

The Speaker's Rooms  
U. S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C. 20515

This Bill

is

on

today

weel

June 27

The Speaker's Rooms  
U. S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C. 20515

Indian Health Service  
Centers at Hugo,  
McAlester, Eufala.

House debate is marked  
in this RECORD.

liquidation of an increased obligation program for the construction of trails.

The budget proposed a substantial reduction in the obligation program, and a corresponding reduction in the liquidating cash requirements. The basis for this reduction was that timber purchasers should be given the responsibility for constructing timber access roads. The committee does not agree with this policy. It has the effect of reducing total receipts to the Federal Government, and therefore to the State and county governments who also share the revenues. Furthermore, it encourages construction of roads whose quality is not consistent with the multiple use objectives of Forest Service lands. In addition, it discourages the small timber operator from competing for timber contracts and depletes the fine engineering staff presently employed by the Forest Service.

The committee directs that no funds be used to prepare for timber sales which require purchasers to locate, survey, or design permanent roads. The committee expects a supplemental estimate or budget amendment to be submitted to the committee providing for both the 11.8 billion board feet sales program recently announced and also a more responsible road construction program in light of the long term needs of all forest users. It is recognized that the road construction program must have the most thoughtful attention if it is to serve both timber production and the environment esthetics of the Nation.

In addition to the proposed obligation program, the committee directs the Forest Service to assist the State and county jurisdictions involved in the costs for construction of a 29-mile segment of road between Boulder, Utah, and Grover, Utah.

#### ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS, SPECIAL ACTS

Appropriation, 1973	\$80,000
Estimate, 1974	94,000
Recommended, 1974	94,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+14,000
Estimate, 1974	

Congress has enacted several special laws which authorize appropriations from the receipts of specified national forests for the purchase of lands to minimize erosion and flood damage.

#### ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

Appropriation, 1973	
Estimate, 1974	\$55,300
Recommended, 1974	55,300
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	55,300
Estimate, 1974	

The act of December 4, 1967—16 U.S.C. 484a—stipulates that deposits made by public school districts or public school authorities to provide for cash equalization of certain land exchanges can be appropriated to acquire similar lands suitable for national forest system purposes in the same State as the national forest lands conveyed in the exchanges.

#### COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS (SPECIAL FUND, INDEFINITE)

Appropriation, 1973	\$700,000
Estimate, 1974	700,000
Recommended, 1974	700,000

#### Comparison:

Appropriation, 1973	-----
Estimate, 1974	-----

Part of the grazing fees from the national forests, when appropriated, are used for revegetation of depleted range lands, construction and maintenance of range improvements, rodent control, and eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds.

#### ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

Appropriation, 1973	\$1,020,000
Estimate, 1974	1,020,000
Recommended, 1974	1,013,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	-7,000
Estimate, 1974	-7,000

These funds are used to provide advice, technical assistance, and financial contributions under section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, to carry out increased tree planting and reforestation work on non-Federal forest lands.

Grants are matched by the States, and work is conducted in accordance with the plans submitted by the States, and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF RECREATION FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1973	-----
Estimate, 1974	\$3,546,000
Recommended, 1974	3,546,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+3,546,000
Estimate, 1974	

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,546,000, the budget estimate. Authority for this program originates from Public Law 92-347, approved July 11, 1972, whereby admission fees and user charges collected by the U.S. Forest Service at certain recreation areas are made available for appropriation for recreation-related activities.

The recommendation will provide for repair of facilities at 3,053 fee-designated sites and increased enforcement of laws and regulations on Forest Service lands in order to reduce vandalism.

#### SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

Appropriation, 1973	-----
Estimate, 1974	\$1,000,000
Recommended, 1974	-----
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	-----
Estimate, 1974	-1,000,000

The bill provides no appropriation for this activity. The committee believes that forest-related research can more usefully be accomplished in this country at this particular time.

#### COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973	\$135,000
Estimate, 1974	144,000
Recommended, 1974	143,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+8,000
Estimate, 1974	-1,000

The Commission of Fine Arts is a permanent advisory agency created to give advice concerning aesthetic standards and matters of civic design involved in the orderly development of the city of Washington; and to furnish expert opinion on questions of art to the President, to the Congress and its committees, and to the heads of various departments

and agencies of the Federal and District governments.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Earlier I noted the deficiencies we have in our hospital programs. I cannot urge too strongly that OMB correct this imbalance in the next budget year. We must begin to put money into the reconstruction and construction of Indian hospitals.

Interestingly enough, in the years from 1965 through 1972 this Congress has authorized the expenditure of \$43,675,000 for the construction and capital improvements of American hospitals abroad in Beirut, Paris, Turkey, Rome, Taiwan, Nigeria, Israel, Poland, Afghanistan, India, Turkey, and Liberia. In those same years the Indian hospital construction for the American Indians in the United States of American was \$19,693,900. These figures speak for themselves, but as a footnote may I remind this Congress that American Indians are our own citizens and it was probably due to their cooperation that we are now here as a nation. Some recipients of hospitals abroad, I dare say, seldom bother to worry about the United States for more than the cash that has been spent there. I am interested in good hospitals wherever they be, but let us not forget that our American Indians have a priority.

Ladies and gentlemen of this Committee, I speak not as an isolationist but on behalf of the first Americans on this continent—our Indians. Let OMB remember their needs in the next budget year.

#### HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

##### INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

Appropriation, 1973	\$172,748,000
Estimate, 1974	176,968,000
Recommended, 1974	184,118,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973	+11,370,000
Estimate, 1974	+7,150,000

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

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 appropriation	1974 estimate
Patient care	\$124,893,000	+\$7,132,000	+\$4,100,000
Field health services	55,701,000	+4,134,000	+3,050,000
Administration	3,524,000	+104,000	
Total, Indian health services	184,118,000	+11,370,000	+7,150,000

The increase of \$7,150,000 over the budget estimate include the following:

Mental health care, +\$500,000.  
Medical care program, Ute Mountain Tribe, Colorado, +\$100,000.

Health Centers at Hugo, McAlester, and Eufaula, Oklahoma, including 51 additional positions, +\$500,000.

Dental care, including programs for the Crow Tribe, Montana and the Small Tribes Organization of Western Washington, +\$300,000.

California Rural Indian Health Board, including funds for a medical care program of the Hoopa Valley Tribe, California, +\$2,000,000.

Pilot urban Indian Health projects using the model of the Minneapolis Indian Health Board, +\$1,000,000.

Additional 150 community health representatives, +\$750,000.

Contract health care, including the Navajo Tribe, Arizona, +\$2,000,000.

#### INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$44,549,000  
Estimate, 1974..... 41,717,000  
Recommended, 1974..... 46,027,000

Comparison:  
Appropriation, 1973..... +1,478,000  
Estimate, 1974..... +4,310,000

The recommended increase of \$4,310,000 over the budget estimate will provide for the first phase construction of a replacement facility for the Philadelphia Indian Hospital, Philadelphia, Miss.

The committee urges that the budget authorities present to Congress next year construction and maintenance budgets commensurate with the needs in this area.

The bill provides \$4,378,000 for replacement of a health facility at Tuba City, Ariz. It also provides sanitation facilities for 8,500 new housing units and for water and/or waste disposal facilities for 3,489 existing housing units.

#### INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$1,075,000  
Estimate, 1974..... 1,086,000  
Recommended, 1974..... 1,086,000

#### Comparison:

Appropriation, 1973..... +\$11,000  
Estimate, 1974.....

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,086,000, the budget estimate for the Indian Claims Commission.

#### NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$1,425,000  
Estimate, 1974..... 1,462,000  
Recommended, 1974..... 1,459,000

#### Comparison:

Appropriation, 1973..... +\$34,000  
Estimate, 1974..... -3,000

The bill provides \$1,459,000, a reduction of \$3,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee has approved \$32,000 for the 1976 Bicentennial exhibit program rather than the \$35,000 budget estimate.

#### NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973..... \$74,514,000  
Estimate, 1974..... 138,000,000  
Recommended, 1974..... 98,675,000

#### Comparison:

Appropriation, 1973..... +24,161,000  
Estimate, 1974..... -39,325,000

The bill provides a total appropriation of \$98,675,000 for activities under this appropriation account. This is a reduction of \$39,325,000 below the budget estimate.

The following tabulation reflects the distribution of funds as provided in the bill:

Activity	1973 appropriation	1974 budget estimate	Committee bill, 1974	Increase or decrease
National Endowment for the Arts:				
Grants-in-aid to groups or individuals.....	\$27,825,000	\$56,750,000	\$41,425,000	-\$15,325,000
Grants-in-aid to States.....	6,875,000	8,250,000	8,250,000	
National Endowment for the Humanities: grants and loans to individuals and groups.....	34,500,000	65,000,000	42,500,000	-22,500,000
Administrative expenses.....	5,314,000	8,000,000	6,500,000	-1,500,000
Total.....	74,514,000	138,000,000	98,675,000	-39,325,000

The committee is aware of the rapidly increasing production costs for all the performing arts and is also deeply aware of the wide public support for these programs. The committee has provided an increase of \$24,161,000 in this appropriation over 1973 to reflect its support for these programs in the arts and the humanities. The committee regrets that budget priorities required that the full budget request could not be provided.

As a part of the Arts Endowment program, the State Arts Councils are doing an excellent job throughout the Nation. In testimony before the committee, the Humanities Endowment also presented one of the most impressive Bicentennial programs which will incorporate national participation in the realization of the essential values of the revolutionary period.

The entire committee, I am sure, is aware of the importance of Arts and Humanities to the quality of life in the United States. However, at the beginning of my presentation I warned the House that we had to regard the bill in context of a total overall spending ceiling.

The Arts and Humanities budget shows a 30-percent increase over 1973 funds. Monies added for the Indians and forests are not in this range. For that all

important item of crisis today—research for energy—there is a 23-percent increase. And, the Smithsonian Institution has only a 3-percent increase.

Therefore, although the committee is a strong supporter of our arts program, and we are tremendously excited and pleased with their programs for all Americans, we had to face the brutal realities of our budgetary ceilings and considerations.

I commend the management of the very distinguished Director of the Arts, Nancy Hanks, and I commend Dr. Berman of the Humanities Foundation, for their tremendously perceptive and outstanding work. However, I think they, too, understand the fiscal imponderables and difficulties we face. And, please do not think that the money reflected in Arts and Humanities is all the money in this budget for the arts. I list for you now the programs associated with arts which are in this bill.

#### ARTS PROGRAMS FISCAL YEAR 1974

Endowment for the Arts..... \$53,675,000  
Endowment for the Humanities..... 46,500,000  
Development of Indian arts and crafts..... 688,000  
Commission of Fine Arts..... 143,000  
National Gallery of Art..... 5,832,000  
American Samoa—Museum and Arts Councils..... 110,000

#### Smithsonian Institution:

National Museum of Art..... \$874,000  
National Collection of Fine Arts..... 1,278,000  
National Portrait Gallery..... 1,068,000  
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden..... 1,269,000  
Freer Gallery of Art..... 191,000  
Archives of American Art..... 208,000  
National Armed Forces Museum Adv. Bd..... 136,000  
Smithsonian Archives..... 108,000  
Anacostia Neighborhood Museum..... 302,000  
Division of Performing Arts..... 341,000

Subtotal, Smithsonian..... 5,975,000

#### National Park Service:

John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts..... 2,400,000  
Ford's Theater..... 523,000  
Wolf Trap Farm Park..... 1,474,000  
Carter Barron Amphitheater..... 452,600  
Summer-in-the-parks..... 1,090,000  
Sylvan Theater..... 110,000  
Gunboat Cairo..... 42,100  
National Symphony..... 215,000  
Audiovisual Arts (Harpers Ferry)..... 880,600  
Museum exhibit production (Harpers Ferry)..... 834,900  
Preservation of historic properties..... 4,054,000

Subtotal, National Park Service..... 12,076,200

Grand total..... 124,999,200

#### MATCHING GRANTS

Appropriation, 1973..... \$7,000,000  
Estimate, 1974..... 15,000,000  
Recommended, 1974..... 8,000,000

#### Comparison:

Appropriation, 1973..... +1,000,000  
Estimate, 1974..... -7,000,000

Funds provided under this appropriation account are available for matching in an amount equal to the total amount of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received by each endowment during the current and preceding fiscal years, for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

The bill provides a total of \$8,000,000 for this appropriation account, a decrease of \$7,000,000 below the budget estimate. This will provide \$4,000,000 for each endowment.

There are those who would oppose spending anything for arts. To these people may I say that, had you watched the CBS presentation of the arts train the other evening, you would understand the committee's desire to fund our arts program.

The reporter on the train moving through the West and arriving at small towns in Montana and Idaho showed us the faces of children who, for the first time in their lives, saw a magnificent work of art, who had an opportunity of watching artists at their work, and who, perhaps, for the first time were introduced into that singular quality of life which takes us out of the syndrome known to many as frustration and despair—the opportunity to know that beauty and creativity are eternal and can belong to everyone.

I have watched with interest Kenneth Clark's presentation of "Civilization," and when we realize in the so-called Dark Ages of world history and



in the emerging renaissance, art was actually the basic language of survival. Battles, bombs, and boundaries are forgotten, but existing forever is the architecture and sculpture of Greece, cathedrals of England and France, paintings of all nations, the music of all nations, and the great literature of every era. The American Indians, the Samoans, the Micronesians, those who came to America from other lands have brought us their heritage of music, dancing, and the joy of living.

The small amount in this budget which will sustain the vitality of artistic presentation to people across this Nation, and the small amount that will insure, that in a country of free people, discussions of ethics, the contribution which a deep sense of values gave to the founders of this country and were intrinsic to the establishment of this country's Government, lying, in fact, beneath its Bill of Rights, are moneys well expended.

We have subsidized cotton, milk, corn, wheat; we have subsidized a thousand other items of life. This Congress need not be ashamed of subsidizing some essential immortal qualities of the spirit.

Two thousand years ago civilization fought battles, nations were conquered and died. Two thousand years ago these same civilizations developed poetry, drama, music, and art. All survived. Two thousand years from now Cambodia, Vietnam, and other names on the map may well be erased in the tears of time. But the music, literature, art, we leave behind us will be a precious legacy. And, I think this Congress, regardless of our personal feelings about some one grant or some one allocation of funds will be proud to know that we said we are interested as a nation in the survival of the spirit, the beauty of our finest and best expressions and bequeath to the future a better understanding of our human goals.

#### SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$51,633,000
Estimate, 1974.....	56,438,000
Recommended, 1974.....	55,438,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+3,805,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-1,000,000

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

Activity	Committee bill, 1974	Bill compared with—	
		1973 Appropriation	Estimate, 1974
Science.....	\$19,362,000	+\$1,200,000	-\$385,000
History and art.....	7,660,000	+410,000	-105,000
Public service.....	2,230,000	+143,000	-31,000
Museum programs.....	5,940,000	+576,000	-125,000
Special programs.....	3,339,000	+384,000	-110,000
Administrative, protection, and support.....	7,849,000	+470,000	-150,000
Buildings management.....	9,058,000	+622,000	-94,000
Total, salaries and expenses.	55,438,000	3,805,000	-1,000,000

#### MUSEUM PROGRAMS AND RELATED RESEARCH (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$3,500,000
Estimate, 1974.....	9,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....	4,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+1,000,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-4,500,000

This appropriation item is to provide for the special foreign currency program of awarding grants to American universities, museums, or other institutions of higher learning, interested in conducting research in foreign countries. The committee urges that these funds be used only for projects of the highest possible priority.

The reduction of \$4,500,000 below the budget estimate includes decreases of \$3,000,000 for the salvage of archeological sites on the island of Philae, Egypt, \$600,000 for archeology and related disciplines, \$600,000 for systematic and environmental biology, \$250,000 for astrophysics and earth sciences, \$30,000 for museum programs, and \$20,000 for grant administration.

#### SCIENCE INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$1,600,000
Estimate, 1974.....	1,665,000
Recommended, 1974.....	1,650,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+50,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-15,000

The science information exchange receives, organizes, and disseminates information about research in progress in the life, physical, and social sciences. Its mission is to assist the planning and management of research activities supported by Government and nongovernment agencies and institutions by promoting the exchange of information that concerns subject matter, distribution, level of effort, and other data pertaining to current research in the prepublication stage.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$875,000
Estimate, 1974.....	3,850,000
Recommended, 1974.....	3,650,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+2,975,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-200,000

The amount recommended will provide for the following:

Construction of Lion Hill.....	\$3,000,000
Planning:	
Visitors parking.....	160,000
Primate exhibit.....	100,000
Elephant house.....	100,000
Bird house.....	60,000
Repairs and renovations.....	230,000

The recommended program will put emphasis on providing better quarters for the animals. The master plan for the zoo has recently been approved and this program represents the first stage of its implementation.

#### RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$5,014,000
Estimate, 1974.....	1,220,000
Recommended, 1974.....	1,070,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-3,944,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-150,000

The reduction of \$150,000 below the budget estimate consists of decreases of

\$75,000 for Smithsonian facilities master plan and \$75,000 for library addition and planning, National Museum of History and Technology.

#### CONSTRUCTION

##### (APPROPRIATION TO LIQUIDATE CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

Appropriation, 1973.....	-----
Estimate, 1974.....	\$27,000,000
Recommended, 1974.....	17,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+17,000,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-10,000,000

This appropriation provides liquidating cash requirements for contract authority previously authorized for construction of the National Air and Space Museum. Testimony from the Smithsonian Institution indicated that only \$17,000,000 is actually needed to liquidate obligations in fiscal year 1974.

I am pleased to report to this committee that the National Air and Space Museum is on schedule and has to date no overrun. Also, I urge the members of this committee to read the hearings and understand the kind of new contracting system being done by the GSA. To GSA I offer a salute. I think they have done a practical and tremendously efficient job of rearranging their contracting management.

#### NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$5,420,000
Estimate, 1974.....	5,832,000
Recommended, 1974.....	5,832,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	+412,000
Estimate, 1974.....	-----

The bill provides \$5,832,000, the budget estimate, for salaries and expenses of the National Gallery of Art.

The National Gallery of Art receives, holds, and administers works of art acquired for the Nation by the Gallery's board of trustees; maintains and administers the Gallery building so as to give maximum care and protection to art treasures and to enable these works of art to be exhibited regularly to the public without charge.

#### WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER OR SCHOLARS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$800,000
Estimate, 1974.....	800,000
Recommended, 1974.....	800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973.....	-----
Estimate, 1974.....	-----

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was authorized by Public Law 90-637, approved October 24, 1968, as the Nation's official living memorial to the 28th President. It sponsors a continuous advanced scholar, international fellowship program on various social and scientific subjects of special interest in the world of today.

The committee recommendation will provide \$427,350 for the fellowship program and \$372,650 for administrative expenses.

#### NATIONAL COUNCIL ON INDIAN OPPORTUNITY

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1973.....	\$290,000
Estimate, 1974.....	300,000
Recommended, 1974.....	100,000

## Comparison:

Appropriation, 1973-----	-\$190,000
Estimate, 1974-----	-200,000

The bill provides \$100,000, a reduction of \$200,000 below the budget estimate, for the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

The function of the Council is to encourage full use of programs to benefit the Indian population.

The committee believes that the objectives of the Council can be better met by providing funds directly to agencies handling Indian-related programs and has provided substantial increases over the budget for Indian programs contained in this bill.

May I urge that in the future the National Council on Indian Opportunity work with all Indian groups in trying to establish a common denominator approach to Indian problems.

## FEDERAL METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

SALARIES AND EXPENSES	
Appropriation, 1973-----	\$160,000
Estimate, 1974-----	160,000
Recommended, 1974-----	60,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	-100,000
Estimate, 1974-----	-100,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$60,000, a reduction of \$100,000 below the budget estimate, for the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review which was established by section 10 of the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act (30 U.S.C. 721-740).

The adjudicative duties of the Board, in docketed cases, involve the hearing and determination of applications filed by mine operators seeking annulment or revision of, and temporary relief from, orders issued by the Secretary of the Interior under sections 8 and 9 of the act.

