the Vice Presidential candidate followed by acceptance speeches by both candidates on the fourth day would complete the agenda of the convention.

In suggesting a revised format for the national convention, I have not attempted to detail every part of the agenda. Rather I believe the changes would provide the framework for achieving the goal of broad participation in the selection of the Vice-Presidential candidate under a system requiring careful scrutiny of the potential nominees. Each candidate for President would send his list of six or fewer names to the Republican National Committee 2 weeks before the start of the convention resulting in public scrutiny of each name on each of the lists. The news media would have adequate opportunity to interview the potential nominees and delve into their backgrounds. The Presidential candidates would of necessity have given long consideration to the names on the lists before they are made public. The public and convention delegates would have an opportunity to voice their views about the qualifications of the candidates. Finally, the Presidential nominee would have the benefit of those views before he makes a final recommendation to the convention.

TIMELY CONSIDERATION

There are many advantages of preconvention scrutiny; and certainly this system is more desirable than creation of a special committee to compile information on what seemingly could be an endless list of potential Vice-Presidential nominees. Under my proposal, the delegates would have some idea of the Presidential candidate's choice for Vice President. The public and news media would have an opportunity to voice their views on the potential nominees. Moreover, the Presidential candidate himself will have given full and timely consideration to the recommendation he makes to the convention.

Second, the convention would be structured so that the Presidential candidate would have 24 hours after his nomination within which to announce publicly his recommendation for Vice President. However, the process for nominating the Vice-Presidential candidate would not begin until the evening of the fourth and final day of the convention. I include these important time provisions to allow adequate time for the nominee and the delegates to weigh their choice and to compensate for the possibility the convention might draft a Presidential nominee who had not announced his list of potential Vice-Presidential candidates before the start of the convention.

Although the likelihood of a convention turning to a draft candidate is remote, it is a possibility and provision should be made. In addition, the extra time would be needed if the Presidential nominee did not endorse a running mate. Also, it would be useful for delegates to gather support for their choice for Vice President if they are opposed to the candidate recommended by the Presidential nominee.

Moreover, the extra time would be needed if the Presidential candidate recommended a running mate whose name was not on his original list. This possibility would be rare since the Presidential candidate would have given careful consideration to his recommendation before the convention. But his first choices for running mate might decline to accept the nomination. Or, the Presidential candidate might have been given valid information that made him question the potential Vice Presidential candidate's qualifications. It is the purpose of meaningful reform to provide a mechanism to weed out those persons who would not be adequate Vice Presidents. The Presidential candidate could go outside his announced list with a minimum of embarrassment to those passed over compared to the shock and trauma of replacing a Vice-Presidential candidate once the campaign is underway.

Third, the extra time available to the delegates by extending the convention schedule by 24 hours could be used to focus attention on the party platform and other reports of important committees. Election of a new national committee could be held and addresses by many prominent persons could be integrated into the schedule. The time could even be used for a nationwide telethon to raise small contributions for the ticket. The telethon could be part of a national chain of fundraising affairs and dinners via a nationwide television hookup, which could also raise contributions for State party organizations.

I realize there will be some who will argue that in previous years the platform and other committee reports were adopted on the second day of the convention in the afternoon session prior to selection of the Presidential candidate. Or that the keynote address should be given on the first day and not the third convention day. However, I maintain that these matters can be logically reserved for the third day of the convention without adverse effect. The Republican Party selected its Presidential nominee in 1972 on the second night and the party could also decide to select the nominee on the third night and reserve the second day for the platform and other business. I would not object, provided a fifth day is added to the convention schedule so that there is adequate time between nomination of the President and selection of his running mate. This would be a most important requirement if we are to have meaningful reform.

In conclusion, I know you realize that no system will be foolproof. I hope you will agree that indepth preconvention scrutiny will make for a better selection process and give ample time for those who should not be serving as Vice Presidential candidates to be eliminated from contention. At the same time, I hope you will agree that there is a place in our political system for the kind of citizen involvement that we find at our national conventions. Participation is what America is all about. We need to involve more of our citizens, not fewer, in the decisionmaking process.

NEW INTERIOR FORECASTS SUPPORTS REPRESENTATIVE UDALL'S POSITION ON STRIP MINING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the debate preceding the passage of the landmark strip mining bill last month, many Members who were opposed to the legislation pointed to National Coal Association, Federal Energy Office, and Interior Department estimates claiming that up to 600 million tons of coal would be sacrificed each year.

I was pleased to see in today's Wall Street Journal an article reporting that

Secretary Morton has revised his estimate of potential coal loss downward to about 40,000 tons, bringing it in line with the forecast made by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL). I would like to commend my distinguished colleague, as well as his cochairman, the gentlelady from Hawaii, for their leadership leading to the enactment of Federal strip mine controls. I welcome the Department of Interior's new assessment of the legislation's impact and feel this will aid the conferees to work out the remaining differences expeditiously so that this legislation may be remembered as one of the legislative highlights of the 93d Congress.

The article, from the August 2, Wall Street Journal follows:

INTERIOR SECRETARY ALTERS ASSESSMENT OF STRIP MINING BILL

WASHINGTON.—Interior Secretary Rogers Morton has decided the House-passed strip-mining bill mightn't be such an energy disaster after all.

Before the bill passed last week by a wide margin, Mr. Morton had warned that its restrictions on strip mining and its requirements to patch up ground that is cut open for coal would cost the U.S. 31 million to 187 million tons of needed coal in 1975.

But yesterday he had a radically different assessment, saying the measure needn't cut more than 40,000 tons from next year's production.

Mr. Morton conditioned the appraisal on his expectation that when the House bill is reconciled with an earlier Senate version, the Interior Department, which is the agency designated to police stripping, will have adequate enforcement "flexibility." The relatively insignificant drop could be achieved "if we don't try to get ahead of the power curve and make guys do things they don't have the equipment to do," the Secretary observed.

Moreover, even the 40,000-ton loss needn't mean that much of a net reduction from overall U.S. production, currently running at better than 600 million tons annually, because "deep mines probably could make up the difference," Mr. Morton added.

CLOSE TO UDALL FORECAST

The new Morton estimate brings the Interior Secretary fairly close to the forecast of Rep. Morris Udall, a leading backer of the House bill. The Arizona Democrat has predicted that the legislation, by ending uncertainty over federal stripping rules, actually would stimulate an expansion of surface coal mining.

The production-loss controversy remains, however. Still on the record, for example, is the estimate by Federal Energy Administrator John Sawhill, based on his own analysis of Interior Department data, that the legislation would cut 1975 coal output 20 million to 60 million tons. And during the House debate, Rep. Craig Hosmer (R. Calif.), who was pushing a substitute bill, warned of a 50% reduction in coal stripping, which accounts for about half of total U.S. coal output.

The National Coal Association, for its part, is staying with its own warning of a 250 million ton loss in 1975. Robert Price, executive vice president of the industry organization, said Mr. Morton "must be able to read something into the legislation that we can't."

Other high points of Mr. Morton's comments:

—The House and Senate strip mining bills, as they affect reclamation and environmental protection, are "a step in the right direction." But Mr. Morton is troubled by a House bill provision for special unemployment benefits in areas where strip mines must be closed down. That could be a "real Pandora's box" if workers in other industries sought similar rights, the Secretary said.

SEEN AS FAR TOO HIGH

—The unemployment benefits, federal dollars to reclaim abandoned strip-minded land and other spending authorizations in the two bills would tap the Treasury for some $400 million to $500 million annually—far too high for the Nixon administration to accept. Mr. Morton wouldn't say, though, whether failure to remove these features risked a presidential veto.

—The Interior Secretary is mulling the value of attempting to lobby against President Nixon's impeachment with members of the House, where he formerly served as a representative from Maryland's Eastern Shore. Mr. Morton said he has "doubts about the wisdom of Cabinet officers . . . trying to twist any arms" on this issue and that he is "tilting away" from such an approach. Nevertheless, he won't make up his mind until he's talked the question over with his "close friend," Vice President Gerald Ford.

As for advice from the White House on impeachment tactics, there hasn't been any, Mr. Morton said.

BACKGROUND ON LEGISLATION FOR THE ELDERLY—PART 2

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting the second part of the informative legislative background study on problems of the elderly prepared by the National Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers Association into the RECORD. The first portion of this study appeared in the RECORD of August 1, 1974 on pages 26421–26423.

HEALTH

Since the introduction of the Kennedy-Griffiths bill in 1969, an ambitious federal cradle-to-grave plan to cover the entire U.S. population, spiraling health care costs and mounting public concern have induced the Nixon Administration and powerful members of Congress to propose serious alternatives. The prospect of a federally mandated national health plan ensuring adequate and quality health care at equitable costs for all is naturally supported by older persons, who, as a class, face the highest incidence of illness and disability and are least able to pay for necessary services.