Testimony before the committee revealed that to date, no appeals have been made to the Board for hearing. Because of the absence of appeals, \$85,000 of the current appropriation is estimated to lapse. If appeals materialize in fiscal year 1974 and budget increases are required, the committee will entertain a supplemental appropriation request.

## JOINT FEDERAL-STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA

SALARIES AND EXPENSES	
Appropriation, 1973-----	\$708,800
Estimate, 1974-----	750,000
Recommended, 1974-----	694,400
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	-14,400
Estimate, 1974-----	-55,600

The Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission for Alaska was established by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (Public Law 92-203). Under the act the Federal Government will pay 50 percent of the Commission's expenses and the State Government will pay 50 percent.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$694,400, a reduction of \$55,600 below the budget estimate. The reduction is necessitated by the fact that the State of Alaska has appropriated only \$695,400 for this purpose in fiscal year 1974.

## PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES	
Appropriation, 1973-----	\$350,000
Estimate, 1974-----	200,000
Recommended, 1974-----	200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1973-----	-150,000
Estimate, 1974-----	

The Corporation is charged with the responsibility to develop and implement a development plan for the portion of Pennsylvania Avenue between the White House and the Capitol. The plan must be approved by Congress before it is implemented.

The committee recommends an appropriation of new obligational authority of \$200,000. The budget request was for \$200,000 in borrowing authority. The committee believes that when the Corporation is ready to begin implementation of the plan, funds can be requested under the borrowing authority provisions of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Act, Public Law 92-578.

Mr. Chairman, before I close and because there are many inquiries from the District of Columbia about expenditures, I would like to list at this time the moneys directly being spent through this legislation in the District of Columbia.

Also, because we have had many inquiries on costs of the Zoological Park, I am attaching also, some facts relative to the cost of the zoo operations, aside from construction. These costs are associated with the visitor load which continually escalates.

The zoo tells me that more than 7 million people have enjoyed the pandas, making this probably the most heavily visited single exhibit in the history of our National Capitol.

## SELECTED QUESTIONS RELATING TO NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

First. What are the costs of animal food by popular species?

Total annual food costs for the National Zoological Park for fiscal year 1973 are an estimated \$160,000.

Illustrations of annual costs for selected popular species are noted below, with the numbers of each in parentheses:

Pandas (2)-----	\$3,989
Elephants (4)-----	4,940
Gorillas (3)-----	1,708
Orangutans (5)-----	2,701
Tigers (5)-----	5,136
Jaguars (2)-----	685
Kiwis (3)-----	4,380
Pythons (10)-----	1,800

Second. What are the costs of the panda exhibition?

Construction costs have totaled \$499,983.53 in order to prepare climate controlled quarters suitable for successful animal management of the pandas and to enable millions of annual visitors to successfully view the animals.

Operating costs of the exhibit, on an annual basis, are less than \$100,000. This costs includes \$91,740 in labor, as follows: animal keeper costs, \$31,140; facility custodial costs, \$11,200; protective services and crowd management costs, \$43,900; and interpretation services costs, \$5,500.

Three. How many visitors have the pandas brought to the zoo?

The pandas were placed on exhibit on April 20, 1972. For the 12 months preceding that date 4,903,723 visitors came to the zoo. For the 12 months following that date 6,417,588 visitors came for a percentage increase on an annual basis of 51 percent. Assuming that the general rate of increase for visitors to the zoo would have been 10 percent, then 40 percent more visitors have been attracted to the place by the pandas. It is reasonable to assume that 90 percent, at the very least, of zoo visitors view the pandas, in addition to other exhibits. Thus, more than 7,000,000 people have enjoyed the pandas since their arrival making this, probably, the most heavily visited single exhibit in the history of the Capital.

Operating costs for the pandas thus average out at less than 1.7 cents per visitor, or less than 2 cents per visitor including capital investment. Considering the educational and recreational value of the exhibit this must be the finest value in town.

## FUNDING IN THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FISCAL YEAR 1974

## National Park Service programs

## Operation of the National Park System:

Office of the Director, NCP----	\$2,134,500
Professional Services-----	394,900
National Capital Parks, East---	3,386,000
National Capital Parks, West---	3,881,400
National Visitor Center-----	358,400
U.S. Park Police-----	10,756,800
Executive Direction-----	206,200

Subtotal, Operation of the National Park System----	21,118,200
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts-----	2,400,000
Planning, Development and Operation of Recreation Facilities: Operation of recreation facilities-----	26,700

Total, operating funds, National Capital parks in the District of Columbia-----	23,544,900
---	------------

## Appropriation account, planning and construction, fiscal year 1974

Building, utilities and other facilities:	
National visitor center:	
Developments (portion) remodeling of Union Station---	\$7,100,000
Audiovisual equipment, exhibits and furnishings-----	1,580,000

Subtotal, planning and construction-----	8,680,000
Road construction, roads, trails and parkways:	

Anacostia Park: developments (portion) community and visitor recreational use facilities-----	300,000
---	---------

Constitution gardens (Navy munitions site): project planning and developments (portion) reception center, audiovisual and exhibits, underground bus parking and miscellaneous facilities-----	3,000,000
Downtown parks: development (portion) improvements to downtown parks-----	501,000

Ellipse: developments (portion) outer circle walk-----	250,000
--	---------

Fort Circle parks: developments (portion) community and visitor recreation use facilities	\$300,000
Jefferson Memorial: developments (portion) safety railing	78,000
Mall: developments (portion) improvements to roads, drives and provide bike-ways	1,870,000
Pedestrian walks	500,000
West Potomac Park: project planning (portion) Tidal Basin safety railing	35,000
Developments (portion) reconstruct reflecting pool and walks	22,000
Subtotal, Road Construction	6,856,000
<i>Appropriation account, planning, development and operation of recreation facilities, fiscal year 1974</i>	
Planning and Development of Recreation Facilities:	
Anacostia Park: developments (portion) community and visitor recreational use facilities	\$200,000
Constitution Gardens (Navy munitions site): project planning and developments (portion) reception center, audiovisual and exhibits, underground bus parking and miscellaneous facilities	500,000
Downtown Parks: developments (portion) improvements to downtown parks	499,000

Fort Circle Parks: developments (portion) community and visitor recreation use facilities	\$352,000
Georgetown Waterfront: developments (portion) Old Stonehouse Craft Center <sup>1</sup>	130,000
Jefferson Memorial: developments (portion) exterior cleaning, repointing and lighting improvements	300,000
Lighting cherry trees (portion)	79,000
Mall: developments (portion) skating rink, national sculpture garden	200,000
Underground comfort station (3)	450,000
Washington Monument: project planning (portion) elevator and visitor use improvements	200,000
Watering System	30,000
Developments (portion) lighting improvements	68,000
West Potomac Park: project planning (portion) comfort station	8,000
Developments (portion) reconstruct reflecting pool and walks	973,000
Subtotal, planning and development of recreation facilities	3,989,000
<sup>1</sup> This project is being deferred in order to allow funding of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Project.	

Total, development funds,  
National Capital parks in  
District of Columbia--- \$19,525,000

Mr. Chairman, as I conclude, may I urge that you support this bill. It is not perfect, it could be larger and I would hope it can be larger in the years ahead. But this year it acknowledges the necessity of a total national effort to make America the kind of Nation we are all dedicated to serve.

This bill has, as I have told you, money for surveys, construction; it also has music and laughter, education and health services for our young, our old, our blacks and our Indians. It is the composite summary of a committee's affection for its Nation and I urge an aye vote.

I include the following:

Total, National Park Service ----- \$43,069,900

#### Other Programs:

National Zoological Park	4,406,000
Anacostia Neighborhood Museum	302,000
National Capital Planning Commission	1,459,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	200,000
Total, other	6,367,000
Grand total	49,436,900

#### COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1974

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, fiscal year 1973 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (6)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources	\$96,565,000	\$91,347,000	\$83,872,000	—\$12,693,000	—\$7,475,000
Construction and maintenance	7,965,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	—1,665,000	
Public lands development roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)	(3,265,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(+735,000)	
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)	17,500,000	17,500,000	17,500,000		
Range improvements (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)	2,714,000	3,376,000	3,376,000	+662,000	
Recreation development and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund)		165,000	165,000	+165,000	
Total, Bureau of Land Management	124,744,000	118,688,000	111,213,000	—13,531,000	—7,475,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Education and welfare services	\$303,285,000	295,572,000	298,476,000	—4,809,000	+2,904,000
Education and welfare services (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)	(271,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+1,229,000)	
Resources management	186,041,000	85,358,000	86,022,000	—19,000	+664,000
Construction	56,078,000	44,000,000	53,343,000	—2,735,000	+9,343,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)	(45,539,000)	(43,000,000)	(43,000,000)	(—2,539,000)	
Alaska native fund	50,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	+20,000,000	
Payment to Ute Tribe of Uintah and Ouray Reservation	65,000			—65,000	
General administrative expenses	6,200,000	5,319,000	5,244,000	—956,000	—75,000
Tribal funds (definite)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000		
Tribal funds (indefinite)	13,530,000	13,505,000	13,505,000	—25,000	
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	518,199,000	516,754,000	529,590,000	+11,391,000	+12,836,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation					
Salaries and expenses	\$4,150,000	4,436,000	4,396,000	+246,000	—40,000
Land and Water Conservation Fund					
Appropriation of receipts (indefinite)	300,000,000	55,223,000	71,223,000	—228,777,000	+16,000,000
TERRITORIAL AFFAIRS					
Administration of territories	22,375,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	—7,375,000	
Permanent appropriation (special fund)	(469,000)	(420,000)	(420,000)	(—49,000)	
Transferred from other accounts (special fund)	(470,000)	(645,000)	(645,000)	(+175,000)	
Total, Territorial Affairs	22,375,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	—7,375,000	
Total, Public Land Management	969,468,000	710,101,000	731,422,000	—238,046,000	+21,321,000

Footnotes at end of table.



Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, fiscal year 1973 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (6)
MINERAL RESOURCES					
Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research	\$150,450,000	\$156,000,000	\$155,974,000	+\$5,524,000	-\$26,000
Bureau of Mines					
Mines and minerals	\$157,465,000	136,824,000	145,424,000	-12,041,000	+8,600,000
Office of Coal Research					
Salaries and expenses	43,490,000	52,500,000	61,500,000	+18,010,000	+9,000,000
Office of Oil and Gas					
Salaries and expenses	1,558,000	1,485,000	2,585,000	+1,027,000	+1,100,000
Total, Mineral Resources	352,963,000	346,809,000	365,483,000	+12,520,000	+18,674,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS					
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife					
Resource management	176,639,500	79,004,000	80,137,000	+3,497,500	+1,133,000
Construction and anadromous fish	2,333,000	9,233,000	12,846,500	+10,513,500	+3,613,500
Migratory bird conservation account (definite, repayable advance)	7,100,000			-7,100,000	
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	86,072,500	88,237,000	92,983,500	+6,911,000	+4,746,500
National Park Service					
Operation of the National Park System	162,918,000	176,780,000	176,720,000	+13,802,000	-60,000
Planning and construction	54,146,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	-34,146,000	
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)	(5,416,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(+29,584,000)	
Preservation of historic properties	4,054,000	4,054,000	4,054,000		
Planning, development and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund)		32,925,000	31,531,000	+31,531,000	-1,394,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	2,000,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	+400,000	
Total, National Park Service	223,118,000	236,159,000	234,705,000	+11,587,000	-1,454,000
Total, Fish and Wildlife and Parks	309,190,500	324,396,000	327,688,500	+18,498,000	+3,292,500
OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH					
Salaries and expenses	16,344,000	13,149,000	13,689,000	-2,655,000	+540,000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR					
Salaries and expenses	7,360,000	7,850,000	7,500,000	+140,000	-350,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses	15,295,100	15,895,000	15,495,000	+199,900	-400,000
Departmental operations	4,466,000	5,737,000	5,737,000	+1,271,000	
Central energy research and development fund		25,000,000			-25,000,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	500,000	1,630,000	670,000	+170,000	-960,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	20,261,100	48,262,000	21,902,000	+1,640,900	-26,360,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of the Interior	1,675,586,600	1,450,567,000	1,467,684,500	-207,902,100	+17,117,500
Consisting of—					
Appropriations	1,675,586,600	1,450,567,000	1,467,684,500	-207,902,100	+17,117,500
Definite appropriations	(1,341,842,600)	(1,327,873,000)	(1,330,384,500)	(-11,458,100)	(+2,511,500)
Indefinite appropriations	(333,744,000)	(122,694,000)	(137,300,000)	(-196,444,000)	(+14,606,000)
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(54,491,000)	(83,500,000)	(83,500,000)	(+29,009,000)	
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority	(1,730,077,600)	(1,534,067,000)	(1,551,184,500)	(-178,893,100)	(+17,117,500)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management	129,231,000	246,324,000	259,701,000	-39,530,000	+13,377,000
Forest research	62,146,000	57,275,000	59,145,000	-3,001,000	+1,870,000
State and private forestry cooperation	32,837,000	23,760,000	27,760,000	-5,077,000	+4,000,000
Total, forest protection and utilization	394,214,000	327,359,000	346,606,000	-47,608,000	+19,247,000
Construction and land acquisition	48,794,900	25,498,000	26,353,000	-22,441,900	+855,000
Youth conservation corps	3,500,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+6,500,000	
Forest roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)	(158,840,000)	(87,700,000)	(90,700,000)	(-68,140,000)	(+3,000,000)
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Special acts (special fund, indefinite)	80,000	94,000	94,000	+14,000	
Acquisition of lands to complete "and exchanges"		55,300	55,300	+55,300	
Cooperative range improvements (special fund, indefinite)	700,000	700,000	700,000		
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,013,000	-7,000	-7,000
Construction and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund)		3,546,000	3,546,000	+3,546,000	
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program)		1,000,000			-1,000,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Forest Service	448,308,900	369,272,300	388,367,300	-59,941,600	+19,095,000
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses	135,000	144,000	143,000	+8,000	-1,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
Health Services and Mental Health Administration					
Indian health services	172,748,000	176,968,000	184,118,000	+11,370,000	+7,150,000
Indian health facilities	44,549,000	41,717,000	46,027,000	+1,478,000	+4,310,000
Total, Health Services and Mental Health Administration	217,297,000	218,685,000	230,145,000	+12,848,000	+11,460,000
Office of Education					
Indian education	18,000,000			-18,000,000	

Footnotes at end of table.



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1974—Continued

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, fiscal year 1973 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (6)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued					
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,075,000	\$1,086,000	\$1,086,000	+\$11,000	
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,425,000	1,462,000	1,459,000	+34,000	-\$3,000
NATIONAL FOUNDATION OF THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES					
Salaries and Expenses					
Endowment for the arts.....	34,700,000	65,000,000	49,675,000	+14,975,000	-15,325,000
Endowment for the humanities.....	34,500,000	65,000,000	42,500,000	+8,000,000	-22,500,000
Administrative expenses.....	5,314,000	8,000,000	6,500,000	+1,186,000	-1,500,000
Subtotal, salaries and expenses.....	74,514,000	138,000,000	98,675,000	+24,161,000	-39,325,000
Matching Grants					
Endowment for the arts (indefinite).....	3,500,000	7,500,000	4,000,000	+500,000	-3,500,000
Endowment for the humanities (indefinite).....	3,500,000	7,500,000	4,000,000	+500,000	-3,500,000
Subtotal, matching grants.....	7,000,000	15,000,000	8,000,000	+1,000,000	-7,000,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	81,514,000	153,000,000	106,675,000	+25,161,000	-46,325,000
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION					
Salaries and expenses.....	51,633,000	56,438,000	55,438,000	+3,805,000	-1,000,000
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program).....	3,500,000	9,000,000	4,500,000	+1,000,000	-4,500,000
Science information exchange.....	1,600,000	1,665,000	1,650,000	+50,000	-15,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	675,000	3,850,000	3,650,000	+2,975,000	-200,000
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	5,014,000	1,220,000	1,070,000	+3,944,000	-150,000
Construction.....	13,000,000			-13,000,000	
Construction (contract authority).....	27,000,000			-27,000,000	
Construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....		(27,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(+17,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	5,420,000	5,832,000	5,832,000	+412,000	
Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	800,000	800,000	800,000		
Operation and maintenance, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	10,150,000			-1,500,000	
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	110,142,000	78,805,000	72,940,000	-37,202,000	-5,865,000
HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS					
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.....	38,000			-38,000	
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON INDIAN OPPORTUNITY					
Salaries and expenses.....	290,000	300,000	100,000	-190,000	-\$200,000
FEDERAL METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW					
Salaries and expenses.....	160,000	160,000	60,000	-100,000	-100,000
JOINT FEDERAL-STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA					
Salaries and expenses.....	708,800	750,000	694,400	-14,400	-55,600
PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	350,000	200,000	200,000	-150,000	
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Related Agencies.....	879,443,700	823,864,300	801,869,700	-77,574,000	-21,944,600
Consisting of—					
Appropriations.....	852,443,700	823,864,300	801,869,700	-50,574,000	-21,994,600
Definite appropriations.....	(844,663,700)	(804,524,300)	(789,529,700)	(-55,134,000)	(-14,994,600)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(7,780,000)	(19,340,000)	(12,340,000)	(+4,560,000)	(-7,000,000)
Contract authority.....	27,000,000			-27,000,000	
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(158,840,000)	(114,700,000)	(107,700,000)	(-51,140,000)	(-7,000,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(1,038,283,700)	(938,564,300)	(909,569,700)	(-128,714,000)	(-28,994,600)
RECAPITULATION					
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles.....	2,555,030,300	2,274,431,300	2,269,554,200	-285,476,100	-4,877,100
Consisting of—					
Appropriations.....	2,528,030,300	2,274,431,300	2,269,554,200	-258,476,100	-4,877,100
Definite appropriations.....	(2,186,506,300)	(2,132,397,300)	(2,119,914,200)	(-66,592,100)	(-12,483,100)
Indefinite appropriations.....	(341,524,000)	(142,034,000)	(149,640,000)	(-191,884,000)	(+7,606,000)
Contract authority.....	27,000,000			-27,000,000	
Memoranda—					
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(213,331,000)	(198,200,000)	(191,200,000)	(-22,131,000)	(-7,000,000)
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(2,768,361,300)	(2,472,631,300)	(2,460,754,200)	(-307,607,100)	(-11,877,100)

<sup>1</sup> Includes the following amounts contained in the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973:

Bureau of Land Management, "Management of lands and resources".....	\$18,500,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs, "Resources management".....	2,900,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, "Resource management".....	900,000
National Park Service:	
Operation of the National Park System.....	4,040,000
Planning and construction.....	3,100,000
Forest Service:	
Forest land management.....	43,627,000
Forest research.....	1,003,000
State and private forestry cooperation.....	77,000
Construction and land acquisition.....	213,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, "Salaries and expenses".....	350,000
Total.....	74,710,000

<sup>2</sup> In addition \$2,040,000 transferred from "Salaries and expenses", Office of Water Resources Research and \$286,000 from "Surveys, investigations, and research," Geological Survey pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

<sup>3</sup> In addition \$72,000 transferred from "Surveys, investigations, and research," Geological Survey pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

<sup>4</sup> Includes \$1,064,000 transferred to other Interior Agencies pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

<sup>5</sup> In addition \$706,000 transferred from "Surveys, investigations, and research," Geological Survey pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

<sup>6</sup> Excludes \$7,505,000 for grants-in-aid.

<sup>7</sup> Includes \$2,040,000 transferred to "Education and welfare services," Bureau of Indian Affairs, pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

<sup>8</sup> In addition \$3,179,000 transferred from "Forest Research" and \$5,000,000 from "State and private forestry cooperation" pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

<sup>9</sup> In addition \$2,734,000 transferred from "Special benefits for disabled coal miners," pursuant to the Conference Agreement 2d Supplemental bill fiscal year 1973.

<sup>10</sup> Appropriated in fiscal year 1973 for obligations incurred in fiscal year 1972. Fiscal year 1973 funding is included in the National Park Service Appropriation.

<sup>11</sup> Excludes \$15,505,000 for grants-in-aid, not authorized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, speaking of vandals, may I ask the gentlewoman this: Is there any money in this bill to take care of the vandalism that was perpetrated in and on the Bureau of Indian Affairs building last November, or does that come under the General Services Administration appropriation?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the restoration of that building has been completed. Many of the stolen items have been returned. There are no specific funds for that purpose in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in particular of the desecration of the interior of the building and the destruction of equipment in the building.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. We had a complete investigation of this incident done by our investigative staff. I would be pleased to give that report to the gentleman from Iowa if he is interested. It is a very interesting report.

Of course, it was a regrettable incident, but on the other hand I would like to say that if you go through the Indian reservations, we have much to be apologetic about. There is yet much to be done for the economy, health, education, and daily living of our Indian people.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to comment by saying that I have never seen more wanton, ruthless, and senseless destruction than that in the Bureau building. I visited that building last November and saw the destruction. I do not know how anyone can possibly, under any guise, justify what they did to the interior of that building.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No one justifies violence. But, I would also say to the gentleman that the \$20 million spent by the Forest Service each year because of vandalism and litter in our National Forests by some of the most respectable people in the United States is just as regrettable.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I would like simply

to commend the gentlewoman for a very fine statement.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SEIBERLING. It shows the kind of priorities I think our country needs, and I want also to commend her subcommittee for doing an outstanding job under rather stringent conditions.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would like to add my commendation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the very able gentlewoman from Washington. I would like to raise one question concerning coal mine health and safety. On page 21 of the committee report, it is indicated that there is \$10,655,000 less in the new appropriation than in the committee bill for fiscal year 1973. Knowing the interest and leadership of the committee in funding coal mine health and safety, I was wondering if we could have an explanation of the reason why the item under education and training has been reduced \$12,892,000 in comparison to the appropriated amount for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. McDADE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

In reply to the question of the gentleman from West Virginia, in order to refresh his recollection, this is a training camp that was built in the State of West Virginia. Construction has been completed, so there is obviously no need for additional funding. It is a one-shot deal.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Yes. I would simply like the RECORD to show I was certainly aware of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Academy located at Beckley, W. Va., in my district. I am pleased that the record shows it was not a reduction of the emphasis of the committee on mine health and safety, but simply a large amount of construction funds were involved. The committee is to be commended for its concern that adequate funds are made available to protect the health and safety of coal miners.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to join my colleague in commending the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington for her very fine efforts in the subcommittee and in the committee in presenting to us a very good appropriation bill under the unwise and stringent guidelines as to expenditures set out by the administration. I believe the report merits particular consideration and commendation of the House and referring particularly to page 5, beginning with the words "The management of our natural resources" and running through the middle of page 7 wherein the gentlewoman and the subcommittee have set forth words that I think merit the consideration of this body, of the Nation, and certainly the administration.

I do wish to think the gentlewoman.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). The committee has been deeply concerned about the lack of management funds for our natural resources. We will no longer have these priceless resources of our Nation, nor the quality of our environment that we need, if we do not start spending more money in these areas.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add my words of congratulation and my compliments to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) for an excellent presentation of this bill. I also wish to express my pleasure and appreciation to the members of her subcommittee, all of them, for an excellent job. I think perhaps in certain areas the bill is rather stringent and the amounts appropriated have been dropped on several matters affecting items in Wyoming. However, I recognize, as we all do, that we all have to pay the price of some reasonable balance in our spending policies.

I would also like to say that I am very pleased for the portion of the bill relative to the preservation of our natural resources.

I would like to suggest that some time during the debate it might be well to present into the RECORD a sheet showing the receipts and revenues of various Department of Interior agencies. These

revenues are increasing every year through leasing, through BLM drawings, through these agencies that we now fund.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the

gentleman from Wyoming will yield, I would like to say that our hearings contain a detailed statement of receipts by the Interior Department and the U.S. Forest Service and I will insert them in

the RECORD at this point. If the Members will save their copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they will have a very accurate report on those very things.

The material follows:

#### RECEIPTS BY SOURCES

[The following table shows actual receipts of the Bureau of Land Management for fiscal years 1970, 1971, 1972 and estimated receipts for 1973 and 1974]

	Actual 1970	Actual 1971	Actual 1972	Estimate 1973	Estimate 1974
Sales, public lands and materials.....	\$2,099,849	\$2,013,823	\$1,941,520	\$2,700,000	\$3,200,000
Fees and commissions.....	4,468,455	4,096,965	5,351,278	5,400,000	5,500,000
Mineral leasing.....	141,217,162	151,332,134	145,098,401	156,851,000	160,206,000
Mineral leasing, Outer Continental Shelf.....	186,861,451	1,050,549,370	279,352,756	1,175,000,000	1,210,000,000
Grazing fees.....	5,668,742	7,548,869	8,021,646	9,828,000	11,152,000
Right-of-way leases.....	249,892	270,963	293,908	300,000	310,000
Timber sale.....	65,419,401	70,663,296	83,519,703	77,368,000	76,789,000
Trans Alaska pipeline.....				10,938,000	7,120,000
Miscellaneous receipts.....	401,606	482,104	341,584	621,000	625,000
Total.....	406,386,558	1,286,958,624	523,920,796	4,439,066,000	2,364,902,000

<sup>1</sup> Despite a critical need for additional resources, the receipt level for fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 will depend upon the anticipated impact of each proposed sale upon the environment as well as the continuing safe operation of existing OCS facilities.

Note: This table does not include public land administration or litter prevention and cleanup receipts.

#### NATIONAL FOREST SERVICE RECEIPTS

[In thousands]

	Fiscal year 1972 actual	Fiscal year 1973 estimated	Fiscal year 1974 estimated		Fiscal year 1972 actual	Fiscal year 1973 estimated	Fiscal year 1974 estimated
National Forests Fund:				National grasslands and land utilization:			
Timber sales.....	\$321,015	\$387,000	\$345,000	Timber sales.....	\$4	\$15	\$15
Grazing.....	4,856	5,960	6,240	Grazing.....	656	660	660
Power.....	205	210	210	Power.....	2	2	2
Recreation.....	3,561	4,100	4,100	Land uses.....	22	22	22
Land uses.....	1,068	1,200	1,200	Mineral leases and permits.....	1,391	1,391	1,491
Mineral leases and permits.....	4,984	5,700	5,700	Admission and user fees.....	5	5	5
Admission and user fees.....	3,198	4,500	4,900				
Subtotal.....	338,887	408,670	367,350	Subtotal.....	2,080	2,095	2,195
Oregon and California grant lands (primarily timber)...	9,040	11,000	10,000	Total receipts.....	350,007	421,765	379,545

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I wish to commend the chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) and the entire subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations.

I think that the gentlewoman has brought forth a very fine bill, and that the gentlewoman has made an excellent statement in behalf of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the gentlewoman for the consideration the committee gave to the Lake Tahoe area. There has been a need for some time to buy the three parcels that are in the bill before us today. I believe that these and other such areas should be acquired by the Forest Service, and be put under their jurisdiction.

Again I want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington for the consideration the committee has given to this matter.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The committee was very pleased to do so.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I too would like to join with my colleagues in support of the praise and approbation they have given to the work done by our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE), the ranking member of the committee, and all of the other members of the subcommittee, for what I believe to be a very thoughtful and desirable legislative product.

May I note just parenthetically that all of the millions of people who reside in the San Francisco Bay area are very grateful that the committee recognized that with skyrocketing land costs that confront this area that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was given funding that will make it possible, hopefully, to be able to buy some of the land at a price this year that will be a good deal less than the price we would have to pay if the purchase of those lands is postponed.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the distinguished chairman, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), whether or not the gentlewoman concurs with my hope, as the author of that legislation, that the Department of the Interior will use these funds, hopefully to make downpayments, rather than using them just to perhaps buy one, two, or three parcels in their entirety?

I may say that a number of the private owners—many of them old Californians—voluntarily offered that their lands be included in the park area, and the authorizing legislation provided for

stage payments so that the tax consequences to these landowners would not become onerous, particularly in light of the fact that they generously, rather than resisting that their own family properties being included, to the contrary they offered and encouraged that their properties be included as a long term haven, if you will, for the millions of people that live in our part of the country.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield. I will reply that the committee was very interested in this procedure. We requested an opinion of the Interior Solicitors. It was the Solicitor's opinion that the purchase on a contract or installment basis was entirely legal.

Subsequent to that time I have learned that the Office of Management and Budget does not approve of this procedure. The members of the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress can never see the Office of Management and Budget to confer with them on the subject of their legal opinions. The best information that I can give the gentleman is that the Solicitor from the Department of the Interior says the procedure is completely legal.

Mr. BURTON. Is it our colleague's view that the Solicitor's opinion is one well founded?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, it is.

Mr. BURTON. And that the Department should proceed on this downpayment route rather than exclusively on the entire-purchase route?



Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, I do, because I think we have had enough experience with the purchase of land in the United States to realize that the price escalation that goes on, once a park is established, is utterly fantastic. I would hope that the Office of Management and Budget would no longer curtail land and water funds, because this fund was established to meet the critical needs for the purchase of recreation lands in the United States before prices escalate.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the gentlewoman. If I may also note, because I think it most justified and proper, that in addition to Mrs. HANSEN's and Mr. McDADE's work, there was enormous assistance and valuable contribution made by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT); the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY); the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS); the gentleman from Utah (Mr. McKAY); the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG); and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). All of us in our part of the country are grateful to all of these Members for this fine product.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Fifty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 301]

Archer	Edwards, Calif.	Patman
Ashbrook	Erlenborn	Pike
Badillo	Evins, Tenn.	Podell
Baker	Fisher	Powell, Ohio
Blatnik	Frey	Reid
Boland	Fulton	Rodino
Bolling	Fuqua	Rooney, N.Y.
Breaux	Gettys	Rosenthal
Brotzman	Gray	Runnels
Broyhill, N.C.	Hastings	Ruth
Buchanan	Hawkins	Shipley
Clark	Hébert	Skubitz
Clay	Jarman	Stanton
Cleveland	Johnson, Colo.	James V.
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Stephens
Coughlin	Landrum	Stokes
Danielson	Long, Md.	Stratton
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Delaney	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, N.J.
Dellums	Mills, Ark.	Tierman
Derwinski	Mitchell, Md.	Wilson
Devine	Murphy, Ill.	Charles H.,
Diggs	Murphy, N.Y.	Calif.
Dorn	Nelsen	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 8917, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 365 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal. The Committee resumed its sitting.

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

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in

support of the bill, H.R. 8817, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal 1974. Before discussing the bill, I wish to extend my appreciation to the chair-lady of the subcommittee, Mrs. HANSEN, for the impartial way in which she conducted the hearings on the bill. Her actions have been conducted in a most thorough and nonpartisan way. I want to compliment, as well, the other members of the subcommittee. Each of them has made an important contribution to the betterment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Interior appropriations bill, which we consider today, is, first and foremost, a resource bill. But it is much more than that. It is both a long term and a short term investment in the people, the land, and the resources of America. The funds we invest today not only generate additional moneys for the treasury tomorrow, but they develop the resources necessary to fuel this Nation's energy needs. They develop the minds of all Americans who benefit from the historical, cultural, and recreational programs funded here. And they develop the bodies and minds of the many native Americans who benefit from the health services and educational opportunities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

The Members will note, however, that this bill is, by no means, an extravagant investment. The committee bill estimates for new obligatory authority are \$4,877,100 below the requested amounts. However, the committee was quite active in establishing certain priorities, making the bill a prudent investment and a responsive investment as well.

The moneys we invest today to manage the Nation's natural resources will be used to maintain and improve the nearly 2 billion acres of Federal lands, including the vast outer continental shelf off shore. These lands are a vast storehouse of public wealth. Each year, they yield 13 billion board feet of timber, 50 percent of the Western half of the Nation's water, grazing area for 16 million head of livestock, 7 million pounds of fish, and \$3.5 billion worth of mineral leases—with royalties accruing to the Government of nearly one-half million dollars per year. Bonuses from these lease sales will amount to more than \$2.2 billion this year.

In human terms, these lands and programs provide educational assistance for nearly 150,000 Indian children in Indian, and public schools, funds to operate the more than 300 irrigation systems to help Indian farmers grow food, and welfare and family services to some 95,000 Indian families.

This bill provides for the needs of the 222,000 residents of the Trust Territories of American Samoa and Guam, for the 533,700 reservation Indians on 39.7 million acres of tribal land and the estimated 503 million visitations by all Americans to our national parks and national forests.

Once again, my colleagues will note that the largest single increase in this bill is directed to the needs of the American Indians. Many basic services of life, which we take for granted—dental care,

maternity care, the birth of a child in a clean, sanitary hospital, are new and life-giving experiences to the American Indians. Death rates from disease, such as tuberculosis, influenza, and gastritis, are decreasing dramatically, while the housing construction, school construction and health services available to Indians are making important advances.

While the committee report details at great length the many accomplishments of the Indian Health Service and the success attributable to the BIA education program, I hope the Members would take the time to read of the many problem areas remaining. They indicate that, while we are making progress, there is still a long road ahead for the American Indian if he is to have the life to which he is entitled.

The budget makes a significant increase in the accounts for management and development of our national resources. The second largest increase found in the budget is directed to the U.S. Forest Service, the Federal agency charged with the responsibility for managing over 187 million acres of national forests and grasslands. The Forest Service also carries on an active program of research in areas such as pest and disease control, as well as cooperative programs with the State and local governments to protect and preserve more than 393 million acres of State and local forestland in our country.

Since 1971, the Forest Service has been cooperating with the States to implement programs to control gypsy moth infestation. Gypsy moth infestation now covers 1.4 million acres—an increase of 500,000 acres over the past decade. The Forest Service presently funds such agreements with the States on a 50-50 basis. I urge the Forest Service to expedite its efforts to develop better environmental controls and alternative solutions that will provide wide application of such controls without any environmental difficulty.

The U.S. Geological Survey and the U.S. Bureau of Mines total activities need \$300 million to monitor and meet the Nation's mineral and energy needs. The energy crisis, we all envisioned for the future, is very much with us today. However, the Nation is on the verge of another potentially more dangerous crisis brought on by the careless and wasteful way in which we use our Nation's minerals. Recently, the U.S. Geological Survey, in a detailed report, outlined the gravity of the shortages we face in providing vital minerals.

Supplies of our Nation's raw minerals are being seriously depleted. We are now importing 29 percent of our oil and gas requirements, about 33 percent of our iron, and a massive 87 percent of our aluminum. At current rates of consumption, our Nation's supply of copper will be exhausted in 50 years. While we produce 9 percent of the world's zinc, we use three times that much. The fifth most widely used metal is manganese. Yet this Nation has no known reserves, and the last manganese mine in the Nation closed its doors in 1970. And you cannot make steel without manganese.

Even more disturbing is the evidence



that we are wasting the ores we use at an alarming rate. If the Government does not devote more significant amounts of its future budgets to new mineral extraction technology, then we will soon find ourselves without any domestic supplies and relying to even greater degrees on foreign imports to meet our mineral needs.

This bill makes a major contribution toward alleviating our energy shortages. The sum of \$126 million is contained in this bill for energy-related research. This is an increase of \$23.6 million above last year's budget for specific projects within the Office of Coal Research, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, and the Forest Service. Many of these projects are in the development or pilot plant stage, all of which, we are confident, will yield significant returns on our investment.

The activities of the U.S. Bureau of Mines focus on several major areas. Since its inception, the Bureau has been the Government's chief research arm in trying to develop new energy sources from our fossil fuels. They have been charged with the responsibility of implementing the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act to protect our Nation's mine workers from the hazards of their occupation. The committee added \$3.8 million in additional funds for coal mine health and safety research to help conquer these hazards.

The Bureau has also embarked upon active and imaginative programs to improve the lands damaged by strip and subsurface mining. Their activities in my Congressional District, wherein so much of the Nation's coal was mined and industry was fueled since the turn of the 20th century, have been particularly laudatory. The present director, Dr. Elburt Osborn, is, in my opinion, the finest director in that agency's proud history. He has an extremely able and cooperative staff, one of whom I would like to single out for special praise. He is Mr. Joseph Corgan, Chief of the Environmental Division of the Bureau, who will be retiring effective June 30, after 36 years of distinguished service to the Bureau and to the Nation. In the often impersonal Federal bureaucracy, Mr. Corgan has become a personal friend not only to me but to the residents of northeastern Pennsylvania. His assistance in extinguishing underground mine fires, in eliminating burning culm banks, in stabilizing vast underground mined areas underlying property, has made the major contribution to a better environment in northeastern Pennsylvania. All of us in the subcommittee shall miss his counsel, and we wish him many happy years of retirement.

I call the Members attention to the \$16 million increase in new budget authority for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's Land and Water Conservation Fund. Since its creation, this fund has been the prime source of funding, not only for State and local outdoor recreation projects, but for Federal land acquisition activity by such agencies as the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Land

Management. Income for this fund is generated chiefly from receipts from offshore oil leases.

This year, the budget estimate contained \$50 million in new budget authority for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to provide a catch-up year wherein the Bureau could reduce a backlog of unobligated balances. The BOR indicated to the committee that a program level of \$196 million for fiscal 74 would clean up their pipeline applications. The committee felt that such a program level was inadequate to meet our recreation needs for State assistance. The committee added \$16 million in new budget authority which, when coupled with previous balances, will bring the program level to a point \$10 million above amounts expended in fiscal year 1973. With \$80 million in the pipeline for fiscal year 1974, the Bureau requested no new funds for Federal programs. The action in reprogramming funds for three critical acquisition projects on the Federal side also brings the Federal obligational level to \$110 million.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8917, the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill contains two items of particular importance to the residents of my congressional district.

On page 20 of the committee report, the committee has directed that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, through its land and water conservation fund, to spend an additional \$10 million for land acquisition in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. I am grateful to the committee for taking this course of action at my request. The committee's decision to commit these funds at this time is a wise one indeed.

This park, authorized in 1962, is the largest unfinished park in the eastern half of the Nation. Yet 6 million Americans visit and enjoy it each year. Last year, the authorization expired, and the National Park Service found itself without the legal means to acquire the remaining 15,000 acres of land. The Congress wisely enacted Public Law 92-575, legislation which I sponsored increasing the authorization ceiling to \$65 million. This represents an increase of \$28 million above the old ceiling. Shortly thereafter, the Office of Management and Budget approved an Interior Department request to reprogram an additional \$7 million through fiscal 1975 to activate its land acquisition program. The action of the House today in making an additional \$10 million available brings the total dollar figure for acquisition to \$17 million through 1974. This does not include the acquisition activities of lands administered by the Army Corps of Engineers. These funds should enable the National Park Service to accelerate their threat of condemnation currently facing land acquisition program to remove the many residents of the park area. These people are in desperate and of relief from the many problems that beset people living in the environs of a half-completed park.

On page 22, the Bureau of Mines has included an additional \$700,000 for environmental improvement in the anthracite area of the district. This money

will be used by experts at the Bureau to improve and alleviate various environmental difficulties caused by the ravages of strip and subsurface mining. Last year, the committee also included funds for the Bureau to undertake a demonstration project by taking a badly stripped and scarred piece of land and converting it into a country park. This new money will be used for similar purposes as part of a continuing program to improve the environment and reclaim abandoned strip mined areas in that area.

The committee's action, while recognizing the difficult budgetary problems we face this year, has attempted to keep the Land and Water Conservation Fund at a viable level for the coming year. Last year, the BOR spent \$202 million. This year, they will have \$212 million available for obligation. Hopefully, the Bureau will return next year with a more realistic budget.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill. It deserves the support of every Member of this House. It is the product of careful scrutiny by the subcommittee and the full committee. We did not accept the budget recommendations blindly. We added some and cut some, and the result is a flexible budget that addresses itself to some of the Nation's most critical needs. I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

(Mr. HANSEN of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I regret that members of the Appropriations Committee did not have the benefit of hearing witnesses before our committee testify as to the need for the \$145 million in appropriations for fiscal 1974 for the Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

The arts endowment alone has almost 8,000 formal and preliminary written requests for assistance, of which NEA can assist less than one-fourth. The humanities endowment can fund only 936 out of 1,844 highly rated applications—total applications 4,113.