However, it is equally apparent that the prospects of a speedy enactment of national health insurance are dim: there are fundamental differences over a comprehensive or incremental approach; the extent of benefits to be provided; the means of delivering those benefits while simultaneously assuring quality controls; the degree of federal involvement; financing and cost-sharing; and the mechanism for delivering catastrophic protection. Thus, any analysis of the proposed legislation must recognize that the elderly will be compelled to accept the inability of the existing programs to provide adequate health care as the debate inevitably continues.

This type of delay is responsible for alternative piecemeal proposals. Wilbur J. Cohen, former HEW Secretary, has said recently that the "sick, disabled, disadvantaged and the poor should not have to wait five or ten more years while we struggle to perfect the mechanism of control and accessibility which is inherent in the proposals of those who criticize an incremental or piecemeal approach."

COMPREHENSIVE MEDICARE REFORM ACT OF 1974 (S. 3154)

Perhaps the most responsive legislation to date is the Comprehensive Medicare Reform Act of 1974. Sponsored by Senator Abraham Ribicoff (D Conn), it recognizes that the elderly in America are not utilizing the full range of health services they need because they simply cannot afford to: last year, Medicare covered only 42% of the personal health care costs of older persons ($1,000 per person). It anticipates changing Medicare from a limited financial program—which at present demands the beneficiary to seek supplemental insurance—to the program originally envisioned: comprehensive health insurance for all older Americans.

Estimated to cost a total of $17 billion annually, the Ribicoff bill will induce approximately $2.5 billion in new costs to the federal budget. The legislation is designed to reverse the present trend of declining Medicare protection and increasing out-of-pocket health care expenses by eliminating the durational limitations on items and services not covered and replacing existing cost-sharing devices with a single system of copayments subject to a catastrophic protection feature related to income.

A unique cost-cutting and abuse-eliminating feature of the bill would require all fees charged to Medicare patients to be predetermined and prenegotiated between representatives of government, medical professions and consumer interests. Public hearings would be required before final fee structures for a particular region could be set. Of particular importance to the elderly is the fact that this legislation does not conflict with existing law and could easily be incorporated into whichever total national health plan Congress will finally enact.

CATASTROPHIC INSURANCE AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE ACT (S. 2513)

Senators Russell B. Long and Abraham Ribicoff have also proposed the Catastrophic Insurance and Medical Assistance Act. This plan would continue Medicare but under its catastrophic provisions, benefits would begin after an expenditure of $2,000 for medical services covered by Medicare, or after the 60th day of hospitalization. Benefits would be subject to copayments up to $1,000 per family. Its estimated new costs to the federal budget would be $8.9 billion. While it would undoubtedly aid many Americans in the case of catastrophic illness, its impact on the elderly population would be minimal.

Complementing these "incrementalist" approaches are a number of serious proposals advocating a comprehensive approach to the issue of national health insurance. Among the most important are the Administration's Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan (S. 2970—CHIP), the Health Security Act (S. 3, H.R. 22, 23) of Senator Edward Kennedy (D Mass) and Representative Martha Griffiths (D Mich), and the Comprehensive National Health Insurance Act of 1974 (S. 3286) Jointly sponsored by Senator Kennedy and Representative Wilbur Mills (D Ark).

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN (CHIP)

The Administration-backed Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan (S. 2970) stresses voluntary enrollment, largely private financing through cost-sharing, a resulting minimal impact on the federal budget and supervision by state rather than federal officials. Within this comprehensive proposal, the Federal Health Care Benefits program would replace Medicare, but this program offers little or no improvement over the existing program.

Of chief concern for the elderly is the resurrection of a 1973 Administration proposal to require older persons to pay more out of their own pockets for short-term hospital stays. The increase in out-of-pocket expenses (approximately $1.2 billion annually) is jus-

tified by the Administration on the grounds that CHIP extends benefits to cover outpatient drugs, limited mental health care and would pay all bills above a $750 out-of-pocket limit. Under CHIP, the Medicare patient (now limited to an $84 fee for the first day of hospitalization and nothing for the second through 60th days) would pay a $100 deductible, a separate $50 deductible for outpatient drugs and 20 percent of all medical bills up to the $750 catastrophic protection threshold.

In short, for the average 12-day hospital stay of an older person, Medicare beneficiaries would pay four times as much under the Administration plan than under the existing program. The Administration supports this effect on the basis that it will eliminate overreliance on hospitalization rather than outpatient care.

HEALTH SECURITY ACT (S. 3, H.R. 22, 23)

Although the Kennedy-Griffiths bill ignores the importance of long-term care provisions for the elderly, older persons will clearly benefit more than under the Administration-backed CHIP. The Kennedy-Griffiths bill provides for complete hospital and medical care without copayments or deductibles. However, its chief drawback is its high impact on the federal budget; it is estimated that there will be at least $60–80 billion in new costs in the first year of operation. On the other hand, CHIP will account for only $5.9 billion in new costs primarily because of the private financing characteristics of the plan: funds would flow from employees and employers to the private insurance industry. At issue is control: both bills expect to cover 70 percent of the nation's health bill ($92.5 billion in 1973). Supporters of the Kennedy-Griffiths bill contend that this money is being spent already; what the bill would do is funnel the money through the federal government, which would regulate it, instead of the private insurance carriers.

THE COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE ACT OF 1974 (S. 3286)

Introduced in April 1974, the Kennedy-Mills bill is similar to the Administration's CHIP plan but includes more liberal provisions for catastrophic coverage and stricter controls over the private insurance industry. To be financed by payroll taxes, comparable taxes on unearned income, state revenues and general revenues, the Kennedy-Mills bill is estimated to cost somewhat more than the CHIP plan.

With respect to the elderly, the Kennedy-Mills measure is an improvement over the CHIP proposal but lacks the comprehensive concern of the Ribicoff Medicare Amendments (S. 3154). While it retains Medicare's basic structure—Parts A and B with provisions for out-of-pocket premiums, deductibles and coinsurance—it envisions the following major changes: (1) provision of outpatient prescription drugs and biologicals for specified chronic conditions subject to a $1 copayment per prescription; (2) elimination of post-hospital requirement for home health services under Part A; (3) elimination of duration limits on in-patient hospital services; (4) elimination of blood deductible; (5) inclusion of catastrophic coverage provision; and (6) provision of an optional long term care program (viewed as separate from the national health insurance program by the sponsors).

The inclusion of catastrophic protection and the elimination of durational limits on in-patient hospital services are important measures; however, the bill has many shortcomings when compared to the provisions of the Ribicoff bill (S. 3154). Due to the haste with which the measure was drafted, it contains significant gaps, among the most important of which are (1) no provision for meeting the out-of-pocket costs of the indigent elderly (now covered under Title XIX); (2) no provision for long term benefits for the elderly in Intermediate Care Facilities; and (3) no provision for coverage of certain medically necessary devices such as eyeglasses, hearing aides, prosthetic devices and walking aids. In addition, the catastrophic provision is not truly comprehensive as it covers only those items and services covered under present law: e.g., after 100 days in a Skilled Nursing Facility, protection would end except for those participating in the new optional long term care program.

HEALTH CARE REORGANIZATION AND FINANCE ACT (H.R. 1)

Another comprehensive approach of some merit is Representative Al Ullman's (D Ore.) Health Care Reorganization and Financing Act. Backed by the American Hospital Association, it would create a national system of health care corporations to deliver comprehensive benefits. It would also create a cabinet-level Department of Health that would aid state health commissions to develop plans to implement the creation of health care areas served by the health care corporations. H.R. 1 would alter but continue Medicare and finance it through Social Security and general tax revenues. Based on income categories determining maximum liabilities before catastrophic protection begins, it too would rely on a copayment structure. Its principal weakness is that it will not be operational until the fifth fiscal year after enactment.

HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATIONS (HMO)

The most important action in the health field taken to date was the passage of legislation (S. 14—P.L. 93–000) providing for federal aid in the development of about 100 Health Maintenance Organizations over a five-year period. HMOs, which offer comprehensive health services for an annual or monthly per capita fee, are considered the major alternative to the traditional fee-for-service medical practice. HMO's unique feature is their emphasis on preventive medicine, an in-built incentive to keep the patient well rather than treating him merely when he is ill. This factor allows HMOs to keep medical costs down and numerous studies have shown them to afford greater control of the quality of the health care provided.

SUMMARY

While the Medicare program has undoubtedly benefited older persons, its performance has indicated its inability to provide the full range of health related services required by the elderly, who, while constituting only 10% of the population, account for 28% of the national health care cost. While current proposals to enact total national health insurance plans in part promise some relief, the inevitable delays before adoption constrain older persons to accept the inadequacy of present programs. This factor should be foremost in considering the relative strengths and weaknesses of the legislation now before Congress.

HOUSING AND HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Although the housing needs of older Americans cannot be divorced from the needs of the total population, the elderly constitute a special and significant component in the stated national goal of "providing a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family" (National Housing Act of 1949). It cannot be stressed enough that housing for older persons must take into consideration the special living environment needs of the elderly, among the most important of which are medical attention and human contact. "Living" must be made possible and as much as institutional settings must be avoided, appropriate and adequate life supportive services should be included in the planning of all federally subsidized projects. John Martin, former U.S. Commissioner on Aging, recently wrote:

"In the past HUD has tended to assume that matters such as the need for homemakers, home health aides, phone reassurance, transportation, meals, recreation, counseling, information and referral, and crime prevention were the responsibility of the tenants and not management. Insofar as housing is built for younger parts of our population, this assumption can perhaps be made. So far as the elderly are concerned, particularly the older elderly, the assumption is mistaken."

Moreover, to reemphasize a point made elsewhere in this paper, the methodology of production and finance is secondary to the adequacy of the commitment: no methodology will produce adequate results with inadequate resources.

Since the housing recommendations of the 1971 WHCoA were made public, the Nixon Administration's record towards meeting the housing needs of older persons has been open to some criticism. After initially promising 70,000 new housing starts for the elderly, all new commitments for subsidized housing programs were halted on January 5, 1973 when the President ordered a moratorium on federal subsidy programs for the elderly (Sec. 202), for homeownership (Sec. 235), rental and cooperative housing (Sec. 236), rent supplements, low-rent public housing and college housing. On March 8, the Administration announced the beginning of a major HUD study to evaluate existing programs for the purpose of developing solid housing policy for the future. In September, the policy recommendations generated by this study were submitted to Congress and the moratorium was lifted on one housing program, Sec. 23, which allowed the rental of an additional 300,000 housing units by HUD from local housing authorities. This commitment constitutes the entire Administration housing budget for fiscal 1975.

The heart of the Administration's recommendations is a rejection of Congressional housing subcommittees' inclination to use new production as the means to upgrade the housing conditions for the nation's poor. Instead, the Administration is considering the adpotion of a sweeping system of cash benefits designed to maximize use of the nation's existing housing stock. This cash payment strategy for low income groups appears to be consistent with the Administration's overall plan to link all types of public assistance to a broader federal system of income maintenance to replace the existing welfare system. Although the cash payment proposal—i.e., "housing allowances"—has merit, its principal drawback is that it delays positive action until late this year or even to 1975. It is a matter of record that the elderly have the least time to wait.

In addition, the Administration's recommendations—i.e., that the problem is the absence of cash and not housing—appear to conflict with the conclusions reached in a two-year HUD financed housing study conducted by the joint Center for Urban Studies of Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This study found that some 23 million new housing units will be needed in the decade between 1970 and 1980 for families that can "pay their own way"; beyond that, it concluded that in 1970 there were some 13 million families with low incomes deprived of adequate housing. Confronted with statistics such as these, one might ask the value of future cash payments when the commodity for which their use is intended is nonexistent.

The Administration has proposed legislation in another community related area that has possibly serious long-range consequences for the elderly. The Better Communities Act of 1973 (H.R. 7277) would merge seven existing community development categorical programs and finance them with General Revenue Sharing funds with little or no fed-

eral controls. In the long view, the BCA's allocation and distribution of funds schedule represents a carefully defined cutback in federal funds in successive fiscal years. It is apparent that the BCA envisions a withdrawal from the current policy of federal assistance to community development. If federal support is diminished as provided for by the allocation schedule, it is evident that local units of government will be forced to raise taxes if they are to continue these programs after the bill lapses. This, of course, would have an odious effect on the elderly homeowner and renter, unless property tax relief is afforded for them.

The Administration's rationale in leaning away from a federal role in the housing business stems from a fundamental dissatisfaction with the past performance of existing programs. An exception to this record is the Sec. 202 direct loan program for housing the elderly.

The principal Administration objection to this highly successful program is its initial high budgetary impact and not the human, managerial or financial success of the projects built under this program. On the other hand, Sec. 235 and Sec. 236 programs have witnessed some major abuses on the part of developers and some public housing projects—in particular, the infamous Pruitt-Igoe disaster in St. Louis—have degenerated into crime-infested slum areas. Although abuses and inefficient, costly mismanagement are present, the total impact of these programs must be weighed. First, Sections 202, 235 and 236 have gone a long way toward providing decent housing for older persons. Second, 39% of all low-rent public housing units are occupied by elderly families or individuals. The question must be asked whether or not the answer to meeting the housing goals of the nation lies in the costly and delay-ridden option of developing totally new programs or in better administering conceptually solid existing ones. The answer may lie somewhere in between, but, nevertheless, what the Administration proposes is no action at all until some time in the vague future.

On the other hand, Congress has developed alternatives in response to the current tendency of the Administration, both in housing and community development. The basic response has been to continue appropriating funds for existing programs in lieu of substantive Administration proposals. These appropriations, within the existing categoricals' structure, reflect Congress' reluctance to abdicate its role to the states—as it would if it unequivocally adopted the "new federalism" approach—in defining and determining measures to achieve national housing and urban development goals.

Congress' response to the Administration is embodied in the $10.4 billion "Housing and Community Development Act of 1974." S. 3066, recently passed by the Senate, calls for $1.7 billion in interim funds to keep present programs in operation until the new ones take effect. The remainder of the $10.4 billion will be used for various housing subsidy programs (among which are the Sec. 235 and 236 programs but with safeguards to avoid previous scandals), public housing and the new community development block grants. The latter would accomplish essentially the same thing as the Administration-backed BCA but requires localities to submit detailed and acceptable four-year plans to the federal government before funds would be allocated. In short, the bill maintains the concept of federal control of federal expenditures in contrast to the President's revenue sharing concept.

Amended to the omnibus housing bill is S. 2179, a bill introduced by Senator Harrison Williams (D NJ) which resurrects the Sec. 202 direct loan program for housing the elderly but in an altered, more fiscally acceptable version. It would establish a revolving fund operating outside the regular federal budget and financed entirely by U.S. Treasury notes: an off budget capital account—of the type already in use by the Department of Defense in some of its programs, it will not appear as a deficit in fiscal transactions. It retains the same building specifications which made the Sec. 202 projects so successful. In its present form, it is essentially a demonstration program to test the validity of the new financing mechanism: earlier last year, a report to Congress from the General Accounting Office stated that nearly $2.2 billion in savings over the next five years could occur if current subsidized housing programs were by direct federal loans instead of the present interest-subsidy approach.

While the revitalized Sec. 202 program will provide some housing relief for the elderly, other action is urged to ensure that older persons are not further neglected. To accomplish this, it is recommended that a percentage set-aside be established for providing housing specifically designed to meet the needs of the elderly within the various housing programs.

SUMMARY

It is increasingly evident that the only way the nation can meet its stated housing goals is to recognize that it will be expensive. Moreover, action is demanded now. To delay action in the name of providing alternatives for the future is a cruel form of neglect when the elderly are concerned. Existing programs that provide for housing production must continue to be funded: numerous studies point out that the problem is an absence of housing, not cash. But, as mentioned earlier, although the production of housing is a laudable endeavor, attention must be directed towards providing those projects intended specifically or substantially for elderly occupancy to include more community related services as well as the critical life supportive services required by older persons. In short, a national policy for housing the elderly must afford the elderly an opportunity to "live."

WOMEN'S EQUALITY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House resolution designating August 26 as "Women's Equality Day," which is similar to the bill, House Joint Resolution 52, passed by this body last year and signed into law.

August 26 marks the day women won the right to vote, and in this 54th anniversary year, I believe it is the duty of this Congress to recognize the long hard struggle of the women's movement for this basic right. August 26 symbolizes women's struggles, both past and present, and in the past few years it has become a rallying point for women around the country who gather in meetings, large and small, to voice their grievance. Last year in Washington alone, hundreds of women gathered at the two local rallies to discuss such topics as job discrimination, lack of adequate day-care facilities for working mothers, credit discrimination, professional recognition and promotion, accessibility of birth control information, and equal representation in political institutions from the local level to this Congress. These are not issues that concern just one political party, religion, class, or ethnic group. They concern every woman, every man, and should concern this House today.

I would like to assure my colleagues that we women are not deluding ourselves that a mere declaration of a special day will wipe out discrimination. We know this is a continuing struggle. We also know that it is only when women organize politically that the full potential of their power can be felt.

A few years ago, when women began to organize politically for the first time since winning the vote, we were scoffed at. The women's movement was described as a fad, a craze of bra-burners and kooks. Personally, I have never seen a bra burned. But we have proven that our movement is not a fad. It is a movement that appeals to women in every walk of life, because our goal is simple; it as a fight for equal rights for all people, not just half of the people.