The arts endowment has been especially successful in raising private and public moneys to match—and overmatch the stimulus of Federal money. They average \$3 to \$4 for every Federal dollar, and in many many projects have had spectacular results in funding programs which benefit areas which heretofore have never been reached with major cultural efforts.

For instance, the Arttrain—now touring in my Rocky Mountain area—a \$50,000 endowment grant, stimulated the raising of \$680,000 to send this unique 6-car art show and educational project into remote and rural, small town areas which have never had the benefit of such art work.

Tell of tour now in Rocky Mountain.

This will tour Southeastern United States soon.

The endowments have made extraor-

dinary efforts to have their programs reach a broad spectrum of American society—they have stretched themselves as I pointed out during debate on the authorization bill—to reach isolated groups, the poor, the aged, the sick, in hospitals in prisons in homes for the handicapped. They have provided seed money to start local theatre groups, dance groups, orchestras, which are still struggling to make ends meet. They have been particularly helpful in helping the modern dance groups become viable at a time when the public is demanding—in the wake of the increased leisure time and better incomes—more cultural programs.

The President had requested \$72.5 million for the arts endowment in fiscal 1974, not quite double the fiscal 1973 amount of \$40 million. Canada, with nearly 22 million people, spent \$26.5 million in 1972 compared to our \$29.7 million that year. Great Britain, with some 54 million people spent \$66 million. And West Germany, with 55 million people, spent \$134 million.

It is the hope of the group called the partnership for the arts, a private organization of citizens, that the United States by 1976 could be appropriating \$200 million, or roughly \$1 per capita for such expenditures.

Compare this goal, which will not be reached, if the Appropriations Committee does not in future years provide us with more money—with the per capita expenditures of: West Germany: \$2.42 per capita; Austria \$2 per capita; Sweden \$2; Canada \$1.40; Israel \$1.34 and Great Britain \$1.23.

We should be doing better in this area and I should like to emphasize that \$145 million would definitely have been a justifiable expenditure for the arts and humanities in fiscal 1974 for the richest country in the world.

To the critics who rationalize cutting this budget because the material needs of Americans have not been fully met, I counter with the argument that we should think for a minute of where our preoccupation with material things has led us. Are we nearer to the peace or understanding between nations? And do not the humanities—reading the great works of literature, history, ethics, and philosophy—do they not have something to say to the present condition of man in this country?

I agree wholeheartedly with witnesses who testified that "humanistic studies have as vital and unique a contribution to make to the amelioration of problems in our national life as do the sciences."

Yet we continue to spend over \$600 million for the National Science Foundation, \$17 billion for research and development. Our priorities are askew; the humanities have more to say to us—perhaps we would not be in the present moral crisis if we had spent more time on ethics, on learning truths from history.

I agree with Dr. Ronald Berman, the very able chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, who said in testimony that by the study of the great books of literature such as, say John Milton, Shakespeare, and all the rest, we are "challenged by moral im-

peratives" which demand that we conduct our private and public lives in the best way we know how.

This is what the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities are attempting—and believe me, such consciousness raising is drastically needed in this country.

Under the gifted leadership of Miss Nancy Hanks, the chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, the renaissance of the arts which already had begun has been stimulated further by Federal support.

There are programs in the Nation's schools which have met with fantastic success—the public is clamoring for the creative artists who visit schools for a week or more; it is anticipated that \$3 million will be available this coming year—a pitiful amount considering the need and the public popularity.

I have heard critics claim that the National Endowments benefit only the big cultural centers on the east and west coasts. Let me state emphatically that the programs of the National Endowment have given badly needed encouragement and new life to our efforts to enhance cultural opportunities in the sparsely populated Rocky Mountain region.

We do not begrudge any of the Endowment funds which are also assisting the arts in major Eastern centers, because we share the pride of all Americans in the world famous arts institutions which exist there.

But we join in the growing judgment of Americans from all walks of life that cultural development and enrichment of human life rate a higher priority—across the board. The National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities have proven themselves to be very effective agents of response to this growing concern of our people.

Cutbacks will mean the State programs will suffer in their attempts to grow and strengthen the cultural activities begun at the grassroots level, and quite importantly, the planning for quality programs for the Bicentennial will also suffer. I regret that the committee has seen fit to cut this budget. It is my feeling that perhaps we in the committee, or the endowments themselves did not do their homework in informing the members of the Appropriations Committee of the very real value of these programs. For I believe that if you saw with our eyes and heard with our ears the tremendous work of these endowments, the Appropriations Committee would have funded these programs at \$145 million for the coming year.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee the gentlelady from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) for their efforts in increasing the amounts for the Arts and Humanities by \$24.1 million over 1973 appropriations. Naturally, I regret that the President's full budget request of \$145 million for 1974 was not granted.

As I tried to point out during the debate on the authorization bill, the need for programs funded by those endow-

ments are very great in planning for the Bicentennial in 1976. The Endowments have been deluged by applications which have received the highest rating from their panels of experts and the endowments are anticipating continuation of those highly rated applications and the need for increased appropriations to help the Nation's communities in their preparation for celebration of its 200th birthday in 1976.

For instance, the NEH—the Humanities Endowment—planned to spend the largest share of its projected budget—\$28 million—for public programs. This would have been of immense benefit to the member districts in terms of educational projects in the humanities—educational and cultural films; public forums on important State issues; the availability of historical documents, books; new and scholarly papers on the Founding Fathers; courses by newspapers on the history of America, educational displays on the early days of the Revolution to help the overburdened museums get ready for the onslaught of visits; films which have been commissioned—television films which trace the historical development of the Revolution; another which is a biography of our revolutionary greats: the Adams family, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson—and many more.

This whole question came up, of course, when the authorization legislation was before the House. Amendments were offered to lower the amount authorized and the majority agreed with the Education and Labor Committee that the amount for the Arts and Humanities Endowments for 1974 be the amount the President requested. I think this was an act of legislative responsibility, and while, as I indicated, I appreciate the increase in appropriations over last year by the committee, I do wish it would have been possible for the committee to increase that amount.

I would at this time urge that when the other body reports its appropriation bill, and if in its wisdom the higher figure is adopted than the House amount, the House conferees would look favorably on their reasoning and agree to that additional amount.

This is a time when money is well spent to rethink and restudy the meaning of our democracy to try to better understand our ideological roots and through the Arts and Humanities to stir once again our national pride and faith in ourselves as a people. In my mind the intangibles which the Arts and Humanities provide are just as important as road building, research and disease, and strengthening our economy, and from these expenditures I expect the quality of life of all Americans will be improved.

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

Mr. McDADE. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

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

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I would commend our chairman, the gentleman from Washington, for an outstanding job and also the gentleman



from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE), the ranking minority member of the committee for a well balanced, good job under very difficult budgetary restrictions.

I would like to address myself very briefly primarily to one area involving the Forest Service. This has to do with the budget request we received in our committee for the forest management in our national forests. The budget request was cut back shockingly, frankly, from last year, and our committee was able to restore some \$14 million for timber resource management, and of this \$14 million, \$7 million was for reforestation and \$5 million was for timber stand improvement. This cutback was particularly unacceptable in view of the high price of soft wood lumber and plywood. At a time when our supplies should be increasing they were cut back.

I would like to direct the attention of the committee to the language on page 31 of the report in which we point out the serious deficiencies in the management of the national forest lands by reason of lack of money. This is an area where we spend \$1 and we get several dollars back into the Federal Treasury. This is to produce a renewable natural resource, one that can be renewed over and over again.

We have nearly 5 million acres of national forest land capable of the commercial growth of timber, needing reforestation and lacking reforestation. Testimony is to the effect that approximately 50 years are needed to reforest the land. It says in the report:

With the additional funds again provided by the Committee, the Forest Service will be able to make a beginning at catching up on the reforestation backlog.

I have in mind that we will have a program presented to us of approximately 10 years duration which will permit us to reforest most of the easily reforested backlog. This program perhaps will cost \$100 million to \$150 million a year average for the 10-year period of time, but if we undertake to do so we will be doing a job which fulfills a commitment to our children and will make money for the Federal Government. It is just that simple.

Again I would commend the members of the subcommittee and our leadership for the very good job in putting this bill together as well as the report.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman particularly for his activity in the subcommittee on the question of reforestation. I am new on the committee and it was appalling to me to learn from the testimony of witnesses that we really have no policy, no firm policy of catching up on those areas that need to be reforested most. As a matter of fact I believe the testimony was that today we are as far behind on reforestation as we were 5 or 10 years ago. We are just barely preventing this backlog from growing even more.

I want to thank the gentleman and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Washington, for their in-

terest in this and for the tremendous efforts both have made. We on the subcommittee have insisted that a policy be developed which will show the total cost and the items that will be included in a 10-year period of accelerated reforestation, so we can begin to catch up.

I thank the gentleman for his remarks and for his yielding to me.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman for his interest and strong support.

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

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is obviously of interest not only to those of us who live in the West but also to the Nation and it is one of the critically important bills that we will be facing in this session.

I would commend the chairman of the subcommittee (Mrs. HANSEN) for what she has done once again in wrestling with a very difficult task and coming out with a balanced budget. Certainly, there are certain things that some of us would like to see increased and yet, measured against all the competing needs which were involved in the bill, I think represents a balanced and good allocation of the dollar. She has done her customary careful work with the members of her subcommittee, and we commend her as we do our colleague (Mr. McDADE) the ranking minority member, and other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, we are grateful for the terribly long hours on each side that do not strike close to home for all members of the subcommittee unless they look hard at the fact that these needs properly are national problems, as indeed they are.

Particularly, I would like to commend my colleague in the well (Mr. WYATT) whom I know to be as knowledgeable on the problems with which the subcommittee deals as anyone in this Congress, and most particularly is this true in this area of the forest. The problems are complex problems. He has been alluding to certain of them, and I personally, knowing him as well as I do, and knowing his devotion to the problems of the forest and what we need to do in connection with them, am grateful for his being on the committee, as I am grateful for the exceptionally fine work I know him to do in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I would join with him in the remarks he has made about the praise due to the subcommittee for what has been done in connection with forest land management. The remarks about the need for reforestation are, if anything, too weak in what they say. The problems are immense. There is great need in this area, and the thing which I think many of our colleagues just do not realize is that we are here dealing with this type of renewable resource that will, if properly handled, not be a net outgo in funds to this Government, but will actually yield more dollars back to the general fund, back to the treasury, than we will be investing in these expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague in the well has made this point, and I seek to

make the comment on this only to emphasize what he said. This is an investment of Federal dollars that will return not only the amount we invest, but will return more than that.

Mr. Chairman, there are a series of other things set forth in the report which our colleagues have read, which deal with State and private forestry cooperation, forest research, roads and the like. I commend the committee for what it has been able to add to the bill in those particular areas.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close with comment on two more areas outside the field of forest; one completely outside and one involved, but not in the management. First, in the area of log exports. As the report makes clear on page 9, and I say this largely for purposes of making the point clear to the secretaries involved, the committee expects the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to take steps to include provisions in timber sale contracts which will assure that the timber involved will not be exported or used by the purchaser as a substitute for timber he exports, or sells for export. The committee expects the secretaries to publish regulations to implement this limitation. The power to do this has been on the books for some time. The secretaries have failed to use that power, and I am delighted to see that the committee is speaking strongly and that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior are warned that this is something they are to do.

Mr. Chairman, the last comment is in this field of energy research, this immense problem the Nation is facing at the present time. As the committee points out on page 8, the committee recommendation provides substantial increases over the current budget for research problems relating to energy.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for this particular item in an area where obviously much more needs to be done than has been done.

Mr. Chairman, I close once again by commending the subcommittee, and most particularly Mr. WYATT, for their actions under adverse circumstances to present a very fine bill.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague from Oregon, who has been a strong supporter in this effort.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this committee has been at work because the gentleman in the well took time last year to come to southern California and totally review the fuel modification program which is an important part of the forest fire protection expended in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I know the gentleman in the well took time to survey some of the problems we have in southern California on the management of our forests, and especially relating to a program of the Forestry Service known as fuel modification. This is basically a program to try to anticipate and prevent forest fires before they occur because of the very dry conditions we have in southern California during the fall months. Can the gentleman inform me what was done in the way of improving the money spent for fuel modifications? For every dollar spent, we are told by the Forestry Service that it, usually can save anywhere from \$7 to \$10 in eventual fire prevention control.

Mr. WYATT. Yes. I would tell my colleague that we increased the money approximately \$150,000, from an area in the neighborhood of \$534,000 to close to \$678,000.

I might say to my friend that in the opinion of most of us on the committee this figure is wholly inadequate, as the figures are in many other areas for the Forest Service, but in view of the pressures upon the committee and the necessity for us to keep within the total budget figure, this is all we felt we could do.

We hope the OMB will increase the figure in the future. I know that just in the Angeles National Forest, in which the gentleman is especially interested, we could use the entire amount, and then some, that is available for the entire United States for these purposes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's comment that the committee was good enough to increase this funding, because it is a substantial preventive measure. It does greatly decrease the long-range fire hazard. For every dollar spent now it does, in fact, result in a substantial savings of dollars that would have to be spent should a fire break out.

I appreciate the gentleman's explanation, and wish to thank the committee for a wise allocation of funds. Our delegation from southern California is grateful.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to join with my colleague from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) in praise of the gentleman in the well (Mr. WYATT). I am happy the gentleman serves on the subcommittee.

I was very disappointed on the amount of money provided for forest roads as this is so detrimental to the local governments involved, as well as the forest products industry. I wonder if the gentleman from Oregon could go into that

subject a little bit and, more specifically, discuss why we recommend \$98.6 million for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities and cut back on roads on Forest Service lands?

Mr. WYATT. I would say to my friend from Idaho, and this should be a part of the record, that he should direct his attention to page 35 of our report. The committee has made it very clear that we do not agree with the policy of shifting heavy forest road construction to the timber purchasers, because it is going to reduce the share going to the counties and reduce the return to the Government. We do not agree with this policy.

We also direct that no funds be used to prepare for timber sales which require purchasers to locate, survey, or design permanent roads.

We have also said we expect a supplemental estimate or budget amendment to be submitted to the committee, providing both for the increased sales program announced recently and a more responsible road construction program, in light of the long-term needs of all forest users.

The amount which was eliminated for permanent forest roads was so huge there was no way we could deal with this meaningfully within the budget restraints. We are very well aware of it, and there is strong language in the report on that page on our position.

Mr. SYMMS. The gentleman does believe there is a possibility of increasing this?

Mr. WYATT. I would hope we would have a budget supplemental.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYATT. I yield to my chairman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I should like to say to the gentleman that the committee is seriously concerned about this proposal to transfer road construction responsibilities to the timber purchasers. When we transfer to the timber companies the responsibility for construction of roads we reduce the receipts to the Federal Treasury and also the funds to the States and counties. In addition, we are depriving the small timber operator of having an opportunity to participate in these timber sales, because it takes substantial capital to be able to purchase the timber and provide for the construction of the roads.

The committee is seriously disturbed about this, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) has stated.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 302]

Andrews, N.C.  
Ashbrook  
Badillo  
Blatnik  
Breaux  
Breckinridge  
Chisholm

Clark  
Collins, Ill.  
Conyers  
Danielson  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Dickinson

Diggs  
Dorn  
Edwards, Calif.  
Fisher  
Frelinghuysen  
Gibbons  
Hawkins

Hébert  
Hungate  
Kastenmeyer  
Landrum  
McEwen  
Martin, Nebr.  
Melcher  
Mills, Ark.

Minshall, Ohio  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Nichols  
O'Neill  
Patman  
Powell, Ohio  
Reid

Rooney, N.Y.  
Rosenthal  
Steele  
Stratton  
Teague, Tex.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Yatron

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 8917, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 389 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG), a member of the committee.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, first I express my admiration for the chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington (JULIA HANSEN). The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) guided the course of our hearings with thoroughness and grace. Her attention to the fine points of the Nation's natural resources budget, her deep sense of priorities, and her skillful handling of the witnesses have earned her the respect of the committee.

The issues raised in considering H.R. 8917, the Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1974, are among the most important facing our Nation today. The work of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee represents a conscious effort toward achieving a balanced utilization of our scarce natural resources. These natural resources are getting scarcer all the time.

Several of the projects included in the 1974 appropriation for Interior programs are of interest to my constituents in the Baltimore area.

In anticipation of the American Bicentennial celebration in 1976, the National Park Service is undertaking to restore Fort McHenry. The Star Fort will be refurbished, the upper battery reconstructed, the moat outworks restored, and the interpretive programs of films, exhibits, dioramas, tours and ceremonies will be improved.

In Baltimore County, the Geological Survey will work toward completion of geologic and hydrologic studies which will help local planning officials identify natural resources, potential groundwater supplies, and areas of contamination. Equipped with such knowledge, officials may plan more effectively for local growth.

With an estimated 1974 apportionment of \$971,000 in moneys from the Land and Water Conservation Fund being made available to the State of Maryland, a total of \$4.7 million in matching funds, including money carried over from previous years, will be available through



the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for land and water resource protection.

There are several other matters of concern to Baltimoreans, Mr. Chairman, on which I would urge that careful study and appropriate action be taken.

The Maryland shoreline, its estuaries, beaches, marshes, and wetlands, which offer the finest recreational facilities as well as natural settings for both man and wildlife, are threatened by the prospect of oil drilling in the Baltimore Canyon area of the Mid-Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf, 40 or 50 miles off the Maryland coast. It is important, therefore, that the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Land Management, which have undertaken studies of the Baltimore Canyon, actively seek to protect Maryland's coast for the use and appreciation of our citizens.

The Chesapeake Bay and the Susquehanna River are two bodies of water extremely important to the State of Maryland—indeed to the Nation. The Chesapeake is Maryland's most valuable resource. The Japanese once pointed out they could feed the entire population of Japan from that estuary if they had to. So much of our economic well-being and recreational activities are irrevocably linked to the bay. The Susquehanna River may in the future become the main source of water for the Baltimore region. At present, the Susquehanna faces an enormous siltation and pollution problem. In order to adequately protect the future of Maryland's water resources, I call upon the Geological Survey and the Office of Water Resources Research to undertake studies of the water quality of both the Chesapeake Bay and the Susquehanna River.

There are several issues of national importance upon which I would also comment.

Strip mining has increased, not only in Maryland, but all across the United States. As a result, much more landscape is being scarred by the scraping of minerals from the earth, leaving unsightly holes and terrifying erosion. Unless intensive efforts are made to restore and reclaim the land, the practice of strip mining must be stopped, or we must enforce an effective means of overcover where the strip mining has been completed. These actions must be taken, because coal is becoming an increasingly important significant energy source.

Under the energy crunch which the Nation now finds itself in, the most pressing need is an increased supply of fuels. In seeking new sources, the United States must step up research into the liquefaction and gasification of coal and other plentiful energy sources. In addition, it is high time that oil import quotas be lifted permanently, enabling an increased supply of oil to enter the country at competitive prices, a source which we can count upon.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion and in the opinion, I think, of others, the United States need not fear for any length of time any price-fixing or oil withholding schemes among the oil exporting nations. Never has an international cartel successfully held together for a long period of time. A policy to admit more foreign

oil would ease the current energy shortage and would help to preserve our rapidly disappearing domestic oil reserves, and make unnecessary some of the proposals to start drilling along the Continental Shelf, in Alaska, and in many other places.

Finally, amid soaring lumber costs and severe shortages in the national supply of lumber, I call for the administration to release the backlog of funds earmarked for better reforestation and timber management programs in the U.S. Forest Service. The cost of new homes is skyrocketing. Witnesses who came before us estimated that in another 8 or 10 years, the cost of an average home would be double what it is now, mainly because of lumber costs.