But a national holiday is meaningless unless there is something to celebrate, and our victories have been too few and far between. This year, 33 of the needed 38 States have ratified the equal rights amendment. This year, numerous sex-discrimination amendments have been added to major pieces of legislation. But this year, still more bills equalizing pay, social security rights, credit availability, and other benefits remain in committee. I believe 1974 should be the year to create a national day that recognizes the progress women have made, but also realizes what inequities still exist. And this year should be the year that both sexes undertake the necessary steps to obliterate these inequities forever. But I believe it is important to give special recognition to the meaning with which the date August 26 has been imbued and to make this symbolize a congressional commitment to equality for American women.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT RESTRICTS NIXON POWER OF IMPOUNDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am elated to call to the attention of my colleagues a landmark decision which has just been issued by Judge June Green in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

In her order signed July 30 and released today, Judge Green has ruled in Rooney against Lynn, et al., that the water and sewer facilities program of grants to assist local governments to develop basic water and sewer systems, arbitrarily terminated by action of the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in January of 1973, be reactivated, that $400 million impounded since that time be released, and that HUD accept and process all applications from local governments throughout the United States.

The decision is vitally significant to the congressional appropriations process because it marks the first time a court has ever found that the President, through OMB, cannot legally place in reserve, or impound, any funds contained

in permanent appropriations. Judge Green ruled that the OMB practice of placing permanent appropriations funds in reserve is "in contravention of the Appropriations Act" which states that funds "are to remain available until expended."

Further, and also of critical importance to the Congress in asserting its coequal status in our system of government, the court found that I, as a Member of Congress, possessed the requisite standing in that my vote in the House of Representatives in support of the water and sewer facilities program was nullified by the actions of OMB and HUD in terminating this program.

The court's order also specifies that while the Secretary of HUD has discretion in determining whether to make a particular new grant award on the basis of the merits of the individual application, there is no statutory authority to exercise that discretion in a manner "calculated to obligate none of the funds."

I think it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the entire Congress is the victor in this decision. We have here an interpretation of existing law which recognizes that the Congress, in fact, has greater authority in the budget process than we sought to assert in the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, Public Law 93-344.

It is significant, too, that the court ruled that this case "is factually distinguishable from and therefore not controlled by" the housing suit, Pennsylvania against Lynn, in which the U.S. District Court of Appeals last week upheld the Nixon administration's suspension of major Federal housing subsidy programs. The distinction is that my suit challenged the administration's abandonment of the water and sewer program for fiscal reasons, while the appeals court found the housing programs were terminated because the administration determined they were not achieving their intended purposes. In the Housing case, the appeals court decision thus avoided the issue whether the President has the authority to impound.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the court order and findings of fact and conclusions of law in this case and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 2010-73, Filed Jul 30 1974]

The Honorable Fred B. Rooney, et al., Plaintiffs, versus James T. Lynn, et al., Defendants.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Plaintiff Fred B. Rooney is a member of the House of Representatives, United States Congress. Plaintiff Rooney represents the 15th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

2. Plaintiffs Borough of Freemansburg, Borough of Hellertown, Township of Lower Saucon, Borough of Nazareth and Township of South Whitehall are municipalities organized and existing under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, Plaintiff Rooney's constituents reside in these boroughs and townships. Each of these borough and township plaintiffs has filed a grant application under the Basic Water and Sewer Facilities Grant Program (Section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. § 1302(a)) (Program).

3. Defendant Roy L. Ash is the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

4. Defendant James T. Lynn is the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

5. By Public Law 93-135 (87 Stat. 483), Congress appropriated $400,000,000 for grants authorized by Section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. § 3102), to be derived from the unexpended balance of amounts appropriated in Public Law 92-73 and continued by Public Law 92-339, "to be available until expended". (Appropriations Act).

6. Under the Program, the Secretary of HUD is authorized to make grants to local communities for the development of basic water and sewer facilities.

7. The Secretary of HUD announced that effective January 5, 1973, HUD was terminating the processing of applications and the approval of grant commitments under Section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. § 3102). Thereafter, Secretary Romney stated that he had ordered a "temporary holding action" on new commitments pending enactment of the proposed Special Revenue Sharing Program, since designated the Better Communities Act. (See S. 1743, H.R. 7277, 93d Cong., 1st Sess. (1973)).

8. The decision to temporarily suspend grant commitments for the Basic Water and Sewer Facilities Program for Fiscal Year 1974 was also based upon the following considerations, according to the Affidavit of Paul H. O'Neill, Associate Director for Human and Community Affairs, OMB:

"(a) Given the existing scarcity of available Federal Resources, and in light of the fact that provision of water and sewer facilities has historically been strictly a local government responsibility, the provision of water and sewer facilities was not deemed to be an appropriate use of Federal dollars;

"(b) Federal grants are not necessary to finance necessary water and sewer facilities, as such facilities can and usually are financed through local user charges, and sewer systems have nationally yielded a profit to municipalities; and

"(c) Even if all funds under the program were utilized, the program could assist only about eight per cent of eligible applicants."

9. While the Secretary of HUD ordered a termination of the processing of applications and approval of new grant commitments, the Department continued to honor all commitments made prior to January 5, 1973. HUD requested, and OMB apportioned $100,000,000 on January 29, 1973, for Program use in Fiscal Year 1973. HUD approved grant reservations of $98,441,163 in Fiscal Year 1973. HUD requested, and OMB approved, an apportionment of no dollars for Program use in Fiscal Year 1974.

10. OMB has "reserved" for savings approximately $401,000,000 appropriated by Congress for grants authorized by Section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. § 3102), pursuant to the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. § 665(c)). This section and the reasons therefor were reported pursuant to the Federal Impoundment and Information Act, as amended. 38 Fed. Reg. 19582-83, 19594 (July 20, 1973).

It stated, in pertinent part, that:

"Existing tax laws and the statutory limitation on the national debt are not expected to provide sufficient funds in the current and ensuing fiscal years to cover the total of all outlays in these years contemplated by the individual acts of Congress."

11. After the termination of the Program, Congress took the following steps to secure resumption of processing applications for the Program:

(a) The House of Representatives Appropriations Committee directed that the unobligated funds for water and sewer grants be carried forward and that the Program be reactivated. (H.R. Rep. No. 275, 93d Cong., 1st Sess. 72-3 (1973)).

(b) The House of Representatives on June 15, 1973, passed a bill reappropriating all the impounded funds for the Program. (H.R. 8619, 93d Cong., 1st Sess. (1973)).

(c) the Senate Appropriations Committee concurred with the House directive that the unobligated funds be carried forward and the Program be reactivated. (S. Rep. No. 253, 93d Cong., 1st Sess. 50-51 (1973)).

(d) the Senate on June 28, 1973, passed H.R. 8619, *supra*, which reappropriated funds for the Program.

(e) H.R. 8619 was signed into law by the President on October 24, 1974. It became Pub. L. 93-135.

12. The defendants' actions (Lynn by continuing the termination of the Program, and Ash by reserving all the appropriated funds for the Program), prevent the plaintiff boroughs and townships from having their applications received, reviewed or funded under the Program.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Court has jurisdiction of this matter under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1361, 2201 and 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706.

2. Plaintiff boroughs and townships possess the requisite standing to maintain the action because they are potential beneficiaries under the Program. *Pennsylvania* v. *Lynn*, 362 F.Supp. 1363 (D.D.C. 1973), *rev'd. on other grads.* ———F. 2d ——— (D.C. Cir., decided July 19, 1974).

3. Congressman Fred B. Rooney possesses the requisite standing in his capacity as a member of Congress to maintain this action. The termination of this Congressionally authorized and funded program nullified his vote as a member of Congress and substantially affected his ability to represent his constituents. *Kennedy* v. *Sampson*, 364 F. Supp. 1075 (D.D.C. 1973); *Mitchell* v. *Laird*, 488 F.2d 611 (D.C. Cir. 1973), *reh, en banc denied* (1973).

4. The Court initially concludes that this case is factually distinguishable from and and therefore not controlled by *Pennsylvania* v. *Lynn, supra*. In the case at bar, the Program was terminated for *fiscal*, non-"program related" reasons (See Findings 6, 7, 9, *supra*), and Congress had *clearly* indicated its desire to reactivate the Program. (See Finding 10, *supra*).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AS TO HUD

5. Section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 3102), provides in pertinent part that the Secretary "is authorized to make grants to local public bodies or agencies to finance specific projects for basic public water or sewer facilities. . . ."

6. To make such a grant, the Secretary must determine that a project is necessary, will contribute to the community's health and living standards, and that the project is designed for reasonably foreseeable growth needs, consistent with a program meeting the Secretary's criteria for a unified or coordinated areawide water or sewer facilities system, and that it is necessary for orderly community development. 42 U.S.C. 3102(c).

7. Based upon the National Housing policy of the United States as established in the 1949 Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1441(a), the 1965 HUD Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3102 and legislative history, *supra*, there is an affrmative obligation on the part of the Secretary of HUD to administer the Program. This means receiving and reviewing grantee applications and funding those which the Secretary deems, in his judgment, meet the requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 3102 and applicable regulations.

8. While the Secretary of HUD continues

to exercise his discretion in determining whether to make a particular new grant award on the basis of the merits of the individual application, there is no statutory authority to exercise that discretion in a manner calculated to obligate none of the funds appropriated by Congress for new awards in Fiscal Year 1974.

9. The continued authorization and appropriation of funds for the Program and its legislative history mandate that the Program be operative. The Secretary's failure to carry out the Congressional mandate is an abuse of discretion.

10. This Court concludes that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, Pub. L. 89–117, 42 U.S.C. § 3102, the Secretary of HUD is obligated to expeditiously process the applications of plaintiffs, the Borough of Freemansburg, the Borough of Hellertown, the Township of Lower Saucon, the Borough of Nazareth, and the Township of South Whitehall for grants for basic water and sewer facilities on the basis of the statutory and regulatory criteria governing his evaluation of such applications.

CONCLUSION OF LAW AS TO OMB

11. Under the Anti-Deficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. 665(c), the language in the Appropriations Act "to remain available until expended" is considered an appropriation of funds not limited to a definite period of time, and as such they *"shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof"*. (*Emphasis added*).

12. Apportionment does not mean expenditure; it means the amount that is available for obligation.

13. The Director of OMB has placed the entire appropriation for the water and sewer program in "reserve". (38 Fed. Reg. 19594 (July 20, 1973)). "Reserve" is described by the OMB as identifying "amounts *not available* for obligation". (OMB Instructions on Budget Execution, Circular A–34, at 20, Sec. 42.7 (July 1971)). *Emphasis added*).

14. The OMB description of the word "reserve" as identifying "amounts which are not available for obligation" is in contravention of the Appropriations Act which states that the ". . . funds are to be available until expended", and in contravention of the Anti-Deficiency Act which states that such funds are not limited to a definite period of time within which to be apportioned.

15. Therefore, the total "reserving" of all appropriated funds for the Program violates the Anti-Deficiency Act, OMB's own guidelines and the Appropriations Act.

JUNE L. GREEN,
U.S. District Judge.

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 2010–73, July 30, 1974]

The Honorable Fred B. Rooney, et al., Plaintiffs, versus James T. Lynn, et al., Defendants.

ORDER

This matter having come before the Court on the plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment, and the defendants' Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative for Summary Judgment, and the Court having considered the record and the motions and oppositions of the respective parties, and having heard oral argument on the matter and being fully advised in the premises, it is this 30th day of July 1974,

Ordered that the Motion to Dismiss or for Summary Judgment of defendant, James T. Lynn, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is hereby denied;

That the Motion to Dismiss or for Summary Judgment of defendant, Roy L. Ash, Director of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is hereby denied;

That plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment is hereby granted; and it is

Further ordered:

(1) That defendant Ash, Director of OMB, release from reserve and apportion the appropriated funds for the Grants for Basic Water and Sewer Facilities Program in a manner which, in his judgment, is their most effective and economical use in the accomplishment of the Program and in conformity with the Anti-Deficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. § 665; and

(2) That defendant Lynn, Secretary of HUD, expeditiously consider the applications of plaintiffs herein, on the basis of the statutory and regulatory criteria governing the Secretary's evaluation of applications for the Grants for Basic Water and Sewer Facilities Program authorized by Section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. § 3102); and

(3) That defendant Lynn, Secretary of HUD, reactivate the Grants for the Basic Water and Sewer Facilities Program by accepting and processing *all* applications from local communities for such grants and by awarding grants to those applicants, who in his judgment, best meet the requirements of Section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. § 3102).

JUNE L. GREEN,
U.S. District Judge.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS CAMPAIGN ACT AMENDMENTS

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, when the House considers H.R. 16090, the Federal Elections Campaign Act amendments, three colleagues and I intend to offer an amendment dealing with public financing of congressional elections. I am proud to be joined in this effort by my good friends, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, and Mr. CONABLE, with active support from 38 colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

This limited amendment will establish a matching payment system for congressional general elections which will be financed out of the "dollar checkoff" fund already provided in this legislation for Presidential elections.

So that our colleagues may be fully aware of the details of this proposal, the text of the amendment follows:

CONGRESSIONAL MATCHING PAYMENT AMENDMENT

On page 78, line 4, add the following new Section 409, and renumber the existing Sections 409 and 410 to become Sections 410 and 411.

CONGRESSIONAL MATCHING PAYMENT ACCOUNT

SEC. 409. (a) The analysis of subtitles at the beginning of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by substituting the following new Subtitle H:

"Subtitle H. Financing of Federal Election Campaigns."

(b) The analysis of chapters at the beginning of subtitle H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Chapter 98. Congressional Matching Payment Account."

(c) Subtitle H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"Chapter 98—CONGRESSIONAL MATCHING PAYMENT ACCOUNT

"SEC. 9051. SHORT TITLE

"This chapter may be cited as the 'Congressional Matching Payment Account Act.'

"SEC. 9052. DEFINITIONS

"For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) 'authorized committee' means the principal campaign committee of a candidate for federal office as designated under Section 302(f) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971;

"(2) 'contribution' means a gift of money made by a written instrument which identifies the person making the contribution by full name and mailing address, but does not include a subscription, loan, advance or deposit of money, or a contribution of products or services;

"(3) 'eligible candidate' means a candidate for election to federal office who is eligible under section 9053, for payments under this title;

"(4) 'Federal office' means the federal office of Senator, or Representative;

"(5) 'general election' means any regularly scheduled or special election held for the purpose of electing a candidate to Federal office;

"(6) 'matching account' means the Congressional Matching Payment Account established under section 9057;

"(7) 'official political party committee' means a political committee organized by the House or Senate members of any political party having more than 15 percent of the membership of either the House of Representatives or Senate of the United States and designated as an official political party committee by the appropriate House or Senate caucus of the political party;

"(8) 'qualified campaign expenses' means only those campaign expenses incurred in behalf of a candidate for the use of:

"(i) broadcasting stations to the extent that they represent direct charges for airtime;

"(ii) newspapers, magazines and outdoor advertising facilities to the extent that they represent direct charges for advertising space;

"(iii) direct mailings to the extent that they represent charges for postage; and

"(iv) telephones to the extent that they represent lease and use charges for equipment.

Provided, That qualified campaign expenses shall not include any payment which constitutes a violation of any law of the United States or of the state in which the expense is paid or incurred.

"(9) 'Representative' means a Member of the House of Representatives, and the Delegates from the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

"SEC. 9053. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENTS

"(a) To be eligible to receive any payments under section 9057 for use in connection with his general election campaign, a candidate shall certify to the supervisory officer that the candidate is the nominee of a political party for election to the federal office of Representative or Senator or is otherwise qualified on the ballot as a candidate in the general election for such office, and he and his authorized committees have received contributions for that campaign in the amount of 10 percent of the maximum amount he may spend in the general election under section 608(c): *Provided*, That no candidate in the general election for the office of Senator need raise more than $50,000.

"(b) To be eligible to receive any payments under section 9057 for use as campaign contributions an official political party committee shall have its chairman certify to the

supervisory officer its status as an official political party committee.

"(c) In determining the amount of contributions received for purposes of subsection (a) and of Section 9054(a)—

"(1) no contribution received as a subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, or as a contribution of products or services, shall be taken into account;

"(2) no contribution from any person shall be taken into account (a) in the case of a candidate to the extent that it exceeds $50 when added to the amount of all other contributions made by that person to or for the benefit of that candidate in connection with his election campaign; and (b) in the case of an official political party committee to the extent that it exceeds $50 in a given calendar year when added to the amount of all other contributions made by that person to the official political party committees of a given political party during the calendar year.

"(3) no contribution from any person shall be taken into account unless the recipient submits to the supervisory officer at such times and in such form as the supervisory officer may require, a matching payments voucher. Such voucher shall include the full name of any person making a contribution together with the date, the exact amount of the contribution, the complete address of the contributor and such other information as the supervisory officer may require.

"(4) no contribution from any person shall be taken into account in the case of a candidate to the extent that it was received prior to June 1 of the calendar year in which the general election is held, or in the case of a special general election, to the extent that it was received prior to three months before the special general election is held.

"(5) no contribution from any person shall be taken into account in the case of a candidate to the extent that it was received by a candidate or his authorized committee in pursuit of an unsuccessful attempt to obtain his party's nomination for the federal office being sought.

"(d) Certification under this section shall be filed with the supervisory officer at the time required by the supervisory officer.