With this reality, the administration has, nevertheless, left millions of acres in the national forests unplanted after previous timber crops were harvested. Delaying reforestation as a measure against inflation is self-defeating, because balance of payments arise when we rely on imported lumber, and uncovered timberland poses an ecological threat to the rest of our national forests.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that H.R. 8917, the Interior appropriation for fiscal 1974, reflects a deliberate and conscious effort to achieve responsible management of our natural resources. I, therefore, recommend to my colleagues the passage of this important measure so energetically, capably presented by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY).

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

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

Mr. VEYSEY. I yield to my colleague from California (Mr. MAILLIARD).

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and other members of the subcommittee for the very sympathetic hearing they gave to us when they were in the process of developing this bill, and to add to the colloquy I heard earlier this afternoon between my colleague from San Francisco (Mr. BURTON) and the chairman of the committee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mr. Chairman, I see by the committee report that the committee has directed the reprogramming of money in the land and water conservation fund to the extent of \$10 million for the purchase of land in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Just so that the record is clear, am I correct in assuming this will be \$10 million in addition to the \$5.9 million which was earlier reprogrammed, with the approval of the committee?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the answer is "yes." This is in addition to that which was previously reprogrammed.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I thank the gentlewoman.

The other point made, which I should like to reemphasize, is that I would hope whatever influence the subcommittee may have on the Office of Management and Budget, that we would together try to persuade them—I have had no success whatsoever so far—to utilize the device which was in the authorizing legislation of fixing the price of this land as of now by signing contracts and paying for it over a period of years. Congress wrote this in order that we not run into the trouble we ran into in years past, where we have set a legislative cost ceiling on a particular piece of property we were going to purchase for the public, and then we delayed the purchase so long the cost was escalated, so we had to come back and get a new ceiling in order to purchase the property. It is beyond my understanding why there is a refusal to use the device, whereby we could fix this year the exact cost of this property which the public is going to acquire.

If we delay and do not use this device, I fear we could end up, as in the case of Point Reyes, with the authorizing legislation inadequate to cover the cost of the property.

I would appreciate any help we can get in leaning on them as to the use of this excellent device the Congress provided.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks. I wish to assure him that all members of the subcommittee are deeply understanding of the problems of creating this beautiful Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I am sure we will move forward as rapidly as possible. Indeed, we have moved rapidly into the acquisition of the necessary lands.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the gentlewoman from Washington, the very gracious and very capable chairman of our subcommittee, for extending to me, really, a very delightful experience as a new member of this subcommittee, and permitting me to participate in the decisionmaking and the hearings with this group. It has been a most interesting experience, a most worthwhile experience, and I truly have enjoyed it. I thank the gentlewoman.

To all the members of the subcommittee, including the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) I would extend that same gratitude and thanks.

Mr. Chairman, I can recommend this appropriation bill to the Members without reservation. It is below the budget, and that suits me, very well. It does deal with major concerns of our Nation.

I find myself in stronger approval of some portions of the bill than I am in other portions of the bill. I should like to just run down two or three concerns I do have about it.

While it is under the budget request figure, I do not feel that we have totally dealt with some of the problems that have come before our committee. I see the possibility, indeed the very serious prospect, that later on we will be called upon for a supplemental appropriation.

That will be for just as real money as though it had been in the original bill, and we will have to deal with those needs.

The problem of forest lands, and dealing with the removal of aging or diseased—

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 303]

Ashbrook	Gubser	Powell, Ohio
Badillo	Hawkins	Rees
Blackburn	Hébert	Reid
Blatnik	Huber	Rodino
Breaux	Hungate	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Ichord	Sikes
Clark	King	Sisk
Conyers	Kuykendall	Stephens
Danielson	Ludrum	Stratton
Derwinski	Melcher	Teague, Calif.
Diggs	Mills, Ark.	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	Minshall, Ohio	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	Murphy, Ill.	Udall
Fisher	Murphy, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Fraser	Patman	Whitten
Gray	Pike	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 8917, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 386 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to my colleague the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I was making the point that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) had so carefully developed in the subcommittee. We are not doing a sufficient amount in terms of expenditure to really take care of our problems on our national forest lands in terms of removing diseased timber, burned timber, overage timber, and thus adding it to our supply of lumber available for construction so sorely needed in the United States today. We must furnish additional funds in this area.

We await a request from the Department for the appropriate amount of funding, and I feel that additional funding must be provided for this purpose.

In another area a request was made for a research slush fund of \$25 million for energy research. This had no support on the subcommittee, and I think appropriately so. Not that there was not need for a further effort in energy research, because we are caught up in an energy crisis at this time, but the committee was totally unwilling to pass out a blank check in this amount.

I assume that correct identification and description of projects will come to

the committee and additional funds will be provided in this area.

Let me bring to the attention of the committee the fact that there are some additions in this bill to the research and development in geothermal energy. I refer to energy removed from the ground. This is a promising new form of energy which is particularly exciting in the Western United States but not confined to that area. It is found in several forms—pure steam, steam and hot water, dry hot rock formations, and geopressed form. It is available now, the closest in timespan of any new source of energy. It is environmentally acceptable as compared to all other forms of energy. It is the lowest cost form of energy available not only in terms of initial investment in plant and equipment but also in operating costs. In my own State of California if we could fully develop our geothermal potential it would mean a savings of over \$2 billion a year to the consumers of power in that State.

I will insert in the RECORD an article which appeared yesterday in the New York Times noting the coming on line of a geothermal power generating facility in Mexico, just across the border from my district, which will soon be powering the factories and lights in northern Mexico.

We should be doing the same thing. We are not moving rapidly enough to develop this energy source and it is not solely for lack of money in a bill such as this. I think it is for lack of desire and lack of organization within the Department of Interior to bring about the necessary implementation of a program which we need sorely at this time.

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

Mr. VEYSEY. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for what he has just said about this important subject. I think the Members of the House should know about the very fine work he has done in encouraging the use of this new energy resource. I personally commend the gentleman for that work and join with and associate myself with the remarks he has made.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) for his comments.

It is estimated that by year 2000, geothermal energy could provide 395,000 megawatts of power in this Nation. That is in excess of the total power-generating capacity of the United States today. This is an enormous resource which we have and which we must use. They are doing it in Mexico, in Russia, in New Zealand, in Iceland, and in California to a limited extent, where one-third of the energy for the city of San Francisco is now coming from geothermal sources. I would like to see us work much more effectively at the development of this needed resource at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the importance of geothermal development cannot be downgraded or overlooked. The potential in this country is tremendous.

I submit an article which appeared only yesterday in the New York Times.

It tells an exciting story of geothermal development in Mexico, and it is indicative of what we can do here if we put the necessary effort into it.

The article follows:

MEXICO SEEKING ENERGY FROM GEOTHERMAL AREAS

(By Richard Severo)

CERRO PRIETO, MEXICO, June 23.—On a savagely hot patch of desert in Mexico's Baja California, the energy needs of nearly half a million people are being met without the use of gas, oil or coal and with virtually no pollution. For the people of Baja and the Mexicali Valley, the energy crisis has become someone else's problem.

The energy is geothermal—steam trapped at 7,500 feet below the surface at a temperature of 675 degrees and piped to the surface where its power is channeled to turbines.

19 WELLS IN COMPLEX

Mexico's Cerro Prieto plant started operation in April and by the end of this month will be providing at least 50,000 kilowatts; within three months it will have an output of 75,000 kilowatts, according to Bernardo Dominguez, the engineer who is resident superintendent.

The 19 producing wells that make up the Cerro Prieto complex are 22 miles southeast of Mexicali near the Cucapah Mountains. The complex is the biggest operating geothermal facility in the Americas and one of the largest in the world—New Zealand, Japan and Italy also have major projects.

The complex is being watched closely by energy-conscious United States scientists who know that in geological conditions similar to Mexico's which might permit massive geothermal development, exist in the western region of the United States.

Robert Rex of the University of California's Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, thinks that in California's Imperial Valley alone, it would be possible to produce 20,000 to 30,000 megawatts of electrical power. He said that Cerro Prieto is currently tapping less than 1 per cent of the potential of the Mexicali Valley, which abuts the Imperial.

Mr. Rex laments that the United States has not yet developed its geothermal energy.

Dr. L. Trowbridge Grose of the Colorado School of Mines says geothermal potential now exists in Nevada, Oregon, New Mexico, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, Utah, Washington and Wyoming, in addition to California.

Jorge Guiza, head of the Mexican Government's Department of Geothermic Resources, is very cautious about making predictions as to where this new development will take Mexico, but he noted that at its present level, Cerro Prieto is saving Mexico's 800,000 barrels of fuel oil a year.

Mr. Dominguez estimated that by 1983, Cerro Prieto will have the capacity to provide electrical power to the estimated 2 million persons who are expected to live in this area.

Under Mr. Guiza's direction Mexico is pushing geothermal exploration in 123 different places, some of them in Central Mexico. The Mexicans may thus provide such energy to many millions of its citizens, including those in rapidly growing Mexico City, which is having difficulty keeping up with the energy needs of its more than 8 million residents. Mexico City's population is growing at an estimated 800,000 a year.

Although Mexico imports less than 5 per cent of her annual petroleum needs and has large deposits of oil, the Government is pushing research into other forms of energy. "Oil reserves are limited," said Mr. Guiza, "and even if they were not, we would certainly prefer energy sources that do not pollute."

The Mexicans are developing their own geothermal technology as they pursue the delicate and sometimes dangerous task of



tapping subterranean steam. "This is one instance where we are really benefiting from the Mexican experience," said Dr. Andre Simonpietri, science officer with the United States embassy in Mexico City and a close observer of Mexican geothermal progress.

Conditions for exploration are ideal. Around Cerro Prieto—which means "dark mountain," four geological faults lie beneath the earth's surface—the famed San Andreas as well as the Imperial, San Jacinto and Cerro Prieto's faults. Cerro Prieto itself is a dark basalt mound that was an active volcano 30 million years ago.

"The volcano is dead, but the earth is still hot," said Mr. Guiza. He explained that the faults have allowed underground water to come into contact with hot magma.

Layers of sandstone and shale sit over the deposits of hot water and shafts must be dug with great care, lest the steam escape through lateral fissures and come to the surface in a great eruption.

The drilling area looks like something from another planet. Pipes emerge from wellcaps—called "Christmas trees"—and snake across a desert where it is frequently 128 degrees in the shade.

"Mexico has its own Disneyland," says Mr. Guiza "and it is called Cerro Prieto."

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

#### CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'NEILL was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to notify the House of a change in the schedule. House Joint Resolution 542, the war powers legislation, will not be taken up later today but will be taken up when we return from vacation.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to also notify the House if the second supplemental is again brought before the House tomorrow it will be my intention to again offer the no-bombing-in-Cambodia resolution and will ask the House to stand by our previous stand.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased with the remarks of my colleague from California (Mr. VEYSEY) concerning geothermal energy.

The gentleman should be complimented for his leadership in advancing the utilization of geothermal steam in southern California. We were the pioneers of this field in northern California and recognize the great value and potential of this resource.

The subcommittee has also shown its awareness of the geothermal potential and I fully support its efforts in this regard.

Also, Mr. Chairman, let me take this opportunity to express my strong support for H.R. 8917 which appropriates

funds for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and her subcommittee continue to demonstrate a remarkable and effective ability to develop a balance between the funding limitations we must maintain and the important and clearly demonstrated needs these funds are intended to meet.

I have discussed many of the items included in this bill on a number of occasions with the gentlewoman and she has always shown the highest interest in helping to advance our proposals.

The same is true for the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE), my friend from Oregon (Mr. WYATT), and the outstanding staff of the subcommittee. They have gone far beyond the norm in their assistance to me, to my constituents, and to the many others who follow the work of the subcommittee.

I would like to speak briefly, Mr. Chairman, on several specific items in the bill in order to bring the attention of the House to them.

First, the committee has again recognized the invaluable work of the California Rural Indian Health Board in meeting the medical care needs of the Indians of our State.

I strongly support the \$2 million in earmarked funds for CRIHB. I am concerned, however, that these funds may be impounded by the Office of Management and Budget as was the case last year. I urgently recommend that this policy not be continued and that these vital funds not be diverted from this work.

Second, the Forest Research Laboratory at Humboldt State College in Arcata, Calif., is funded by the bill for the full amount of \$800,000.

As a longtime proponent of reforestation, forest improvement and updating our forest management programs, I believe this scientific facility must be constructed without delay.

Finally, and in line with the forest research lab, I am pleased that the committee has given a higher priority to reforestation activities and that it has taken the initiative to place a restriction on the export of timber from public lands.

Reforestation needs more money than is included in this bill as well as greater incentives for small private landowners to become involved, but I believe we are making progress in a field that has been too long neglected. The subcommittee obviously shares this view and has recommended a substantial \$7 million increase above the budget request for reforestation.

The export question is more complicated and requires our continuing efforts toward administrative, legislative, and diplomatic means to deal with it.

All of these items deserve the full support of the House, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) for the \$600,000 she put in this bill, at my request, for the Atlantic salmon fish hatchery at Bethel, Vt.

The proposed hatchery is not in my district; it is way out of my district, but the gentlewoman knows I have taken a great interest in the Atlantic salmon. This fish has fought a very hard battle to survive; first against the netting by the Danes, and people in the Greenland and Iceland areas, and then against pollution and the nettings at the mouths of the rivers of Canada.

Finally, after a great deal of work, we have a treaty signed by the Danes and the Canadians. For all intents and purposes, the Canadians are no longer netting, and the Danes have agreed to reduce their netting year by year, eventually cutting it out entirely. Before we achieved this agreement, however, this severe overfishing had dangerously depleted the numbers of this great fish. Therefore, we now have to work together to try to supplement the Atlantic salmon population. By this appropriation of \$600,000 for the hatchery in Bethel, Vt., we are going a long way toward helping to restore the Atlantic salmon on the Atlantic seaboard.

This hatchery will produce 500,000 smolts a year, which will be put into the Connecticut River.

At one time that river was one of our finest Atlantic salmon streams. Unfortunately, it became polluted, as did many of our other rivers. But now it is being cleaned up and we are working with the electric powerplants to see that fish ladders are built on the river. When this hatchery is completed, the smolts will be provided and hopefully we will have salmon again in the Connecticut River.

The Members may wonder why the gentlewoman from Washington has taken such an interest in this. In the last 2 months, it has been my privilege to visit her State. I fished for steelhead salmon in the Klamath River, which runs through her hometown. I might say it is one of the most beautiful and scenic places in the world. I can understand why the gentlewoman is such a beautiful woman; everything out there is beautiful. I recommend a visit to that area to anyone in the House and in the country. It is just breathtaking.

Mr. Chairman, I fished also in Washington's Quinault River near the Quinault Reservation, an exceptionally beautiful stream. I fished in many other places of great natural beauty in that area, so I can see why the gentlewoman from Washington has taken such a deep interest and gone forward in helping us with this needed appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) who has taken a great interest in this particular project, for working with the chairman of the committee to make this hatchery a reality. I hope the other body will go along with it, and when the money is appropriated that the administration will spend it. At that time, I hope the three of us, and all the

members of the committee, will go up to Vermont for the opening of that hatchery.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee. Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I again wish to commend the gentlewoman from Washington, and the subcommittee, for the very fine job they have done on the bill under difficult circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has done a good job under difficult circumstances. I would like to direct a question to the gentlewoman from Washington regarding the matter that concerns me before I begin my remarks.

My question is, Madam Chairman, can she inform me of the status of wildlife refuges, particularly with their visitors and the secondary uses, such as recreation? I am troubled that there is not sufficient money here for the administration of those refuges, and I would point out that under law, before refuges may be opened for these appropriate and secondary uses, that there must be an administrative certificate by the Secretary indicating that there is sufficient money on hand for the administration of the refuges.

Does the committee in any way intend to change that law or to make possible the opening of refuges for these secondary uses without that certification?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I may say the committee is as disturbed as the distinguished gentleman from Michigan about the entire refuge problem.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife recommended reductions in the recreation uses of wildlife refuges. The committee cannot agree with this policy because if some youngster should drown at a beach, or if there is an accident of some kind because of lack of adequate supervision, it will be a terrible tragedy. You will note that the committee placed in the bill an additional \$250,000 for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for recreation management on wildlife refuges. We urge that before the Department proceed with this kind of policy, they should consult with the proper committees in the Congress and should work with State and local governments to make suitable agreement.

Mr. DINGELL. I would advise the gentlewoman that that legislation has already been written by the committee having jurisdiction over the refuges, and we have provided that unless they can show on an annual basis there is sufficient money to administer and to protect the refuge for its principal purpose that these secondary uses may not be allowed.

I should like to turn with the gentlewoman to the question which troubles me next, and that is the question of refuges and the closure of refuges. There

are a large number of refuges under this bill for which there will be no money for administration. I am sure the gentlewoman is aware of that. I am satisfied the gentlewoman is as critical of that kind of practice as I am. Can the gentlewoman comment on that subject?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes. We believe that when the Government has acquired land and opened a refuge it should properly manage that refuge. You will note that we have placed in the bill an additional \$750,000 for general wildlife refuge management.

Mr. DINGELL. I thoroughly agree with the gentlewoman.

I should like to direct the attention of the gentlewoman to a further point, which is that in the committee report \$100,000 has been deleted from the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife request for funds. The reduction relates to the "preparation" of environmental impact statements required in connection with the Bureau programs under section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act.

I note that this relates to the "preparation" of impact statements. I am troubled, but I assume that the gentlewoman has made the judgment that there is sufficient money for them to make the impact statements as required by law. Is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman is correct. There is a great deal of money for environmental impact statements.

Let me point out to the gentleman from Michigan that this bill contains something in the vicinity of \$60 million for the preparation and review of environmental impact statements. There has been an unconscionable amount of paper which has been going into some of the reports.

Let me give the gentleman one interesting figure, because I am sure he is as concerned about the environment as I am. Each Sunday issue of the New York Times uses wood from 20,000 trees and 175 acres of land. Even if 25 percent of the newspaper is recycled, we can still imagine the amount of trees involved.

We believe the Department of the Interior should lead the way. They could single space some of their statements and economize in a way that will not jeopardize the environmental impact statement preparation.

Mr. DINGELL. I do wish to draw the attention of the gentlewoman to the point that troubles me now; that is, I assume that this is not intended in any way to be a restriction on the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to make comments on environmental impact statements, also required by law, and this does not relate to that.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Not at all. I can assure the gentleman that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries has done an outstanding job on environmental impact statements. I am sure they will continue to do so. This would in no way jeopardize that operation.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentlewoman.

I am now concerned with the question of the basic operation and maintenance

needs of the national wildlife recreation system. I recognize that the gentlewoman received inadequate requests, and I do not attempt to direct her attention to this more forcefully, except to say that I believe she has done about the best she could with that with which she had to work.

I should like to make some further legislative history at this time, and I wonder if my good friend the gentlewoman from Washington would agree with me that it is the intent of the committee that there could be no transfer of the total management responsibility on any refuge or transfer of jurisdiction or transfer of any refuge to any State or local jurisdiction without the approval of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies and the appropriate legislative committee of the Congress; namely, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the committee agrees with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am sure that the committee had no intention of doing this. I have received communications personally, and I have been assured they have no intention of doing this. In spite of the fact some of the regional areas are talking about this, we still have assurances that we will not get into the problems the gentleman points out.

(Mr. EVANS of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman. I became concerned about this matter when I received numerous reports of plans to shift the management of wildlife refuges from the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to the States or other Federal agencies after being told in the subcommittee hearings that the Bureau had no such plans.

I made an inquiry to Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish, Wildlife and Parks—Nathaniel P. Reed—about these reports and received a prompt and reassuring reply from his office. So that there can be no misunderstanding that the Congress is not approving or authorizing any shift in administration or management of wildlife refuges by passing this appropriations bill, I would like to quote from the letter I received and relied upon dated June 8, 1973, and signed by Douglas P. Wheeler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Fish, Wildlife and Parks; Assistant Secretary Reed and Spencer Smith, Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; reaffirm their statements to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies:

You may be assured that the Bureau has no plan or intent to transfer any National Wildlife Refuge, or the administration of any such area, to any State agency.