"SEC. 9054. ENTITLEMENT TO PAYMENTS

"(a) Every eligible candidate and official political party committee is entitled to payments in an amount which is equal to the amount of contributions received by that candidate or official political party committee, subject to the provisions set forth in Section 9053.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), no candidate is entitled to the payment of any amount under this section which, when added to the total amount of any other payments made to him under this section exceeds the amount of thirty-three percent of the expenditure limitation applicable to him for his general election campaign under section 608(c).

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), no candidate shall be entitled to receive any payments under this section prior to the date on which the nominating process is complete in the candidate's state for the federal office being sought in the general election, provided that in no event shall any funds be paid to any candidate prior to June 1 of the calendar year in which the general election is held, or in the case of a special general election, prior to three months before the special general election is held.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), no official political party committee is entitled to receive in a given calendar year an amount in excess of $1 million when added to the amounts received by all other official political party committees of that political party during the calendar year.

"(e) No campaign contributions made by an official political party committee to a Congressional candidate shall be eligible to be matched by the candidate with funds otherwise available under this chapter to the candidate.

"SEC. 9055. LIMITATIONS

"(a) No candidate and his authorized committee who receive payments under this chapter shall use these funds except for qualified campaign expenses incurred for the period set forth in Section 9054(c).

"(b) No official political party committee which receives funds under this chapter shall use those funds except for purposes of making general election campaign contributions to Congressional candidates.

"(c) All payments received by a candidate or official political party committee under this chapter shall be deposited in a separate checking account at a national or state bank designated by the candidate or official political party committee and shall be administered by the candidate or the candidate's principal campaign committee or by the official political party committee. No expenditures of any payments received under this chapter shall be made except by checks drawn on this separate checking account at a national or state bank. The supervisory office may require such reports on the expenditures of these funds as it deems appropriate.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, no more than 100 percent of the allowable spending limit for a given candidate in a general election under Section 608(c), shall be paid under this chapter to all eligible candidates in that race; provided that the Secretary of the Treasury, in seeking an equitable distribution of such funds shall make such distribution in the same sequence in which such certifications are received pursuant to Section 9056.

"SEC. 9056. CERTIFICATIONS BY SUPERVISORY OFFICER

"(a) After a candidate or official political party committee establishes its eligibility under section 9053 and subject to the provisions of Section 9054, the supervisory officer shall expeditiously certify from time to time to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each candidate or official political party committee the amount to which that candidate or official political party committee is entitled.

"(b) Initial certifications by the supervisory officer under subsection (a), and all determinations made by it under this chapter, shall be final and conclusive, except to the extent that they are subject to examination and audit by the supervisory officer under section 9058 and judicial review under section 9060.

"SEC. 9057. PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES

"(a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish and maintain an account known as the Congressional Matching Payment Account. The funds in this Matching Account shall be available for payment to any candidate or official political party committee eligible to receive payments under section 9053. The Secretary shall deposit in a Presidential election year into the Matching Account the excess amounts available under Section 6096, after the Secretary determines and allocates the amounts required in that Presidential election year in accordance with sections 9006, 9008 and 9037.

"In each of the two years following a Presidential election, the Secretary shall deposit into the Matching Account that portion of the annual amounts designated by taxpayers under section 6096 that equals the excess above twenty-five percent of the total amount made available in the last Presidential election in allocating funds under sections 9006, 9008 and 9037. The monies in the Matching Account shall remain available without fiscal year limitation.

"(b) Upon receipt of a certification from the supervisory officer under section 9056, and subject to the provisions of sections 9053, 9054, and 9055, the Secretary of the Treasury shall promptly pay the amount certified by the supervisory officer from the Matching Account to the candidate or official political party committee to whom the certification relates.

"(c) If on June 1 of any election year the Secretary determines that the funds deposited in the Matching Account pursuant to paragraph (a) amount to less than 100 percentum of the maximum aggregate entitlement for such election, he shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this Chapter, limit payments to each candidate to an amount which bears the same ratio to the maximum entitlement of such candidate as the amount of funds in the Matching Account bears to the maximum aggregate entitlement.

"(d) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) 'maximum entitlement' means the total amount of payments which may be received by a candidate subject to the limitation of section 9054 (b); and

"(2) 'maximum aggregate entitlement' means an amount which is the product of two and the sum of the maximum entitlements for each Federal office for which an election is to be held.

"(e) No payment shall be made under this chapter to any candidate for any campaign in connection with any election occurring before October 31, 1976 or to any official political party committee before June 1, 1976.

"SEC. 9058. EXAMINATION AND AUDITS; REPAYMENTS

"(a) After each general election, the supervisory officer shall conduct a thorough examination and audit of all candidates for Federal office and official political party committees with respect to the funds received and spent under this chapter.

"(b)(1) If the supervisory officer determines that any portion of the payments made to an eligible candidate or official political party committee under section 9057 was in excess of the aggregate amount of the payments to which the recipient was entitled, it shall so notify that recipient and the recipient shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount equal to the excess amount.

"(2) If the supervisory officer determines that any portion of the payments made to a candidate under section 9057 for use in his general election campaign was used for any purpose other than for qualified campaign expenses in connection with that campaign, the supervisory officer shall so notify the candidate and the candidate shall pay an amount equal to that amount to the Secretary.

"(3) If the supervisory officer determines that any portion of the payments made to an official political party committee under section 9057 were used for any purpose other than to make general election campaign contributions to Congressional candidates, the supervisory officer shall so notify the official political party committee and the official political party committee shall pay an amount equal to that amount to the Secretary.

"(4) Amounts received by a candidate under this chapter may be retained for thirty days after the general election for the purpose of liquidating all obligations to pay qualified campaign expenses which were incurred for the period set forth in section 9054(c). After the thirty-day period following the election, all remaining federal funds not yet expended on qualified campaign expenses shall be promptly repaid by the candidate to the Matching Account.

"(5) If the supervisory officer determines

that any candidate who has received funds under this chapter, is convicted of violating any provision of this chapter, the supervisory officer shall notify the candidate and the candidate, shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury the full amount received under this chapter.

"(6) No payment shall be required from a candidate or official political party committee under this section in excess of the total amount of all payments received by the candidate or official political party committee under section 9057.

"(c) No notification shall be made by the supervisory officer under subsection (b) with respect to a campaign more than three years after the day of the election to which the campaign related.

"(d) All payments received by the Secretary under subsection (b) shall be deposited by him in the Matching Account.

"SEC. 9059. REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"(a) The supervisory officer shall, as soon as practicable after the close of each calendar year, submit a full report to the Senate and House of Representatives setting forth—

"(1) the qualified campaign expenses (shown in the detail the supervisory officer deems necessary) incurred by a candidate and his authorized committees, and by each official political party committee, who received any payment under section 9057.

"(2) the amounts certified by it under section 9056 for payment to each candidate and his authorized committees and each official political party committee; and

"(3) the amount of payments, if any, required from that candidate or official political party committee under section 9058, and the reasons for each payment required. Each report submitted pursuant to this section shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

"SEC. 9060. JUDICIAL REVIEW

"(a) Any agency action by the supervisory officer made under the provisions of this chapter shall be subject to review by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upon petition filed in such court within 30 days after the agency action by the supervisory officer for which review is sought.

"(b) Review Procedures—The provisions of Chapter 7 of Title 5, United States Code apply to judicial review of any agency action, as defined in Section 551 (13) of Title 5, United States Code.

"SEC. 9061. UNLAWFUL USE OF PAYMENTS

"It shall be unlawful for any person who receives payment under this chapter or to whom any portion of such payment is transferred, knowingly and willfully to use, or authorize the use of, such payment or such portion for any purpose other than for the specific purposes authorized by this chapter.

"SEC. 9062. FALSE STATEMENTS

"It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly and willfully to furnish any false, fictitious or fraudulent evidence, books or information to the supervisory officer under this chapter or to include in any evidence, books, or information so furnished any misrepresentation of a material fact, or to falsify or conceal any evidence, books or information relevant to a certification by the supervisory officer.

"SEC. 9063. KICKBACKS AND ILLEGAL PAYMENTS

"It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly and willfully to give or accept any kickback or any illegal payment in connection with any payments received under this Chapter or in connection with any expenditures of payments received under this chapter.

"SEC. 9064. PENALTY FOR VIOLATIONS

"(a) Any knowing and willful violation of any provision of this chapter is punishable by a fine of not more than $25,000, or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both."

CHANGES IN FAA REGULATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL ON AIRCRAFT

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I would like to announce that the Atomic Energy Commission has recommended changes in FAA regulations governing the transportation of radioactive materials on passenger aircraft. The recommended changes are the result of a series of studies of the past 16 months to evaluate the adequacy of existing regulations.

The AEC on Wednesday, July 31, issued the following press release on its recommendations:

AEC RECOMMENDS CHANGES IN REGULATIONS ON TRANSPORTING RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS ON AIRCRAFT

The Atomic Energy Commission's Regulatory staff today forwarded to the Federal Aviation Administration recommended changes in some FAA regulations governing the transportation of radioactive materials on passenger aircraft.

If adopted by FAA, the proposed changes would (1) reduce by one-half the maximum radiation level at any single seat on a passenger flight from packages of radioactive materials; (2) limit the maximum radiation exposure rate from any single package of radioactive material to less than one-third the current allowable rate on passenger flights; and (3) prohibit from passenger flights "unnecessary" shipments of radioactive materials.

Last year there were about 800,000 domestic shipments of radioactive materials of which approximately 75 percent were carried by air. Ninety-five percent of the airborne shipments contained radioisotopes used for medical diagnostic and therapeutic purposes in hospitals and doctors' offices throughout the country.

The AEC, in cooperation with the FAA and the Department of Transportation, has conducted a series of studies over the past 16 months to evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of existing regulations. Based on the studies, the AEC believes the proposed changes in regulations can be implemented without limiting the shipment of medical radioisotopes.

Radiation levels would be cut in half either by using predesignated areas in cargo compartments for carrying limited amounts of radioactive materials or by specifying minimum separation distances between the floors of passenger compartments and the nearest surface of the packages. The external radiation dose rate of packages would be reduced by limiting the "Transportation Index" (TI) of any single package to 3 TI instead of 10 TI (one TI equals a radiation level of one millirem per hour at three feet from the surface of the package).

Shipments of radioactive materials which would be banned from passenger aircraft as "unnecessary" are those with radioactive yellow-III labels with the exception of radiopharmaceuticals and of radionuclides having half-lives of 30 days or less. Packages marked with radioactive yellow-III labels are those with more than 10 millirems per hour of radioactivity at the surface of the package and more than 0.5 millirems per hour at three feet.

Among the shipments prohibited would be radioactive sources such as iridium-192 used in industrial radiography. It was an improperly packaged source of iridium-192 which led to the exposure to unnecessary radiation of passengers on two passenger flights early last April.

CORRECTIONS IN H.R. 69

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I will move that the House suspend the rules to agree to a House concurrent resolution which will correct certain clerical errors made in the conference report on H.R. 69. I would now like to take a minute to describe those corrections.

The first correction will be to add two subsections to the State program for the handicapped under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Those subsections were adopted in an identical form by both the House and the Senate but through error were deleted from the conference report as it was filed.

The second correction will be to insert the correct references to a title of the bill which is being amended by section 252 of the bill. This correction has no substantive effect.

The third correction will be to strike "Office" from a section dealing with the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped in the U.S. Office of Education. This correction also has no substantive effect.

Mr. Speaker, I have deleted from the concurrent resolution which I am going to bring up on Monday two sections which appear in the House Concurrent Resolution 570, which I tried to bring up before the House last Wednesday after the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 69. One of those corrections dealt with the impact aid program, and the other correction dealt with the Equal Educational Opportunity Act. After checking the enrolled bill, we discovered that those two errors did not appear in the enrolled bill although they did appear as printing errors in the conference report as it was printed and distributed. Since they did not appear in the enrolled bill as errors, they are not necessary to correct.

The text of the concurrent resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. —

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 69) to extend and amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed to make the correction described in the following sentence. Immediately after subsection (b) of section 121 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which is added by section 101(a)(2)(E) of the bill, insert the following:

"(c) A State agency shall use the payments made under this section only for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and, where necessary, the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of such children, and the State agency shall provide assurances to the Commissioner that each such child in average daily attendance counted under subsection (b) will be

provided with such a program, commensurate with his special needs, during any fiscal year for which such payments are made.

"(d) In the case where such a child leaves an educational program for handicapped children operated or supported by the State agency in order to participate in such a program operated or supported by a local educational agency, such child shall be counted under subsection (b) if (1) he continues to receive an appropriately designed educational program and (2) the State agency transfers to the local educational agency in whose program such child participates an amount equal to the sums received by such State agency under this section which are attributable to such child, to be used for the purposes set forth in subsection (c)."

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of such bill is further authorized and directed to make the correction described in the following sentence. In section 252 of the bill, strike "Title IV" and insert in lieu thereof "Title V".

SEC. 3. The Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of such bill is further authorized and directed to make the correction described in the following sentence. In the title of section 612 of the bill, strike out *"Office"* and insert in lieu thereof *"Bureau"*.

UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR OF MOBIL OIL CORP.

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today condemning on the floor of the House of Representatives, the blatantly unethical behavior of the Mobil Oil Corp. and I am calling for an immediate investigation into its activities by both the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Energy Administration.

During the last few months, Mobil has subjected the American people to a barage of advertisements stressing the need for energy conservation in industry, at home, and on the road. They have incorporated into these ads a lot of nonsense stating in no uncertain terms that Mobil Oil Corp. desperately wants America to use less gasoline.

Ordinarily such efforts, albeit suspicious conduct for a gasoline company, would be laudable. However, I have conclusive proof that simultaneous to conducting this public relations gambit, Mobil Oil Co. has been pressuring a constituent of mine to sell more gasoline, complete with veiled threats to his ownership of the station if he did not comply.

How can a company which admits the energy crisis will be with us for a long time, which paternally delates that "the American public must develop a new national ethic with respect to the use of energy," be surreptitiously pushing for increased sales? How can this be?

Mobil Oil Co. has on the one hand advertised their commitment to energy conservation while on the other has pushed for higher gasoline sales. Mr. Roger W. Sank, acting assistant administrator of the FEA, explained to my office that such actions were "contrary to the whole spirit expressed to us." I categorize such behavior as clearly dichotomous, hypocritical and unethical. Mobil is egregiously insulting the intelligence of the American people and guilty of unquestionable moral laxity.

Included for the RECORD is the letter sent to one of my constituents by Mobil. His name and any possibly revealing statistics have been deleted for his protection. I would also like to mention for the RECORD that he is an independent dealer, and that I will personally take care that Mobil takes no vengeful action against him.

In conclusion I ask my colleagues in the House and Senate to juxtapose this letter to a number of Mobil's energy conservation advertisements, also included. Does this seem like ethical behavior to you? Does a dealer, in light of this Nation's energy woes, have "an obligation to Mobil" to sell more gasoline? I think not; and condemn Mobil accordingly. I am axiously awaiting the results of investigations into Mobil's advertising practices and its relationships with independent dealers.

The material follows:

MOBIL OIL CORP.,
Wethersfield, Conn., July 1974.

DEAR ———: Your monthly gasoline allocation is based on historical factors and proven growth at your location. The allocation for the months of May and June at your location were ——— gallons and ——— gallons respectively. Your total purchases for these two months were ——— gallons or ——— gallons short of what you could have purchased.

You have a very important obligation to your customers, to yourself and to the Mobil Oil Corporation to sell the full allocation available to you each month. Your Marketing Representative ——— has discussed various actions which you could take that would enable you to make your full allocation available to the consuming public. Within the next few days ——— will again review with you our recommendations to eliminate the operational shortcomings and help you fully use the allocation to which you are entitled.

If you have any questions regarding your allocation or our recommendation to fully utilize the allocation you are entitled to, please do not hesitate to discuss them with ——— or ——— your Area Manager, or myself.

Very truly yours,
R. R. SPIOTTA,
District Manager, Connecticut/ Rhode Island District.

[This ad appeared in the New York Times on December 13, 1973]

A FEW REASONS FOR CONSERVING PETROLEUM

Besides fueling our furnaces and cars, petroleum is an essential raw material for an endless list of things. Without these things, we wouldn't eat or play or live very well. And if the industries that make them slow down, many of us won't have jobs. So conserve.

MOBIL.

[This ad appeared in the New York Times on November 29, 1973]

WE MAKE MORE BY USING LESS

This weekend, many a homeowner will be tracking down cold drafts, putting up the last of the storm windows, and yelling at the kids for leaving the back door open.

We're doing the same kinds of things at our refineries, where vast amounts of heat-energy are used to convert crude oil into products like home-heating oil and gasoline.

The homeowner insulates the attic; we wrap tons of insulation around pipes, boilers, and reactor units.

He turns down the thermostat; we use a computer to find the lowest temperature that will keep each refinery unit operating efficiently.

We also go a bit further, like operating an entire refinery by computer for top efficiency.

We recycle waste heat. We transfer heat from hot air going up the chimney to cold air coming into the furnace. And when a product is distilled out of crude oil at high temperature, we transfer waste heat from the product to the crude oil. In both cases we reduce the amount of fuel needed to run the furnaces.

Nothing new about insulating boilers or recycling waste heat. Modern refineries are designed for the conservation of energy—just as new homes and factories and all other buildings should be.

What's new is our Energy Conservation Activity, an all-out effort to apply hundreds of small, extra steps to conserve fuel in our U.S. refineries. Total savings in this program now exceed 60 million gallons of oil a year, and each gallon saved can be converted into consumer products. By the end of 1976 we will be saving nearly 300 million gallons of oil a year. Other companies have similar programs.