I would like to add that since I received Secretary Reed's letter, and notwithstanding the letter, I have continued to receive reliable reports that regional offices of the Bureau have continued to plan for the shifting of management and administration of refuges to the States and other Federal agencies.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS) for his contribution.

I am disturbed again, Mr. Chairman, about the level of funding for the anadromous fish program. I note that the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) has again done a good job, even though there are inadequate budgetary requests from the administration, and I would be glad to yield to her for a comment on this subject.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman is well aware, in 1973 the amount was \$2,410,000, and this year it is \$1,831,000 for the anadromous fish conservation program for grants in aid to States.

If I might say just one thing to the gentleman from Michigan, I wish he would join the committee in telling OMB that they are so shortsighted in the management of our natural resources and that they are very shortsighted concerning this country's future.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would thoroughly agree.

Mr. Chairman, I will now direct the attention of my good friend, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) to the problem of refuge acquisition funds.

As the gentlewoman knows, there are two funds involved here, the first of which is the accelerated wetlands acquisition program. I notice there are no funds in the bill and none was requested. I personally happen to think that this is outrageous.

Mr. Chairman, I am not critical of the efforts of the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) but I would be glad to yield to her for further comment on this subject.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is an estimated \$7 million to be available from receipts from the Federal migratory bird hunting stamp fund to continue the wetlands acquisition program. This is a permanent appropriation and the committee does not act on it each year.

However, there is no money provided in the budget for the accelerated acquisition program, as the gentleman has stated. The committee was unfortunately faced with severe budget constraints.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would now like to direct the attention of the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) to the problem of migratory bird stamp receipts.

As I am informed by the Department of Interior, there was approximately \$10 million in receipts from duck stamp sales last year. I am informed that there is \$7.1 million which is authorized or which was requested and which was appropriated in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I note here that the law is so phrased that the \$7 million or,

rather than the \$10 million in duck stamp sales constitutes an earmarked fund. It is my view that to spend less than the \$10 million is illegal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has expired.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would note that this constitutes in my view as a chairman of the subcommittee which handled the legislation which authorized all recent earmarking of funds and price increases in duck stamp prices. I also speak as the author of all the recent legislation relating to migratory bird stamp sales—and first at \$2, then raising the price to \$3, and finally to \$5. Those were earmarked funds, and after duck stamp prices were increased to \$5 and earmarked for the migratory bird conservation fund, this constitutes an illegal impoundment of what are essentially trust funds.

I wonder if my good friend, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) would comment on that.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the committee felt the same way, and we had quite a dialog on this subject when departmental witnesses were before the committee.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

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

#### CONCERNING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I note in the committee's report on H.R. 8917 that a reduction of \$100,000 has been made in regard to the request by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. The reduction relates to the "preparation" of environmental impact statements required in connection with the Bureau's programs by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act.

I am concerned about this reduction. I think it is ill-advised. However, since it only applies to the "preparation" of impact statements, I believe that its effect on the Bureau's program will not be too great. The Bureau prepares only about 100 such statements annually. This represents only a small proportion of the total Bureau workload under this section of NEPA. The principal area where the Bureau spends a great deal of time and money is in the review of environmental impact statements prepared, not by the Bureau, but by other executive branch agencies.

It is my understanding that the Bureau reviews over 90 percent of the impact statements prepared by these Federal agencies. It is essential that when the Bureau conducts this review, they do so in a timely fashion and with complete thoroughness.

My subcommittee is currently investigating the activities of the Interior Department and the Environmental Protection Agency to determine whether

there is in fact adequate funding and personnel to carry out this review responsibility under NEPA. Thus, my colleagues will understand my concern over this \$100,000 reduction in H.R. 8917.

But since, as the committee report stresses, this reduction does not and cannot affect the Bureau's review of impact statements, I have decided not to seek an amendment to restore this sum at this time. I hope, however, that the committee will agree to its restoration if the Bureau makes a good case in the Senate for it.

Once again, I want to stress to all here today and to the Bureau that it is my understanding that none of this reduction would be applied to the Bureau's costs of reviewing impact statements. That review, which is certainly an awesome task, must continue unhindered so as not to undermine NEPA. I also want to stress that if my investigations prove that further appropriations for this function are needed, I will urge that they be included in any supplemental appropriations considered during this session of this Congress.

#### CONCERNING THE NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL REFUGE SYSTEM

Next Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to basic operation and maintenance needs of the national wildlife refuge system.

In an audit report recently issued by the Department of the Interior, it was concluded that the national wildlife refuge system is seriously underfinanced. It found that many existing facilities are badly in need of repair, some of which are literally falling apart; increased costs of utilities, material, supplies and contract labor for maintenance functions have eroded base appropriations; and new programs have created additional demands on a diminishing dollar base, resulting in overcommitment for resources in both funds and manpower. To fully achieve the output potential of the areas within the system, it was estimated that an annual operation and maintenance base of \$34 million would be needed.

Mr. Chairman, in order to insure that these refuges continue present levels of production, I appeared before Chairman HANSEN's subcommittee and requested that an additional \$5 million be added to the Department's request. I note from pages 23 and 24 of the committee report on H.R. 8917 that the Appropriations Committee increased the budget estimate by the following amounts: \$750,000 for general wildlife refuge management; \$250,000 for recreation management on wildlife refuges; and \$25,000 for Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this program, I would like to call to the attention of the Members certain language contained on page 24 of the committee report which gives me great concern. I refer to the following language of the report:

The budget proposal for 1974 included significant curtailments in National Wildlife management and fish production from warm water hatcheries. The basis of these reductions, in large part, was that these activities could be transferred to the State or local jurisdictions involved. The Committee is concerned that on-going programs will be

abandoned before adequate arrangements can be made for funding from other sources.

The Committee directs that before any on-going programs in the refuge or hatchery systems are transferred to other jurisdictions, the Committee be consulted.

Mr. Chairman, I think it could easily be interpreted from the language of the report that the committee would not object to the transfer of jurisdiction over refuges to State or local jurisdictions provided the committee was consulted before such transfers actually took place. I certainly hope this was not the intention of the committee.

Personally, because of recent budgetary restrictions, I would have no objection to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife temporarily entering into cooperative agreements with certain States for the purpose of obtaining assistance in the management of certain activities in certain refuges, such as the management of resident wildlife, including big game and upland game species; and the management of hunting and fishing activities in such areas. However, I would object most strenuously to the turning over of total management responsibility or the transfer of units of the system to State or local jurisdictions.

In a recent statement carried by the press, Assistant Secretary Reed stated that the Department has no intention of turning wildlife refuges over to States. In fact, he said, the Department has no authority to turn over refuges to States.

#### CONCERNING THE ANADROMOUS FISH PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, I would like next to discuss the anadromous fish conservation program.

This program authorizes the Secretaries of the Interior and Commerce to enter into cooperative agreements with the States for the purpose of carrying out programs to conserve, develop, and enhance the anadromous fishery resources of our Nation and the fish in the Great Lakes that ascend streams to spawn. For the period ending June 30, 1974, there is authorized to be appropriated \$10 million to carry out the purposes of the act, with approximately one-half of the authorization to be used by each of the Secretaries.

Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention that for fiscal year 1974, the States had indicated to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife a need for \$4,120,000 but only \$1,605,000 had been included in the appropriation request. I appeared before Chairman HANSEN's subcommittee and requested that the appropriation for this program be increased, at least \$500,000 to a total of \$2,105,000 for cost sharing, the same level as in recent years. Needless to say, I am disappointed that only \$1,833,000 was finally included in the bill for this important program. Naturally, this action will require a cutback in planned programs, a reduction in trained and experienced personnel with losses to program accomplishments and uncertainty for the future. This is just not fair to the States as well as to the abused anadromous fish resource.

#### CONCERNING THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

Next Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss a matter that is of particular distress to me. I refer to the land acquisition program under the migratory bird conservation account.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment and as a Member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I am greatly concerned over the lack of funds with which to carry out this program. This program has not been adequately funded since the Wetlands Loan Act was passed in 1961, which authorized a total of \$105 million to be appropriated on an advanced basis to the migratory bird conservation account over a 15-year period. Through fiscal year 1973, \$81.4 million of the \$105 million authorization has been appropriated, leaving a balance of \$23.6 million to be appropriated over the remaining 3-year life of the program. The moneys advanced under this act are added to the annual receipts from the sale of duck stamps and are available for expenditure for wetland and refuge acquisitions.

Mr. Chairman, it is folly to make cuts in this program in the face of rapidly escalating land prices and despoilment of waterfowl habitat everywhere. Postponements now may very well be permanent, either because the habitat is gone, priced beyond reason, or is being rapidly diverted to other uses, such as for residential and commercial development programs.

Mr. Chairman, because of my concern over the inadequate funding of this program, I appeared before Chairman HANSEN's subcommittee and requested that \$7.5 million be added to this program for fiscal year 1974, which would be in keeping with advances made in prior years. Much to my great sorrow, the Appropriations Committee failed to appropriate the first penny for this program for fiscal year 1974. I think a tragic mistake has been made.

To add insult to injury, the Office of Management and Budget has taken steps to place further constraints on this program by placing a limitation on the level of expenditures. This action, Mr. Chairman, has resulted in the impoundment of duck stamp receipts and I will briefly explain at this time the actions taken by OMB which resulted in the impoundment of these funds.

The budget presented to the Congress for the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Fund for fiscal year 1973 showed that estimated obligations of \$14.4 million would be incurred. It was estimated that the fund would receive \$7 million from the sale of duck stamps and it was requested that \$7.1 million be appropriated under the Accelerated Wetlands Acquisition Act. It was estimated that \$3 million in unobligated funds would be carried over from fiscal year 1972 and that there would be no unobligated funds available at the end of fiscal year 1973.

The requested appropriation of \$7.1 proved. The latest estimate by an official

of the Department of the Interior is that receipts from the sale of duck stamps total \$10.7 million for fiscal year 1973, or \$3.7 million in excess of the budget estimate and that about \$1 million in unobligated funds were carried over from fiscal year 1972. If the estimate of receipts proves to be correct, \$18.8 million would be available from the fund for obligation in fiscal year 1973.

It is my understanding that, for fiscal year 1973, an obligational ceiling of \$12.1 million has been placed on the fund by OMB and as a result the fund will carry over about \$6.7 million in unobligated funds into fiscal year 1974.

It is my further understanding that OMB has placed an obligation ceiling of \$9 million on the fund for fiscal year 1974. No appropriated funds were requested and no funds were appropriated for the fund for fiscal year 1974 and it is now estimated by Interior officials that duck stamp sales are expected to be \$10 million for this fiscal year. If the Department of the Interior's estimates of receipts for fiscal year 1973 and 1974 are correct, then the obligation ceilings imposed by OMB will result in the impoundment of \$6.7 million at the end of fiscal year 1973 and \$7.7 million at the end of fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, the obligation ceiling makes no distinction between appropriated funds advanced to the migratory bird conservation fund by specific congressional action and receipts from the sale of stamps which are automatically appropriated and available to the fund. Since \$7.1 million was advanced to the fund for fiscal year 1973 and an estimated \$6.7 million will be impounded at the end of that year, it may be assumed that the funds impounded at the end of fiscal year 1973 will be advanced funds. However, since no advance has been requested or appropriated for fiscal year 1974 and it is estimated that the funds impounded at the end of fiscal year 1974 will increase to \$7.7 million, part of the impounded funds at the end of fiscal year 1974, if the estimates are correct, will apply to receipts from the sale of stamps.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out for the benefit of the Members that the information I have just presented on the impoundment of duck stamp receipts was supplied to me by letter today by the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, the Comptroller General of the United States, in response to my request to him of March 30, 1973, to audit the migratory bird conservation account with a view toward determining if duck stamp receipts had actually been impounded by OMB.

Mr. Chairman, the impounding of these duck stamp receipts by OMB is in my opinion an illegal action. This body must make it clear that these trust receipts are to be expended as intended by the Congress, without OMB interference.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).



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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the many nice things that have been said about this legislation, I am reluctant to come up with a sour note, but, nevertheless, I feel that I must.

It was just 2 weeks ago this House acted on the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities. This was, as you know, a very detailed debate that was carried on in the House. There was much discussion and many amendments. Finally, the House, by a 5-to-1 majority, passed this legislation. What we passed was a bill calling for \$153 million for the arts and humanities. This was the amount of money that had been budgeted by the administration for this legislation.

The arts and humanities reaches all sections of this country; it is not a bill that favors one section of the country over another.

However, the committee has made a cut of nearly \$46 million from the amount that we passed in the House just 2 weeks ago. In other words, a cut of nearly 30 percent.

I am on the committee that put this bill together, and the impact of this cut is going to be quite broad, it will affect a number of programs. It will affect museum programs that were laid out for this coming year; it will affect funds to State art agencies for community councils, which is a part of a new program; it will affect the expansion of art programs involving heavily the Nation's black, Indian, Chicano, Appalachian, and other regions and people who have traditionally been missed by this program. There is a whole list—and I will not take the time of the House at this time to list one project after another—that will have to be grossly curtailed or in some cases eliminated.

The same thing is true in the humanities. It is a shame, I feel, that this one area which reaches out so deeply into our country and affects for the good so many people would be cut so severely.

I am not going to offer an amendment during the amending period to reinstate this money, because I feel the Appropriations Committee has made its decision, and I will not challenge it on the floor of the House.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. May I say to the gentleman this was one of the most difficult decisions the committee had to make. Unfortunately, this was the single major agency in our bill where full funding was requested. I want to mention however, although there is a reduction, the committee has provided about a 30-percent increase over the amount of funds appropriated last year.

Funding for the Indian programs contained in this bill received only a 3.3 percent increase. In forestry the committee provided an increase of only 5 percent. For energy research programs there is an increase in this budget, which

is for the whole United States, of only 23 percent.

We do deeply regret this reduction, but at the same time in the allocation of funds, how do you explain the fact that you will grant 100 percent funding in one instance and in another instance grant a small or no increase?

It is very unfortunate that this bill had to be confined to a budget limitation considering the 27 agencies funded by this bill.

I want to remind the gentleman that the States art councils were granted all of the budget increases that were requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

If the gentleman will yield further, let me say, the reductions will have to be allocated on the determination of the foundation, and I hope they will be as wise as possible.

I want to join the gentleman in his regrets, but I just wish there were more money available.

Mr. PEYSER. I appreciate the statement of the gentlewoman.

It is still my hope that these cuts can be restored by the Senate and in conference.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for the cut it made in the Arts and Humanities, and say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) that if a reduction was to be made, a grossly severe one would be the kind to make.

I note, however, that the Arts and Humanities will have an increase next year of some 32 percent in salaries and expenses. Such an increase, in view of the Government's financial crisis and inflation, is unreasonable.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the Chairman of the Arts Endowment, Miss Nancy Hanks, explained to the committee that the most reliable kind of management of these programs is only possible through a very careful surveillance. I think the gentleman from Iowa will agree that the money that is expended needs to be audited carefully, and watched carefully. That is the reason for the increase.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a newspaper article, a United Press news-story which indicates that there is being created in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior an assistant for the arts. And apparently she has already been selected, a woman by the name of Pamela Susan Coe, 30 years old, who is to be assistant to the Secretary of Interior for the Arts.

I wonder if the committee had any indication of this?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will yield to the gentlewoman in just 1 minute.

Her function in life from here on out apparently will be to create Federal cultural centers across the land in phased-out military facilities, as well as seashore parks, and atop trails, wherever atop trails may be.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa that the young lady is an assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. GROSS. She is now an assistant to the Secretary?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. She is now an assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently she is one of the reasons why the expenses and salaries are going up 32 percent, since she is to be paid \$32,000 a year.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, if the gentleman will yield further, that I am sure that is not the reason the expenses are going up. I may say, that the National Park Service and other components of the Interior Department have many programs throughout the country that deal with the arts. These include the Wolf Trap Farm, Ford's Theater, the Summer in the Parks program, the Carter Barron Amphitheater, and many other programs, including some involving Indian arts and crafts. I think that the young lady will probably earn her money very handily.

Mr. GROSS. I would ask the gentlewoman from Washington if her committee is prepared to finance all these new culture centers across the land, atop winding trails, in abandoned air bases, Army bases, and so on and so forth?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield further, there is no money to fund winding trails beyond the regular programs of park and forest trails.

Mr. GROSS. My understanding, according to this United Press news dispatch, is that the cultural centers will be located atop winding trails as well as the inactivated air bases, Army bases, naval bases, and so on and so forth.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield further, I must say that the Secretary has not been before the committee for the rather elaborate program the gentleman from Iowa has detailed as the result of the reading of a press release.

I can only warn the gentleman that sometimes press releases from various sources are not fully accurate.

Mr. GROSS. Can I assume now that the committee has approved the \$32,000-a-year job for Pamela?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. She is on the payroll.

Mr. GROSS. She is on the payroll now?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. All ready to go.



Did the committee approve hiring 40 recognized artists to paint pictures of Government projects? Is that a part of the arts and humanities? Or is this something new?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I did not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. GROSS. Forty recognized artists to paint pictures of Government projects—is that a part of the arts and humanities program, or is this something new that would come under Pamela's jurisdiction?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That item was not reviewed specifically by the committee. I would point out to the gentleman from Iowa that some of the best art we have in America is the result of the WPA art program.

Mr. GROSS. I should hope we are not returning to the days of the old WPA.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I also should like to commend the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican, and the entire subcommittee for doing an outstanding job on this bill. However, there is one thing that does disturb me, and that is that on April 1, 1971, I introduced a bill, H.R. 7088, with 24 cosponsors. That bill was reported out later on February 3, 1972, by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and then was passed on February 7, 1972, by this House by a vote of 361 to 8. I might read to the Members the last part of the bill where it says:

Appropriation, section 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2.25 million to carry out the provisions of this Act.

I should also like to read to the Members section 1 of the act, Public Law 92-326:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the preservation from imminent destruction the last remaining Tincum marshland in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with its highly significant ecological features, including a prime habitat for many species of wildlife and a feeding and resting place for migratory wild fowl,*

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to establish a Tincum National Environmental Center and administer the same as a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is 1,200 acres lying within the metropolitan area of Philadelphia, the fourth largest metropolitan area in the United States. The Tincum Marsh at one time consisted of thousands of acres. It is now down to a maximum of 1,200 acres. Much of the marshland has been used for the construction of a large part of the Philadelphia International Airport. Every square inch of these 1,200 acres is owned by corporations who, through community pressure and the fact that the Congress did pass this act in the last Congress, have shown re-

straint and have not used the land for construction purposes.

A landfill has been stopped at the suggestion, and only the suggestion, of a Federal judge who is hesitant to see this case go to litigation. From each side this 1,200 acres is receiving tremendous pressure. One corporation has offered to give the land they own, while another corporation, namely Westinghouse, when I-95 was constructed through property owned by Westinghouse settled for something like \$15,000 per acre. They have offered to sell this land, their remaining land, the marshland to the Department of the Interior at a substantially lower amount than they received from the condemnation, and 90 percent of it was Federal money. So we do have a time limit.

If we drew a radius around this entire marsh of say 12 miles we would encompass approximately 6 million people and if this Tincum area is properly developed it will not only provide a wildlife refuge and a stopping and feeding place for tens of thousands of wild fowl but will also provide a place where people can go and actually see nature. I would hope we could preserve this.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have no amendments. I have no quarrel with this bill. On the contrary, I have appreciation and understanding for the great significance of this bill and for the work required of the members and staff of the subcommittee. I doubt that it is generally known, but this is one of the most comprehensive of all the appropriation bills in that it covers so many agencies; some of very great importance. Nobody questions the first-line essentiality of the Forest Service or the various programs involved in Indian Affairs or the National Park Service or the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife or the Bureau of Mines or the Youth Conservation Corps to say nothing of the Department of Interior itself. These are names selected at random from the many agencies which come under the jurisdiction of this very important subcommittee.

This has frequently been called the "all-America bill," and in truth it well justifies the title. Anyone who loves the outdoors or who appreciates the grandeur of America's resources or seeks the preservation and protection of our country's assets must be proud of the distinguished manner in which this committee exercises and lives up to its responsibilities.

Now in particular let me pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the committee. There have been many who served with ability and distinction as subcommittee chairmen of appropriations and as chairman of this subcommittee. I question that there have been any who presided with more dignity and ability and more effectiveness than JULIA HANSEN. I want the record to show that I, as an outdoorsman who loves America and its great natural resources and its

beauty, am appreciative and proud of the way that JULIA HANSEN has carried on the very essential work of this subcommittee. She is a great lady—a great Congresswoman. She is ably supported by an outstanding subcommittee and staff. They deserve the full support of the committee and the House on their bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it is rare that we can bring to Congress an appropriations bill which is in effect, a money making proposition. We have here today the Interior and Related Agencies bill for fiscal year 1974. As you know, the legislation contains appropriations for a variety of Department of Interior agencies, plus the U.S. Forest Service within the Department of Agriculture.

Legislation which the Appropriations Committee has reported to the floor adds up to some \$2,269,000 in new obligational budget authority. With carryovers and so forth and other funds, the spending program for fiscal year 1974 would add up to about \$2.9 billion. At the same time, we have revenues which would be generated by agencies funded by this legislation totaling a little over \$2.9 billion. This fact to me demonstrates the wisdom of the wise conservation and utilization of our God-given natural resources.

We need these resources for a variety of things, including recreation of all types, ranging from intensified high use areas to wilderness. We also need these resources, however, for timber production and the legislation before us reflects a timber harvest of 13.1 billion board feet. This is equivalent to the construction of about 1.1 million average size homes.

We have heard a great deal about the need for new homes and adequate housing for our people and we must recognize that to build these homes we need timber.

Again, turning to other areas of interest we have soil, water conservation in the various Department of Interior agencies. We have improvement of our grazing conditions, the husbandry of our all too scarce mineral resources which are so important to our technological society and contribute so much to our high standard of living.

All in all, I think, that the investment is a wise one and I would like to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), and the chairman of the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), for an outstanding job.

We have heard quite frequently, discussions about the "free-spending Congress." Yet here we have a bill in which we have met our responsibilities and reduced the spending recommendations submitted by the administration by nearly \$5 million. The committee in its wisdom has increased some of the funds over and above what was recommended by the President and in other areas they have reduced the recommendations.

A review of these increases and decreases reflects very accurately the great consideration for the committee and I hope the Congress, for what I believe,

and my colleagues I am sure believe, are the human areas of responsibility.

The biggest increase over the budget in this bill is for Indian education, welfare and health services. We have made over the past 16 years substantial progress in providing for these native Americans, but there is much to be done and it is our hope that through realistic funding, as is recommended by this committee, we will continue on with this effort.

The next major item of increase is in the national forests. The President has called upon the Forest Service to increase its production of timber in order to help face up to the high cost of lumber in the retail market and also the high cost of home construction. If we are going to accomplish this goal we are going to have to spend the money to do it. Therefore, I am pleased to note that the national forest program would be expanded under the recommendations contained in this bill.

The third major area of increase is in the land and water conservation fund. A program which the administration has tried to phase out. This is a program which the Congress has found to be successful in providing adequately for our recreation uses for all people and I think, that its a beneficial program which the Congress should continue.

The other areas of increase represent efforts to solve the energy crisis which we face today and certainly all of us know how important that is.

At this point I would like to single out a specific recommendation made by the committee, this calls for an allocation of \$4,030,450 for the acquisition of lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Forest Service would be utilizing these funds out of the land and water conservation fund. It is our hope that with this start of an acquisition program we can make major strides in protecting the fragile soil structure in the basin and thereby not only enhancing the preservation of this scenic resource but also halting and reversing the pollution and erosion problems which we face there.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this fine bill and commend the committee for an excellent job.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8917. This bill recommends that \$2.3 billion be appropriated for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1974. This is 1 percent less than last year's appropriation and 2 percent below the administration's budget request. It is a reasonable appropriation for a well-managed Department that administers many vital areas of national commitment.

There is included within the allocation for the U.S. Forest Service a line item of particular interest to me, and the people of my district; \$200,000 is earmarked for the specific purpose of expanding the recreational facilities at Mount Rogers National Recreation Area near Abingdon, Va. The funds will make it possible to complete construction of a very desirable portion of the park. In addition, by utilizing funds already appropriated for Job Corps and Manpower Training personnel,

who will perform the work required, this appropriation will result in improvements worth nearly a million dollars.

The proposed improvements will greatly enhance the esthetic value and practical use of the Mount Rogers Recreational Area, and will provide many happy hours of relaxation for nearby residents and visitors alike. Recent years have seen a new awareness of nature's beauty and healing properties. Consequently, more and more people are taking advantage of any opportunity to leave behind the burden and worry of everyday existence to seek solace in simpler things.

I urge my colleagues to vote favorably for H.R. 8917 to enable this and other worthy programs to continue through the next fiscal year.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Interior Department Appropriation for fiscal year 1974 (H.R. 8917). I am especially pleased by the inclusion in this bill of an appropriation of \$6.2 million for Gateway National Recreation Area. This appropriation represents a real and substantial commitment for the development of Gateway.

Gateway is a project which is of great importance to my constituents, because it will provide desperately needed recreational facilities.

I want to commend the distinguished gentlelady from Washington for her efforts to insure that this project is speedily completed.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentlelady from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and her committee for several of the provisions contained in the interior appropriations bill which she has brought to the floor.

I am particularly pleased, Mr. Chairman, that the bill before us recognizes the importance of the role played by the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Mrs. HANSEN has brought us a bill which contains an appropriation of \$346,606,000 for the Forest Service, an increase of \$19,247,000 over the budget estimate. This certainly indicates that the Appropriations Committee recognizes and supports the work done by the Forest Service in preserving our environment and insuring maximum timber production from our forest lands.

The committee has also recognized the need for reduction of U.S. log exports, while encouraging reforestation and timber stand improvement. There are, I believe, sound steps toward solving the impending crisis which the United States faces in the availability of timber products for our own use. We will never meet the national additional housing goals set by Congress unless we plan for additional lumber needs.

As chairman of the Forests Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee, I share the concern expressed by Mrs. HANSEN's committee over the fact that the Forest Service expends an estimated \$20 million yearly to pick up after visitors and repair damage done by vandals in the national forests. This is an expense that could be avoided. If the public were more careful in the use of these lands and were concerned over their environ-

ment, additional funds could be used for critical forest management programs.

Finally, I would like to commend the gentle lady and her committee for recognizing the importance of the Land and Water Conservation Fund in preserving our environment and insuring adequate outdoor recreational opportunities for future Americans. The bill before us appropriates \$71,223,000 for this purpose, an increase of \$16 million over the budget estimate. I am especially pleased Mr. Chairman, that the committee has set aside \$16 million of the funds appropriated for the States to be apportioned through a special account to those States who have fully obligated all previously apportioned monies, including the funds otherwise apportioned for fiscal year 1974. I certainly share the committee's feeling that these States, including my State of Louisiana, which have taken advantage of the funds appropriated under this program in previous years to preserve and protect their environment while insuring outdoor recreational facilities for their people should not be penalized.

Mr. Chairman, these provisions which I have discussed are in the best interests of the American people. I shall cast the sixth District vote in favor of this legislation.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4-11 as supplemented by Public Law 92-347), including \$5,223,000 for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation during the current fiscal year, and acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the State concerned, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2 of said Act as amended, to remain available until expended, not to exceed \$71,223,000, of which not to exceed \$66,000,000 shall be available for payments to the States to be matched by the individual States with an equal amount.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS: Page 12 strike lines 1 through 6 inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "State, or Federal agency, concerned, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2 of said Act as amended, to remain available until expended, not to exceed \$73,473,000, of which (1) not to exceed \$66,000,000 shall be available for payments to the States to be matched by the individual States with an equal amount; and (2) not to exceed \$2,250,000 for the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife."

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, what I am doing with this amendment is simply adding the \$2.25 million which would



be necessary to acquire the Tinicum Marsh and to convert it into the Tinicum Environmental Center.

During my remarks in general debate, I called attention to the fact that this is the last remaining tidal marshland in Pennsylvania. There is nothing similar to it anywhere else in the country within a metropolitan area. I did remark that we were getting tremendous cooperation from Mr. Richard Griffith, Regional Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, which takes in this part of Pennsylvania and in fact runs all the way from Boston in New England, down to West Virginia. He has said that this is one of the most important projects that he has had to handle in recent years.

I can only say this: I just referred in passing to some of the pressures that are being brought to bear on this 1,200 acres of land within the metropolitan area. Another company involved is the Tinicum Real Estate Holding Co., which is a subsidiary of the First Pennsylvania Bank.

Mr. Richard Griffith of the Department of the Interior, Regional Director, and I have had meetings with the officials of these corporations, and they have agreed to cooperate. We have managed to keep this land open for a period of over 2 years. I can tell the Members that we do not have much chance of continuing to keep it open.

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

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

Mr. HUNT. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in regard to Tinicum Marsh. It is just across the line from my district in New Jersey. It is very important to preserve this last piece of marshland in Pennsylvania. Everything else is taken up. There is no place for the wildlife to go, no place for the ducks to go, on the eastern flyway, in the rest of that area.

New Jersey quite recently passed a new bill protecting our wetlands across the coastal areas. It is too bad we did not have the foresight to do the same as Pennsylvania, because they have the only piece left over in Tinicum Marsh. It is now paralleled by I-95 highway.

We do need further wildlife sanctuaries. This is very close to the city of Philadelphia. It is a very desirable tract to be kept in the itinerary of the Tinicum land.

I commend the gentleman, and I shall support him when he brings his amendment to a vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his comments.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that a part of this marsh does lie within the city of Philadelphia itself. In fact, city hall is approximately only 9 miles from the marsh.

In addition to all of the benefits we would gain by properly providing for our wildlife and migratory waterfowl, section 3 of the authorization bill makes this statement:

The Secretary shall construct, administer, and maintain at an appropriate site within the Tinicum National Environmental Center hereby authorized a wildlife interpretative center for the purpose of promoting environmental education, and to afford visitors an opportunity for the study of wildlife in its natural habitat.

The only reason I bring this proposal up at this time, rather than waiting for the possibility of having the committee put it in next year, is that the fact that next year may be too late and this land might not be there.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to rise in opposition to the acquisition of land which is very valuable to an area, but unfortunately the Office of Management and Budget did not this year see fit to provide the committee with a proper land and water conservation fund budget. I believe it was a grave mistake.

We have made a very sincere attempt to assist the States to maintain their programs. We have provided an additional \$16 million for this purpose.

I am not going to support and cannot support this additional \$2,250,000. We receive hundreds of requests. The committee had over a billion dollars worth of requests for budget increases. We had to turn many down simply because there is just not enough money.

I would say to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that he should reserve his request until the Office of Management and Budget decides the natural resources of this country should be preserved and sends to us a proper budget.

If we adopt this amendment, then some other Member will have an amendment, and very rapidly we will be over the committee budget ceiling.

I do hope my colleagues will vote against this amendment.

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

I merely wish to support the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) in his request for consideration of this very valuable area which should be a national park. I am quite familiar with the area. It adjoins my own district.

I well recall the efforts to preserve this area when I was in the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It required the relocating of the U.S. Highway I-95. It has encountered a number of problems with the Philadelphia International Airport. After many years of struggle we have reached a point where some action can be taken by the Federal Government to preserve this unique area, unique not only in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and adjoining States but indeed unique in the Nation.

Indeed it is unique for the Nation, and I would hope it may be saved.

I might say parenthetically that I well understand the concern of the Chairlady, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) concerning amendments to this bill *ad litem*, but our interest is in but a single situation here.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conceive of

OMB refusing to cooperate in this particular instance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WARE) yield?

Mr. WARE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to repeat that OMB is not running this Congress, and the only reason I am bringing this point up at this time is because it could very easily be our last chance.

Part of the deal that Westinghouse made in their condemnation procedure with the State for the construction of I-95 was to have an access road built into the marsh so they could fill and construct on a major part of these 1,200 acres.

We are not going to let that happen, but we are not going to relinquish this last remaining marshland in Pennsylvania as a wildlife refuge and for the enjoyment of at least 6 million people in the immediate vicinity and of those who appreciate nature.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Members the significance of this vote concerning the Tinicum Marsh.

My colleague, the gentleman from Delaware County, Pa. (Mr. WILLIAMS) makes a crucial point, I think, when he says that if something is not done about this now, the chances are that nothing will be done at all, and that this land may be lost. It is the last tidal marsh in the State of Pennsylvania. It is extremely important from a wildlife point of view; it is important from an ecological point of view.

Mr. Chairman, this may be the last chance the House will have to do something about this project.

I am always most reluctant to ask the House to disagree with my friend, the Chairman of the Committee here today, but this is an emergency situation.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREEN) yield?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREEN) has pointed this out, because as we all know, the pressure will be severe to acquire this marshland for industrial purposes rather than to keep it intact for environmental protection that it will be impossible to save that land in another 2 or 3 years.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, The gentleman from New Jersey is correct and makes some of the points I was about to mention when I yielded to him. There are other important reasons for action now.

This land is right next to the Philadelphia Airport, and I am sure there is



tremendous commercial interest in this land.

I have been in and around the area; my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) and I have even taken boat trips through this marsh.

Mr. Chairman, one can see right from the water there literally garbage and rubbish being pushed inch by inch over this area, and it is just a question of time as far as survival for this marsh is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, once again I rise to urge the members to support this amendment and save this treasure for recreation and ecological reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS). The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, including teletype rentals and service, and not to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$15,495,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 23, line 18, strike the period and insert the following: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation under this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of any special assistant for field coordination."

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which reads as follows:

Page 23, line 18, strike the period and insert the following: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation under this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of any special assistant for field coordination."

Mr. Chairman, several years ago the Interior Department established the position of field coordinator or representative and stationed one in each of eight regions of the Nation. For some time these coordinators did little and were of little value to the Department or the public. But they were costly. Their budget exceeds \$400,000 annually. Gradually, however, several of them began to take on added responsibilities and became little czars. They often overruled other departmental officials. On several occasions the House Committee on Government Operations and my subcommittee objected to this practice.

Finally, it came to my attention that the Interior Department until recently had also been supplementing its appropriation for field coordination by requiring that the various constituent agencies of Interior provide funds, personnel, and services to Interior's field representatives. Last November I called this matter to Secretary Morton's attention, and at the same time again objected to the fact that the field representatives were in a number of cases overruling

the recommendations of Interior's bureaus regarding various environmental matters. On January 4 Secretary Morton advised me that he was going to streamline the field coordination function, and on April 9, 1973, he issued an order reorganizing the Secretary's field offices.

The order provides that the personnel detailed by Interior agencies should be returned to those agencies, and takes from the field coordinators certain functions. But at the same time the order changed the title of "field representative" to "special assistant to the Secretary" and provided that each such special assistant "will have one or more staff assistants."

However, it did not prohibit these new special assistants from utilizing bureau personnel, services, and funds. It did not prohibit them from overruling the bureaus on various matters. Moreover, a review of the departmental manual which sets forth the duties and responsibilities of these special assistants raises a serious question as to whether the public should be spending nearly half a million dollars annually for this purpose.

Several weeks ago, I called these facts to the attention of the Appropriations Committee and urged that these field coordinator positions, which are not required by any law, be abolished. At the very least, I urged that the committee specify in the appropriation act that Interior's constituent agencies shall not be allowed to supplement appropriations for these special assistants by providing funds, personnel or services to them.

Today, I am pleased to note that the Appropriations Committee, to its great credit, has wisely reduced the budget of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior by \$400,000 and specifically disapproved the Department's "proposal to add eight staff assistant positions for the Secretary's regional field representatives." See House Report 93-322, June 22, 1973, page 29.

This is a progressive step in the right direction. It will save the taxpayers money and will improve efficiency in the Department.

But I am concerned that the Interior Department may attempt to continue this useless coordination role using other departmental funds as it has done in the past. Unfortunately, the committee's bill and report does not preclude this possibility. My amendment will prevent this.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), the chairwoman of the subcommittee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on page 29 of our report the committee makes it quite clear that the request for the additional eight staff assistant positions for the Department regional coordinators was not approved. In addition to that, the committee has reduced the salaries and expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. (Mrs. HANSEN of Washington asked

and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, the committee has reduced the salaries and expenses for the Office of the Secretary by \$400,000. So I believe that the legislative intent in this matter is quite clear. I have no doubt that this legislative intent will be honored by the Department of the Interior. I might add further that I know of no agency of the Government that follows the committee report as meticulously as does the Interior Department.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the amendment is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the committee did discuss this entire matter, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) is aware. We informed the Interior Department that the committee was not agreeable to this proposal, as the report states.

I do not think the amendment is necessary, but I know the gentleman feels he must offer this amendment.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I would say that I do not believe this amendment is at all necessary. As a matter of fact, I hope the amendment is voted down.

We try to deal with these matters, and to see that the Secretary of the Interior has the necessary assets to do his job, and at the same time balance the requirements that our committee has to watch in the budget, and to see that that money is used properly.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see that there is any reason to take a great deal of time on this subject. I will just add again that we have tried to deal with this in the report, and we have discussed these things with the Secretary. So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from Washington will yield further, I think that the committee has made a good case that the purpose of the amendment is to make sure that the intent of the committee is carried out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902 and D.C. Code 4-204).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 26, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"SEC. 106. None of the appropriations made in this title shall be available for any advisory committee, council, board, or

similar body which is not established by, or pursuant to, law, unless such committee has been established in accordance with section 9(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (86 Stat. 770) and its charter has been filed in accordance with section 9(c) of said Act."

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was to have been printed in the RECORD last night but was not printed because of the lateness of the meeting, although permission was extended.

The amendment simply does away with the payment of the cost of advisory boards, panels, and commissions which are not established by law. Had it not been for the rule under which we are functioning today which denies me and other Members of Congress the right to attack legislation in the bill now before us, I would be seeking to reach the same result through the device of a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the first annual report of the President on Federal advisory committees, dated March 1973, indicates that as of December 31, 1972, the Department of the Interior had a total of 126 advisory committees, of which only 78 were established by, or pursuant to, statute. The total cost of these committees is over \$472,000 annually, according to the President's report.

Some of these nonstatutory advisory committees are:

First. The Industry Advisory Committee on Coal Exports which was established in 1964 by secretarial memorandum and consists of six members, all from the coal industry.

Second. The Industry Advisory Committee to the Defense Electric Power Administration which was established in 1966 by a Secretary's memorandum. It consists of 11 non-Federal members, all of whom are public and private power executives.

Third. The National Petroleum Council, established in 1946 by secretarial directive, and consisting of over 100 executives from petroleum companies and related industries and law firms, plus the vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

It is interesting to note that, in a statement setting forth the purpose of the National Petroleum Council, which is attached to the Interior Department's annual report of agency advisory committees concerning this Council, the Council states that—

Membership is drawn from all segments of the petroleum and natural gas industries. The Council is supported entirely by the voluntary contributions received from its members.

Yet, astounding as it may seem, in answer to question K on the Interior form which asks what is the estimated "total annual cost to the United States to fund, service, supply, and maintain" the National Petroleum Council, Interior's report gives a figure of \$30,000. Apparently the National Petroleum Council is unaware that it is using Federal funds to carry out its activities. Or is it possible that the Interior Department is unaware

that the Council claims that it is funded entirely by "voluntary contributions"?

Fourth. The Emergency Advisory Committee for Natural Gas which was established in 1962 by secretarial directive. It has 26 members from various gas companies, such as El Paso Natural Gas Co., and, at least one member, the chairman of the board of Continental Oil Co., who is also on the National Petroleum Council.