This will by no means solve the energy shortage. But along with savings in the producing, transportation, and marketing parts of the business, it will help. And petroleum is just one industry that can save energy.

Conservation costs money. Heat exchangers, computers and other equipment are expensive. That's where some of our profits go. Just as some of a homeowner's earnings might go into oil-burner tuneups, attic insulation, or storm windows.

And like the homeowner, we may save enough oil to offset the cost. These days, neither homeowner nor businessman can afford to pass up an investment that saves money and conserves energy at the same time.

MOBIL.

[This ad appeared in the New York Times on June 15, 1972]

EVEN IF YOU HAVE MONEY TO BURN, YOU SHOULD SAVE ENERGY

We have a booklet called *Money Saving Tips from Mobil*. It's free. You ought to have it, even if a shortage of cash is not one of the crises in your life.

You should have this booklet because there is a crisis that affects you no matter how well off you may be. It's the energy crisis in the United States.

We Americans use far more energy than any other people on earth. Energy is so central to our lives that virtually everything that works in our country—and almost every job—depends on it to some degree.

Oil and natural gas supply three-quarters of the energy used in the United States. Yet crude oil reserves in the lower 48 states are now at the lowest point in 20 years, while natural gas reserves are at the lowest level since 1957. Our country is moving out of an era of abundant, low-cost, largely indigenous energy into an era of serious and growing shortage of domestic energy and greatly increased imports.

Meanwhile, the demand for energy is growing year by year.

Dwindling supply, growing demand. A gap. A widening gap. And when a serious supply-demand gap opens in anything as essential as energy, it's a crisis.

Money Saving Tips aims to help alleviate the energy crisis. It lists 42 practical ways to reduce your consumption of the energy fuels (gasoline, fuel oil, natural gas) needed to power your car, your air-conditioning, and your home-heating system—and to save money in the process.

Here's a sample tip, about driving:

"With a manual transmission, get your car

into high gear quickly. At 20 mph, second gear consumes up to 20% more fuel than high—and first gear, up to 55% more."

Here's one on air conditioning:

"You can cut down hours of operation by drawing outdoor air through the house with an attic ventilating fan."

Sensible stuff.

Why should we tell you how to save fuel, when we're in the business of selling it?

Because the most important thing we can sell right now is energy conservation. That's one reason we've been urging improvements in mass transit all these months. We hate to see energy fuels wasted. We don't believe the gasoline consumed by a car idling in a traffic jam represents the best possible use of limited petroleum resources.

Our little booklet won't solve the energy crisis in the United States. Substantial government and other actions are needed. But the booklet can help.

And it certainly won't hurt you to save money, will it?

Send for a free copy of *Money Saving Tips from Mobil*. Write Room 646, 150 East 42nd Street, New York, New York 10017.

MOBIL.

[Advertisement from the New York Times, June 28, 1973]

MOBIL NEWS RELEASE

Mobil Oil Corporation today announced it is discontinuing its gasoline advertising, including its "Mr. Dirt" television and radio commercials.

The company said it would redirect its efforts toward broad public-service and public-information programs covering the conservation of gasoline and specific suggestions on more efficient use of available energy.

"The American public must develop a new national ethic with respect to the use of energy," Mobil Chairman Rawleigh Warner, Jr. said. "We as a nation must adopt long-term approaches to conserve energy, because the energy shortage will be with us for some time."

Please note there is no "E" in Mobil.

[Advertisement from the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1974]

THIS MANY AMERICANS DIDN'T DIE IN JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, THANKS TO THE 55 MPH SPEED LIMIT

This January and February 1,880 people didn't get killed on U.S. highways compared with highway fatalities during the same months last year.

This January and February, 40,000 people didn't suffer disabling injuries in car accidents compared with the number hurt during the same months last year.

So say the statistics compiled by the National Safety Council.

Some of the lives were saved because motorists couldn't get enough gasoline and used their cars less. But, according to NSC, most of the lives were saved because, by and large, people observed the 55 mph speed limit.

Nationally, fatalities decreased 25% in the two-month period. Traffic deaths in some states fell even more dramatically—46% in Maryland 68% in Rhode Island, 74% in Utah—where lower speed limits began earlier or were more vigorously enforced.

Caution: these figures don't cover the weeks following the lifting of the Arab oil embargo, when drivers began to regain some of that old get-up-and-go-spirit.

Will American motorists once again slaughter 55,600 people a year as they did in 1973?

We hope not. We hope the energy crisis taught us not just that the 55 mph limit saves dollars and gasoline. But much, much more.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today, on account of official business.

Ms. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

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 Member (at the request of Mr. SARASIN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ESCH, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DRINAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MELCHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia to revise and extend his remarks in connection with the debate on H.R. 15736.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SARASIN) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUDE in five instances.

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. GILMAN in three instances.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. SYMMS.

Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.

Mr. REGULA.

Mr. HUBER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in five instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in five instances.

Mr. HANNA in six instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. TIERNAN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2354. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the African Development Fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3362. An act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the operation, maintenance, and continued construction of the Federal transmission system in the Pacific Northwest by use of the revenues of the Federal Columbia River Power System and the proceeds of revenue bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11873. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee did on August 2, 1974, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8217. An act to exempt from duty certain equipment and repairs for vessels operated by or for any agency of the United States where the entries were made in connection with vessels arriving before January 5, 1971, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10309. An act to amend the act of June 13, 1933 (Public Law 73-40), concerning safety standards for boilers and pressure vessels, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13264. An act to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 5, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXVI, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2618. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of a facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2619. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1973-May 1974, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2620. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of State, transmitting of his determination that the provisions of assistance to Egypt consisting of a VH3A helicopter is essential to the national interest of the United States, and that such assistance will neither directly nor indirectly assist aggressive actions by Egypt, pursuant to section 620(p) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2370(p)) and Executive Order 10973; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2621. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed plan for the use and distribution of Ponca judgment funds awarded in dockets 322, 323, and 324 before the Indian Claims Commission, pursuant to 87 Stat. 466; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2622. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of June 30, 1974, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 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 internal policies regarding chemical warfare. (Rept. No. 93–1257). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFF: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 507. Concurrent resolution for negotiations on the Turkish opium ban; with amendment (Rept. No. 93–1258). 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. PHILLIP BURTON:

H.R. 16244. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the life and work of Harriet Tubman; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. GROVER, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 16245. A bill to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 in order to strengthen the import restrictions which may be imposed to deter foreign countries from conducting fishing operations which adversely affect international fishery conservation programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself and Mr. BREAUX):

H.R. 16246. A bill to prohibit the transfer of atomic technology to foreign powers without the express approval of the Congress; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MADIGAN:

H.R. 16247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the exemption for purposes of the Federal Estate Tax, to increase the estate tax marital deduction, and to provide an alternate method of valuing certain real property for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 16248. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to authorize a tuition assistance program for enlisted members of the National Guard and the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 16249. A bill to support the price of milk at 90 percentum of the parity price for the period beginning April 1, 1974, and ending March 31, 1976; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Ms. BURKE of California, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 16250. A bill to require candidates for Federal office, Members of the Congress, and officers and employees of the United States to file statements with the Comptroller General with respect to their income and financial transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. CULVER):

H.R. 16251. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 16252. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands for an entrance road at Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.J. Res. 1105. Joint resolution designating August 26 of each year as Women's Equality Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.J. Res. 1106. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the Fourth Sunday in September annually as National Next Door Neighbor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. LOTT, Mr. GINN, Mr. CLARK, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. FOLEY, Miss JORDAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. DULSKI):

H. Con. Res. 577. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. STEED, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. YATES, Mr. RYAN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. DRINAN):

H. Con. Res. 578. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. REUSS, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. STEELMAN, Mr. MARAZITI, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. MINISH, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

H. Con. Res. 579. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. MCCORMACK, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. RODINO, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. FREY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. STEELE, Mr. TREEN, Mr. HUBER, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. PREYER, Mr. HICKS, and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H. Con. Res. 580. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANRAHAN (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. RARICK, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. GRAY, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. HUBER, Mr. COLLIER, and Mr. LONG of Maryland):

H. Con. Res. 581. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the imprisonment in the Soviet Union of a Lithuanian seaman, who is a U.S. citizen, and who unsuccessfully sought asylum aboard a U.S. Coast Guard ship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANRAHAN (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. ABDNOR, and Mr. MCCLORY):

H. Con. Res. 582. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the imprisonment in the Soviet Union of a Lithuanian seaman, who is a U.S. citizen, and who unsuccessfully sought asylum aboard a U.S. Coast Guard ship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Res. 1288. Resolution regarding censure of President Richard M. Nixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H. Res. 1289. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the participation of the United States in an international effort to reduce the risk of famine and to lessen human suffering; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.