Fifth. The OECD Petroleum Advisory Committee, which was established in 1962 by secretarial directive and has 11 members, all from the petroleum industry.

It is interesting to note that one committee—the Natural Energy Committee—was terminated in September 1972. It was established in September 1970, "to conduct a study to provide the Secretary of the Interior with data upon which national energy policies could be developed." It never met. Yet, according to Interior's report, \$50,000 was available for this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DINGELL was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, on June 22, 1973, when the Committee on Appropriations reported H.R. 8917, no mention was made in that bill or the committee's report—House Report 93-322—of June 22, 1973, about any of these advisory committees. Nor does H.R. 8917 specify an appropriation item for these committees. Apparently, the Interior Department funds these committees out of general appropriations to the Department or its constituent agencies. They do not want us to review that funding. So it is buried in the bill.

The act of March 4, 1909—31 U.S.C. 673—specifically forbids the use of any "public moneys, or of any appropriation made by Congress for the payment of compensation or expenses of any council or other similar body, or—or for expenses in connection with any work or the results of any work of any council or other similar body, unless the creation of the same shall be or shall have been authorized by law."

The Federal Advisory Committee Act—Public Law 92-463; October 6, 1972—which applies to all advisory committees, unless otherwise specified by law, provides in section 9(a) a procedure for the establishment of such advisory committees "by law." Until this is done, however, the 1909 law prohibits these committees from expending Federal funds.

My amendment will provide that none of the funds appropriated by this bill may be used for these committees unless they comply with the 1972 act.

I urge adoption of my amendment in order to reduce Federal costs, cut back on the proliferation of unnecessary advisory committees, and most importantly, comply with the congressional mandates of the 1909 and 1972 acts.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to identify some of the

committees which, under the gentleman's amendment, would probably fall by the wayside. These apply only to the Department of the Interior. In addition, the committee has a compilation of data relating to advisory committees of the U.S. Forest Service which goes on for 627 pages. The advisory committees for Interior where there is no specific authority are as follows:

Indian Education for Health Committee	\$8,000
O & C District Advisory Boards	5,000
O & C Advisory Board	4,000
Industry Advisory Committee on Coal Exports	
National Advisory Board for Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	10,000
Industry Advisory Committee to the Defense Electric Power Administration	1,000
Advisory Committee on Water Data for Public Use	6,000
Advisory Panel for the USGS National Center for Earthquake Research	5,000
Committee on Minority Participation in Earth Science and Mineral Engineering	7,400
National Park Service Midwest Regional Advisory Committee	6,000
National Capital Memorial Advisory Committee	100
Advisory Board on the San Jose Mission National Historic Site	280
Wolf Trap Farm Park Advisory Board	
National Park Service Western Regional Advisory Committee	7,500
National Park Service Pacific Northwest Regional Advisory Committee	7,500
National Park Service Northeast Regional Advisory Committee	6,000
Historic American Engineering Record Advisory Committee	4,000
Natural Sciences Advisory Committee	2,500
Historic American Buildings Survey Advisory Board	4,000
Emergency Advisory Committee for Natural Gas	8,000
OECD Petroleum Advisory Committee	3,500
National Petroleum Council	30,000

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to several provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act which the gentleman refers to. In the first place, the very first sentence in the Act states that—

Congress finds that there are numerous committees, boards, commissions, councils, and similar groups which have been established to advise officers and agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government and that they are frequently a useful and beneficial means of furnishing expert advice, ideas, and diverse opinions to the Federal Government.

It seems quite clear to me that Congress did not say that all advisory committees are bad. Yet the gentleman's amendment would affect both the good and the bad without discrimination.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I would call the committee's attention to section 5 of the act. That section places clear responsibility on the committees of Congress to review the need for advisory committees. It states that in exercising its legislative review function, each committee shall take appropriate action to abolish, revise, or merge advisory committees. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the appropriate place to review this network of committees is



in the legislative committees where the process can be careful and selective.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point the committee's attention to section 14 of the act which says that "each advisory committee which is in existence on the effective date of this act shall terminate not later than the expiration of the 2-year period following such effective date unless \*\*\*" certain conditions are met. The act, therefore, provides for the orderly termination of advisory committees.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Federal Advisory Committee Act is a good piece of legislation. It provides for an orderly, thorough review of all committees and for the orderly termination of those that are wasteful or unnecessary. The act was enacted on October 6, 1972, and became effective on January 3 of this year. Let us give the act a chance before we start using the meat-axe approach to its implementation. Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE).

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state to the Members of the House that I share the opinion of the gentlewoman from Washington. The Committee on Government Operations has enacted a specific statute to try to deal with this problem in an orderly and effective process.

I regret to say that I must disagree with my distinguished colleague from Michigan on this amendment. I think he is wrong here in not separating the good from the bad and not trying to do it in an orderly manner.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the last two speakers.

Last year, Congress passed legislation which would abolish all advisory boards in about 2 years unless they were extended by act of Congress, all boards that do not have a specific termination date in legislation creating them.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose there was to get rid of deadwood type advisory boards and put on Congress a specific burden to continue those performing a viable service and which should be continued. Two weeks ago, this House approved a continuation of the National Historic Advisory Council, because it was meeting in connection with our national historic program. Several of these other advisory councils performing important services with regard to the operation of our national parks, and I feel as to those that the Interior Committee, which studies and deals with the national parks, should have an opportunity to consider them individually as to whether they should be abolished or not.

Mr. Chairman, they should not be abolished by an amendment in this manner.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise here to attack or support advisory committees, but only to support the proposition that funds within an appropriation of this type should only go to advisory committees which are authorized by law. It seems to me that this is a very simple proposition. That is all this amendment says, as I read it.

Mr. Chairman, had this matter come before us without certain waivers of points of order, these advisory committees could be stricken out. This appropriation for advisory committees could be stricken out on a point of order.

It does seem to me that if the advisory committee is worth maintaining under Executive order, then somebody ought to be willing to put up the money from some previously appropriated fund.

To provide for advisory committees that are not established by law seems to me to be beyond a proper use of funds under this bill. I am not against advisory committees generally, but it does seem to me that the authorizing committee should justify the expenditure and look into the question before advisory committees are permitted to be financed by governmental money.

I support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I want to agree with the gentleman from Texas on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan. If there is anything we have too much of in this Government these days it is more advisory boards and committees.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for taking the floor.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I certainly agree on this point. It does seem to me if it is a good advisory committee it ought to be able to sell itself to the authorizing committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; purchase or rental of two passenger motor vehicles; purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees; \$55,438,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we also are surfeited in this Government with people on whom we spend a good many millions of dollars for studying things of one kind and another.

I note the Appropriations Committee has approved an increase in counterpart funds to the tune of \$1 million to sustain Smithsonian Institution do-gooders in the globe-trotting style to which they have become accustomed. At \$4.5 million, this year's request favors archeologists who are supposed to bring you a report on such projects as "The Cultural, Economic, and Social Impact of Rural Road Construction" in Poland at a cost of \$85,000 for fiscal year 1974. Incidentally, the same fellow wandered about the paths of Poland last year and managed to spend \$30,000. If nothing else, he learned how to soak Uncle Sucker for another year at an increase of \$55,000—page 29.

Biology, earth science, and museum enthusiasts did not fare as well as the archeologists this year. They will have to be content with the same level of funding received last year.

I can only wonder what led Congress to provide authority for such as this:

A project in Yugoslavia which will purportedly tell all there is to know about what hermit crabs say to one another. That costs \$5,000 in Yugoslav currency—page 62.

Over the years, the biological rhythms of catfish and flatfish which inhabit the streams of India have been under the looking glass of American braintrusters. Not satisfied with the \$8,000 received last year, the flatfish experts want another \$4,000 to continue their studies—page 38.

Another project to again receive the Smithsonian's favor is the "Ecology of Hoolock Gibbons" which, we are told, is studied because like man, it "mates for life." I suggest that before the mating experts spend another \$5,000 in India, they might give further study to the concept of and increased divorce at home—page 40.

I will wager that it will take some explaining if the equivalent of \$6,000 is spent to study bisexual frogs in Poland. I am sure we could not get along without that one—page 54.

Last year, \$15,000 was spent on the "Comparative Bioenergies of the House Sparrow" of India. I see they wanted another \$3,000 for it this year—page 41.

I am somewhat stymied by a proposal to spend \$5,000 to compare the similarities between American and Indian whistling ducks—page 46—but I note that lizards are also well provided for. While the experts want to spend \$3,000 in search of Indian lizards—page 47—Yugoslav lizards must be less plentiful as it will require \$15,000 to find them—page 60.

You may recall the Smithsonian sent a man to India last year to survey the tiger population. I fail to notice a request for continued funding for that project this year, and I was wondering



if he returned alive. At any rate, this year researchers will be receiving \$35,000 to chase wild boars in Pakistan. We have already spent \$73,000 on that, and some \$50,000 to conduct "A Survey of the Wild Sheep and Goat Population" also in Pakistan which cost \$10,000 last year.

Mr. Chairman, from the collection of moss in Burma—page 32—to the collection of art high in the Himalayas of Bhutan—page 16—you will find Uncle Sucker an easy catch for researchers waiting to lure a sponsor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein. This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1974".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SEIBERLING

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEIBERLING: Page 41, after line 18, insert the following new subsection:

SEC. 303. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be expended for any expense in connection with any lease, permit, approval, or other action hereafter authorizing surface coal mining on any lands within any area of the National Park System; the National Wildlife Refuge System; the National Wilderness System; or the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, including "study rivers" designated under section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment.

The committee report notes that the Interior Committee of the House is considering and has been for some time considering legislation concerning the control of the strip mining of coal. That legislation is still working its way through the subcommittee, but it seems to me there is one thing we can do to make perfectly clear the position of the Congress with respect to the lands where, as a matter of policy, the executive branch departments do not authorize new coal strip mines but where the Congress has never expressly ratified that policy.

All this does is to say that the funds we are appropriating here shall not be used for granting any additional permits, other than those that already exist, for strip mining coal in national parks, national wildlife refuges, national wilderness systems, or areas set aside as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. It does not prevent anybody from doing so who already has rights to mine the coal, and it does not affect any minerals other than coal, but it does make it clear that Congress backs the policy already in existence with respect to those areas.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I am pleased that the gentleman from Ohio

has offered this amendment to ban strip mining in certain areas. I hope that eventually the Congress in its wisdom will vote a complete ban on strip mining everywhere. Mark my words, that day will come. This amendment really does not go far enough, it seems to me, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio. It does not cover national forests, and there is strip mining going on in the gentleman's own State in the Wayne National Forest in Ohio. There are 24 permits for strip mining, covering 1,800 acres in the Wayne National Forest. The amendment does not cover deep mining which causes great damage in the areas that the gentleman is interested in protecting. It seems to me the gentleman's amendment really ought to be extended to cover those areas, but I enthusiastically support it nevertheless and strongly urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SEIBERLING. It does not go far enough, I agree. And I might say I also feel that, in the end, we will come to realize that a phaseout of coal strip mining is in the national interest, both from an energy standpoint and an environmental standpoint. I also appreciate the advice and assistance the gentleman has given me on this amendment. It has been most helpful.

The reason why it does not cover national forests is a purely technical one, which is that there is money in this bill to authorize experimental work on reclamation of strip mining of coal in national forest land. Since, under the House rules, we cannot have legislation in an appropriation bill, I was unable to draft an exception which would cover that particular provision in the bill. For that reason, and in deference to the wish of the distinguished chairwoman of the subcommittee (Mrs. HANSEN) that I not propose action which would block that experimental work, I eliminated the reference to national forest land. However, I am sure she will agree with me that, by deleting the reference to national forests, we are not thereby approving the principle of surface mining of coal in national forest land.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I did discuss the amendment with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, and I think he will recognize there is \$1,700,000 in this bill for Project SEAM, which is a research and demonstration program devoted to finding better ways to reclaim surface-mined areas.

There is also experimental work going on in Berea, Ky. There is also a continuing program going on in Utah in the dry, arid lands. It would seem to me that it would be irresponsible to cut off this research given our present energy crisis. At the same time, as the gentleman knows, the Interior authorizing committees in both Houses are marking up strip mine regulation bills. This amendment, which proposes to prohibit surface coal mining in the National Park System and the National Wildlife Refuge System, the National Wilderness System, and the

Wild and Scenic Rivers System certainly does no violation to this needed research.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this subject up, and the wording the gentleman has used. I certainly have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full 5 minutes, and I will try not to take even 1 minute. However, I want the record to show, and I want the Members to know that strip mining is taking place now in the national grasslands of the State of Wyoming.

The Members in the Congress created the national grasslands in the interim while I was not in the Congress, and the time that I came back. So I now wish to make it a matter of official record that strip mining is going to take place in the national grasslands.

Mr. Chairman, I know that we cannot change the amendment to include them, but I do take the floor at this time so as to have this made a matter of record for the balance of our Congress, so that the Members and the proper committees can work upon it.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Wyoming on his remarks. The gentleman from Wyoming is absolutely right. This merely points up the fact that the only solution to the giant rip-off involved in strip mining is for the Congress to enact a complete ban on this assault on our land, forests, waters, and soil. We hear a great deal about the "energy crisis," and some of my colleagues ask me: "How can you favor a ban on strip mining when the Nation faces an energy crisis?" The answer to this question is very clear: There are only 45 billion tons of coal available which can be strip-mined economically with current technology. Even the most rigidly conservative estimate of the tonnage of deep-minable coal which can be extracted economically with current technology would place the figure at 356 billion tons—which is eight times as much deep-minable as strip-minable coal.

A recent study made for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs places the ratio of deep to strip coal at 30 to 1. In any event, it is vital if we are to meet the energy crisis to stockpile our strippable coal reserve underground to be utilized if needed after we have used up our deep-minable coal reserves. This is why I have introduced H.R. 1000, and companion bills, which phase out the strip mining of coal in steep, contour areas within 6 months,

and phase out the deep mining of coal within 18 months in relatively flat areas.

This is why I consider the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) as a very constructive step in the right direction, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I know that the hour is late. I believe that this amendment is absolutely worthless. It purports to ban strip mining where none exists, and it does not address itself one iota to the areas where it does exist. It borders upon the ludicrous, but it does not violate, of course, the spirit or the efforts of our committee in overseeing the national public lands. It is inconceivable that strip mining, for example, would ever occur in a national park.

In that spirit, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment but, as I say, I do not think the amendment does any good.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8917) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 4, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

YEAS—405

Abdnor	Dellums	Jarman
Abzug	Denholm	Johnson, Calif.
Adams	Dennis	Johnson, Colo.
Addabbo	Dent	Johnson, Pa.
Alexander	Devine	Jones, Ala.
Anderson, Calif.	Dickinson	Jones, N.C.
Anderson, Ill.	Diggs	Jones, Okla.
Andrews, N.C.	Dingell	Jones, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Donohue	Jordan
Annunzio	Downing	Karth
Archer	Drinan	Kastenmeier
Arend	Dulski	Kazen
Armstrong	Duncan	Keating
Ashley	du Pont	Kemp
Aspin	Eckhardt	Ketchum
Bafalls	Edwards, Ala.	Kluczynski
Baker	Edwards, Calif.	Koch
Barrett	Ellberg	Kuykendall
Beard	Erlenborn	Kyros
Bell	Esch	Landrum
Bennett	Eshleman	Latta
Bergland	Evans, Colo.	Leggett
Bevill	Fascell	Lehman
Biaggi	Findley	Lent
Blester	Fish	Litton
Bingham	Flood	Long, La.
Blackburn	Flowers	Long, Md.
Boggs	Flynt	Lott
Boland	Foley	Lujan
Bowen	Ford, Gerald R.	McClary
Brademas	Ford, William D.	McCloskey
Brasco	Forsythe	McCollister
Bray	Fountain	McCormack
Breckinridge	Fraser	McDade
Brinkley	Frelinghuysen	McEwen
Brooks	Frenzel	McFall
Broomfield	Frey	McKay
Brotzman	Froehlich	McKinney
Brown, Calif.	Fulton	McSpadden
Brown, Mich.	Fuqua	Macdonald
Brown, Ohio	Gaydos	Madden
Broyhill, N.C.	Gettys	Madigan
Broyhill, Va.	Gialmo	Mahon
Buchanan	Gibbons	Mailliard
Burgener	Gillman	Mallory
Burke, Calif.	Ginn	Mann
Burke, Fla.	Gonzalez	Maraziti
Burke, Mass.	Goodling	Martin, Nebr.
Burleson, Tex.	Grasso	Martin, N.C.
Burlison, Mo.	Gray	Mathias, Calif.
Burton	Green, Oreg.	Matsumaga
Butler	Green, Pa.	Mayne
Byron	Griffiths	Mazzoli
Camp	Grover	Meeds
Carey, N.Y.	Gubser	Melcher
Carney, Ohio	Gude	Metcalf
Carter	Gunter	Mezvinsky
Casey, Tex.	Guyer	Michel
Cederberg	Haley	Millford
Chamberlain	Hamilton	Miller
Chappell	Hammer	Minish
Chisholm	schmidt	Mink
Clancy	Hanley	Minshall, Ohio
Clausen, Don H.	Hanna	Mitchell, Md.
Clawson, Del	Hanrahan	Mitchell, N.Y.
Clay	Hansen, Idaho	Mizell
Cleveland	Hansen, Wash.	Moakley
Cochran	Harrington	Mollohan
Cohen	Harsha	Montgomery
Collier	Harvey	Moorhead, Calif.
Collins, Ill.	Hastings	Moorhead, Pa.
Conable	Hawkins	Morgan
Conlan	Hébert	Mosher
Conte	Heckler, W. Va.	Moss
Corman	Heckler, Mass.	Myers
Cotter	Heinz	Natcher
Coughlin	Helstoski	Nedzi
Crane	Henderson	Nelsen
Cronin	Hicks	Nichols
Culver	Hillis	Nix
Daniel, Dan	Hinshaw	Obey
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hogan	O'Brien
Daniels	Holifield	O'Hara
Dominick V.	Holt	O'Neill
Davis, Ga.	Holtzman	Owens
Davis, S.C.	Horton	Parris
Davis, Wis.	Hosmer	Passman
de la Garza	Howard	Patman
Delaney	Huber	Patten
Dellenback	Hudnut	Pepper
	Hunt	Perkins
	Hutchinson	Pettis
	Ichord	Feyser

Pickle  
Poage  
Podeil  
Powell, Ohio  
Preyer  
Price, Ill.  
Price, Tex.  
Pritchard  
Quile  
Quillen  
Rallsback  
Randall  
Rangel  
Rarick  
Rees  
Regula  
Reid  
Reuss  
Rhodes  
Riegle  
Rinaldo  
Roberts  
Robinson, Va.  
Robinson, N.Y.  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rogers  
Roncalio, Wyo.  
Roncalio, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rose  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Rousselot  
Roy  
Roybal  
Runnels  
Ruppe  
Ruth  
Ryan  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Sarasin  
Sarbanes  
Satterfield

Saylor  
Scherie  
Schneebell  
Schroeder  
Sebelius  
Seiberling  
Shipley  
Shoup  
Shriver  
Shuster  
Sikes  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Snyder  
Spence  
Staggers  
Stanton  
J. William  
Stanton,  
James V.  
Stark  
Steed  
Steele  
Steelman  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stephens  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Stuckey  
Studds  
Sullivan  
Symington  
Symms  
Talcott  
Taylor, Mo.  
Taylor, N.C.  
Teague, Calif.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Thone  
Thornton  
Tiernan  
Towell, Nev.

NAYS—4

Collins, Tex.	Landgrebe	Mathis, Ga.
Gross		
Ashbrook	Derwinski	Mills, Ark.
Badillo	Dorn	Murphy, Ill.
Blatnik	Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.
Bolling	Fisher	Pike
Breaux	Goldwater	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Hays	Sisk
Conyers	Hungate	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	King	Thompson, N.J.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Evins of Tennessee

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hungate.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Murphy of Illinois.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Danielson with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Pike with Mr. Sisk.

Mr. Badillo with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. King.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hays.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.